

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 11, 1979

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): – Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce you, sir, and to the other members of the legislature, a group of 20 students from Martin Collegiate who are seated in the west gallery. Would you like to stand up and be recognized? These students are accompanied today by Peter Flaska, their teacher. Many of you might know that Martin Collegiate is well known for its sports program in Regina, particularly wrestling. It has probably one of the best high school wrestling programs in Saskatchewan, indeed all of Canada. But they also have academic excellence in abundance at Martin Collegiate. I'm sure all of the members would want to join with me in welcoming these students to the House this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Cornwall Centre

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the minister responsible for the Cornwall Centre. Will the minister confirm or deny reports in today's Leader-Post that both the principal and interest charges to private investors of the Cornwall project . . .

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Mr. Speaker, I'll reword the question. New question, sorry. Mr. Minister, are the principal and interest charges of the Cornwall Centre to be calculated before the net cash flow is determined?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): – Yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Well, Mr. Minister, is that not unusual and why wouldn't you offer it to some Regina families or businesses or developers as was also reported in today's Leader-Post?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, I find this very interesting. The Conservatives have, all of a sudden, developed a keen interest in local business – in the retail end of the operation. You know, when it comes to oil, uranium and potash, they want those to go to multinational corporations, Mr. Speaker. They support the multinational corporations in development of our resource industries. But when it comes down to retail operations, all of a sudden they become interested in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order. I get the impression that the minister is attempting to make a speech and I don't intend to permit him to make a speech. He may answer the question.

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, I say they have all of a sudden developed an interest in

the local business people. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity for local business people to develop the downtown area in Regina has been there for many years, for at least 10 years. I am aware that the city of Regina has been talking about downtown redevelopment for many years. Local business people, for whatever reason, did not see fit to try in the city of Regina or to come forward to help the city of Regina redevelop the downtown core.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that when the project was being developed or the idea of redeveloping the downtown project, the local business people did not come forward with any proposal to assist in the redevelopment. As a result, Mr. Speaker, Chartwood, together with Eaton's, came forward with a proposal which we believe is going to be viable and is going to make a very attractive redevelopment of the downtown area.

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of . . . did you want to call a point of order? . . . the information that you have given us or failed to give us and in light of the confusion that is existing in this province today or in the city, will you now at least table the basic agreements that you have undertaken with Chartwood and Eaton's, so that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan may know the sweetheart deal you have made and the extent to which you have sold them out?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, I believe the only people who are confused are the Conservatives on the opposite side of the House. They are the only confused people because I see the media are generally reporting the situation relatively accurately and I believe the people of Saskatchewan do understand the proposal and the project. As far as tabling the agreement, Mr. Speaker, I said last week and we restate it again that there are at the present time some revisions taking place to the agreement and when those revisions are completed we will consider that as well. The hon. members I'm sure are well aware there are the other two partners, Eaton's and Chartwood, that have to be consulted about tabling any agreements.

Cornwall Centre

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – I would like to direct a question to the minister responsible for Cornwall Centre. You have indicated that the press statements are accurate. One of the press statements is to the effect that the eastern developers will have a return on investment of roughly 6000 per cent. Would the minister indicate whether Eaton's, for example, makes any rental payment the first year, because the press statements seem to indicate that net cash flow after the first year? Who gets the first year? Secondly, does Eaton's make any rental payments the first year?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, we are to receive in the first year a \$450,000 ground lease. That is what we will be getting in the first year. I am afraid that I do not have the particular detail that the hon. member is asking about.

MR. LANE: – Would the minister not admit that a \$450,000 return on a \$14 million land acquisition investment by the government on the first year is, I believe, a lot less than 3 per cent and that of itself is extremely poor negotiating by the government and a bad return on investment?

MR. SMISHEK: – No, I would not agree. Remember this is the first year of the operation and it is not unusual in these kinds of set ups in the first year. In the second year, as I indicated, we will get the \$450,000 plus 51 per cent of the net cash flow.

MR. LANE: – Who gets the income on the first year? Will you tell us? Is it the developer? He gets the full income the first year?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, certainly the project takes the money in the first year.

Occupancy Rate of Cornwall Centre

MR. LANE: – Is your so-called cash flow based on 100 per cent occupancy in your estimates?

MR. SMISHEK: – Well, the net cash flow and the 51 per cent, regardless of whether it's 100 per cent occupancy or less – it's still going to be 51 per cent of the net cash flow.

MR. LANE: – Supplementary. No, but you've also indicated that there's to be a 12 per cent return and I'm asking you whether your estimations of income are based on 100 per cent occupancy or not.

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, that's a minimum figure that we calculate. Even, I notice, the press today came out saying their estimation is 15 per cent. No, it will not, there are always some vacancies going to occur from time to time. The calculations are made accordingly.

MR. LANE: – Supplementary. What is the vacancy factor that you have used in your agreement?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, I do not have that figure at my fingertips at the moment.

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

MR. LANE: – New question. You've indicated that the cash flow calculation starts supposedly a year after completion of the project. The following situation is not abnormal, that that would be for, say, the prime tenant, Eaton's, to occupy the premises for, say, two years before the project is completed. Would you indicate whether Eaton's gets free rent for one year or makes no contribution for the first year or exactly when is that project deemed to be completed so that the year is determined for calculating the supposed net cash flow?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that from the time the construction starts till completion will be approximately 20 months. It may be longer, based on weather conditions and other factors so really we're saying one year from the completion of the project and actually that is the way the agreement is determined.

MR. LANE: – Just one final supplementary to the minister. Are you now prepared to table in this Assembly your agreement between the developer or its company and the specific agreements with Eaton's or do you continue to refuse to give that information to the public?

MR. SMISHEK: – No, I'm not refusing that. I have already answered that question, Mr. Speaker.

SGEA Strike – Minister of Highways' Statement

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – Mr. Speaker, my question is to the

Minister of Labour. Mr. Minister, do you endorse the statements of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) and threats of lawsuit levelled against the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) union and its members at this time?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): – Mr. Speaker, I'm inclined to believe contributions by the hon. member who just took his seat and by cabinet ministers and other MLAs are somewhat less than productive, and I would think while the collective bargaining process is going on, perhaps members opposite, perhaps as well members on this side of the House, might contribute more by withdrawing from the process.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: – I take from your statement, when you mention members on your side of the House, that you do not approve of the minister's statements. If that is so, have you recommended to the Premier his withdrawal from the cabinet?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: – I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. You have been strangely silent through this whole process – you're the only cabinet minister over there who seems to have been. You have been asked a very pointed question. You have been a very articulate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order. Does the member have a question?

MR. LANE: – Yes. You've been a very articulate spokesman for the labor movement in this province. Do you or do you not condone the statements by the Minister of Highways and secondly, do you condone his statements in the process of the collective bargaining process?

MR. SNYDER: – I appreciate the member's anxiety to embroil more people in involving themselves in a process which I said earlier I believe to be less than productive. I don't intend to comment any further to the satisfaction of the member opposite or anyone else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

SGEA Strike – Road Conditions

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): – Question to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, having been an individual that was unfortunate enough to have to travel your highways between Moose Jaw and Regina about 12:30 or one o'clock today and having seen the disgraceful condition of the overpass in Regina, south of here, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, may I ask the minister when we can expect his rhetoric with Mr. Brown of the SGEA to cease so we can get some action to make our highways safe, or do we have to have a tragedy before something will happen from your department?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): – Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the member for Thunder Creek is here, honoring us with his presence for once. I would like to inform him of the condition of the roads reported for Regina: generally icy conditions; packed

snow in sheltered conditions; sanding is in progress; caution is advised. That is normal for this time of the year; one day after a storm. I would like to inform the member that I have checked the road conditions between here and our neighbor to the west. During the last two weeks there have been nine fatalities in Alberta due to icy conditions and none in Saskatchewan, in reply to his concerns about deaths. Our people are doing a tremendous job. They deserve credit and they will continue to do it. Our roads are in better than average condition compared with both sides of the border.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: – Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Isn't it true that many of your employees are hesitant to return to properly man the equipment that they have strictly because of the needless, silly, useless confrontation between yourself and Mr. Brown which has hampered the so-called (in the terminology of the Minister of Labour) the sacred collective bargaining process? Isn't it true that you, because of our rhetoric with Mr. Brown, are impeding the safe condition of our highways at a very critical time of the year?

MR. KRAMER: – Mr. Speaker, no it is not true.

SGEA Strike – Negotiations

MR. KATZMAN (Rosthern): – We are now into the twenty-sixth day of the SGEA strike. Will you now please use our good offices to assist in the speeding up of negotiations?

MR. SNYDER: – The member for Rosthern never ceases to amaze me. At the present moment, I understand since 9 o'clock this morning, Sig Walter, Industrial Relations Officer, has been meeting, will be meeting with both of the parties today making every effort to ensure that there is no stone left unturned; that every effort is being made to have the parties arrive at a peaceable settlement just as quickly as possible. I don't know of anything further that could appropriately be done under the circumstances, or we would be doing it.

MR. KATZMAN: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As the minister is aware these negotiations are still not face to face. I understand if you remember correctly, when the last major strike hit the province of Saskatchewan – I refer to the dairy workers strike – your office intervened when the two parties would not get together directly. Do you not feel that your office can bring those two parties back to the bargaining table, get a settlement, the same as you did in the dairy strike when you intervened?

MR. SNYDER: – I have to inform the hon. member that we hire and pay good wages to industrial relations officers who conduct collective agreement processes, or attempt to act as a catalyst between the parties. For me to inject myself into the bargaining process I think would be wholly inappropriate at this time. I am sure that if the tone is right and our industrial relations officer believes that there is something to be gained by bringing the parties together face to face he will be doing that. I am sure the hon. member knowing something about the collective bargaining process would also agree that to bring the parties together prior to that appropriate moment sometimes results in a non-productive activity, sometimes counterproductive.

MR. KATZMAN: – Supplementary, Mr. Minister. Would you guarantee to this House that if the negotiations should break down again your good office will be used to do its

utmost to get them back and if it includes the minister personally intervening, as he did in the dairy strike, would you give this House the commitment that you will do it again?

MR. SNYDER: – No, I will offer no such assurances. There are a number of options which are open to the public service commission and the public service commission is the body at the table which is negotiating with the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association. I will not give assurances that I will personally involve myself.

Meewasin Valley

MR. E.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): – A question to the Attorney General. I understand the R.M. of Corman Park, one of the members of the Meewasin Valley Authority, has passed a resolution to the effect that they intend to opt out of Meewasin Valley Authority unless the land that is encompassed by that authority is substantially reduced. Have you had any discussions and do you have any comments with regard to them pulling out of Meewasin Valley Authority?

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, I have not seen any resolution to this effect. I have not had any discussions with the R.M. of Corman Park and therefore I cannot make any useful comment in this regard.

MR. ANDREW: – Would you not agree, Mr. Attorney General, that the R.M. of Corman Park is indeed a very important part of Meewasin Valley Authority and if they are going to pull out with something like 90 per cent of all the privately owned land in that R.M. of Corman Park, that this really puts the Meewasin Valley Authority in very serious problems?

MR. ROMANOW: – I think, Mr. Speaker, what we have to get here is a copy of the resolution to see what the R.M. of Corman Park does say. I don't know what the options are and I just imply say what I said in the earlier answer – I am not appraised of this decision. I would wait until the Meewasin Valley Authority, as an authority, deals with the subject if and when it does come up before them, before I would respond as one member of that authority.

MR. ANDREW: – New question, Mr. Speaker. The Mortgage Lenders Association of Saskatoon have also indicated, I believe, that as long as section 45 of the act remains as is, they are not prepared to make any mortgage money available to house mortgages, etc. Does the Attorney General in his notice yesterday intend to make amendments to section 45 of that act?

MR. ROMANOW: – Well I think, Mr. Speaker, there will be amendments. I hope they will be ready for tomorrow. I believe the Premier, on behalf of the government or someone, gave notice yesterday for the amendments on Wednesday. I think there will be an amendment dealing with section 45. I am not sure it will address itself to the concern of the money lenders specifically, but I think we profitably should await the tabled amendments before we can carry on any sensible discussion as to what the amendments say or don't say. So wait until tomorrow.

MR. ANDREW: – Final question, Mr. Speaker. I understand, from press reports yesterday in Saskatoon, the Attorney General indicated that if the pressure continued he was prepared to simply dissolve the authority. Now that strikes me, Mr. Minister, as basically saying if you don't play by my rules, I am going to take my ball and go home. My question to you is: is that any way for the Saskatchewan's answer to J.F.K. to be

acting?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I'm glad at least to be an answer in some way to Saskatchewan rather than the present member who asks the question, who so far as I know is an answer to no one in Saskatchewan.

But let me say this with respect to the statements which I make. I don't think the opposition can have it both ways. They can't say to us, listen to the voice of the people which they represent, the voice which calls for the repeal of the Meewasin Valley Authority. That was the substance of the early questions about a week ago when the House started. At the same time they say if we do listen to the voice of the people, we are acting in a high-handed way. I say, Mr. Speaker, that question shows duplicity in that regard.

The position of the government is very simple. We believe the river bank of Saskatoon is an exceptional thing to preserve and to promote. We believe that legislation is required, with authority in the legislation, to effect that objective. We are prepared to amend the legislation to accommodate many of the legitimate concerns of the R.M. of Corman park, of the heritage association, or the money lenders or anyone else. There comes a point whereby in accommodating in the legislation, we end up with no authority, whatsoever. It is meaningless for the money lenders or other people to say we are for protecting the river bank and at the same time say we want the bill repealed without defining what authority they would give to this agency. So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing everything that we can to propose the amendments and to accommodate the legitimate concerns of all the citizens involved in this area. Inevitably there will be a conflict between authority and private. I say that we are trying to strike that balance. If we cannot get the public's acceptance of the view there may be no other option but to do as I indicated in the press yesterday in Saskatoon.

Answer to Question – Poplar River Power Project

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): – Mr. Speaker, the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) yesterday in my absence addressed a question and two supplementaries to the Premier. The question and the two supplementaries dealt with the SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) Coronach operations.

The question, I believe, was attempting to indicate to the Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan that the minister responsible for the power corporation, myself, had misled and shown arrogance in conveying certain information to the people of Coronach, and in effect to the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Montana in respect of that power installation. He suggested that I had been somewhat less than honest in conveying to them that at one point in time the Coronach installation was expected to generate some 1,200 megawatts of electricity. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. If the member had taken the time to inform himself he would have known that the concept of a 1,200 megawatt unit was initially a preliminary, internal corporate decision as to what supply of coal was available in the area and what level of generation it would provide. It would provide for 1,200 megawatts. And we indicated that to the first Poplar River Board of Inquiry as far back as November 1974. It is inappropriate for the member for Estevan to suggest to this Legislative Assembly that we have been attempting to mislead and misdirect the people of Saskatchewan as to the ultimate size of the installation. I emphasize that it is ultimately possible to have a 1,200 megawatt unit only because of the reserve of coal. There were certainly other mitigating factors that had to be taken into consideration before such an installation could be put into place. At all times, especially during public inquiries, the

Saskatchewan Power Corporation made that information available to the general public.

His two supplementaries, Mr. Speaker, deal with the ongoing relationship between the minister, the government and the SPC, and the state of Montana in attempting to be open and forthright in conveying to them the implications of this power installation. In fact, I quote him in yesterday's journal as saying, and this is a quote he says I made, Mr. Speaker:

It is not our obligation to abide by the laws of foreign jurisdictions.

He thereby attempts to leave the impression, Mr. Speaker, that I have paid no consideration to the concerns of Montana residents. Let me bring to the member's attention the statement that I made to the IJC (International Joint Commission) hearing September 10 in Coronach. I state in full, because this is where he got that quotation:

I would also emphasize that the Government of Saskatchewan and SPC are committed not only to obeying the letter of the law but the intent and spirit of the laws of Saskatchewan and Canada. We are also sensitive to Canada's international obligations and will respond to the legitimate concerns of our American neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite don't want to hear the total content of my statement and it shows the kind of attitude that the members of the opposition use when they talk about the actions of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: – I continue, Mr. Speaker:

We are not, however, legally or morally bound to obey the laws of another nation and this must be made clear. It is, however, our fullest intention to be good neighbors and I believe we have demonstrated our sincerity in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that in all instances we have been fully co-operative . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order! I would ask the minister – he has already had two minutes anyway . . . Order, order! I was saying that the minister had already had at least two minutes to answer the question and he appears to be going on further. I don't think that the question period would allow him to do that even if we had more time. We have now reached the point where we are at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the hon. members to go directly to the special order debate.

MR. SPEAKER: – Order. There has been a request by the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) that we move directly to special order and return later this day to complete the balance of routine proceedings. Is the Assembly in agreement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: – Special order.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Solomon (Regina North-West) for an address in reply.

MR. B. M. DYCK (Saskatoon-Mayfair): – Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned the debate yesterday I was saying that I am pleased to participate in this, the tenth consecutive throne speech debate, from the government's side of the House. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to represent from this side of the House the many fine people of Saskatoon-Mayfair who have elected me to represent them in this legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: – There have been many complimentary remarks made about the mover and the seconder of the throne speech, and I, too, want to add my words of congratulations to the member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) and the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long), who in my view did an excellent job. My congratulations to the member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) should be twofold since I should also congratulate him for winning rather handily last October in the by-election in that seat. The Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, lost their deposit, ran a poor campaign, and ran a poor third in the voting. I predict they will be running a poor third for some long time to come in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: – I also want to extend my well wishes to the new members recently appointed to the Executive Council. Mr. Speaker, while I'm in this congratulatory mood, I would like to commend the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer), on his stewardship of that particular corporation. While the Crown corporations of Saskatchewan all serve us well, it certainly was a delight to hear the financial report recently from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan indicating a net profit of \$46 million. This is \$46 million that would normally have left this country and ended up in some head office in the United States. In terms of our resource policy, Mr. Speaker, certainly Saskatchewan has done its best to ensure that Canada is owned by Canadians and not by foreign investors, who come here to exploit our resources and our labor and return the profits to other parts of the world.

I believe the cabinet has done a good job in their continuous fight, Mr. Speaker, for the western farmer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: – In particular here I would like to mention the Minister of Agriculture, the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy). Although I am an urban MLA, Mr. Speaker, I think that the welfare of the rural part of this province is very

important to the cities of the province. I think he has done a tremendous job for Saskatchewan people in his fight against the abolition of the crowrate. The crowrate, as many people might be aware, is the keystone to the transportation policy for Western Canada. The member for Last Mountain has fought against the Conservative transportation policy. He has fought against the international grain companies, and he has fought against the railways and their plan for wholesale abandonment of rail lines. While fighting against these, Mr. Speaker, he has fought for the retention of the crowrate, and he has fought for the retention of rail lines in this province. In other words, Mr. Speaker, he has fought for the small farmer; he has fought for the small town; he has fought for the rural way of life in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: – In rising in my place, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say once again that the Saskatchewan economy remains very buoyant. It is buoyant, and it is growing, and the future looks optimistic – growing by every economic indicator. The labor force is increasing in number. The gross provincial product is increasing. The population is increasing. Mineral production and manufacturing are increasing. The net incomes are increasing, and the future does in fact look very bright for the province of Saskatchewan.

Turning from quantity to quality. Mr. Speaker, it is my view that the quality of life in Saskatchewan, while there is some room for improvement, is certainly superior to that of other provinces in Canada. In large part this is due to the many fine social programs that have been introduced by this government since 1971. But when one looks at the economic picture across Canada, and particularly if one look to the East, the situation is not the same. Canada as a whole is living through some very difficult times, difficult times that have become more difficult under the present Conservative federal government. Interest rates are extremely high and they are hurting a great number of people. They are hurting the small businessman, they are hurting young people who wish to buy a home, and they are hurting others. The serious problems of inflation and unemployment are still with us and there appears to be little chance for either one to improve. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, through the course of the next few months inflation will, in all likelihood, increase across Canada and unemployment will worsen. To me, for such a great country like Canada, with such great potential, this situation is nothing less than a tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to turn, for a few minutes, to talk about energy. The question of a long-term secure supply of oil and natural gas and the related question of oil and gas pricing has to be on the minds of Canadian legislators whether at the provincial or federal level. Mr. Speaker, as I see it, the situation we find ourselves in is this: the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, better known as OPEC, has now raised the price of a barrel of crude oil on the international market to well over \$20. When you consider that in January of 1970 that same barrel of crude oil was selling for \$1.80, you get some idea of the economic impact OPEC has had on those many parts of the world that must import oil. Canada relies on imported oil to meet the needs of the Maritimes and parts of Quebec. And for all the hollow talk by Joe Clark and Roy Hnatyshyn about self-sufficiency, it seems more and more likely, if you look at the figures realistically that we are going to become more dependent on foreign sources of oil.

Mr. Speaker, this increasing reliance on foreign sources of energy points out one of the most tragic failings of successive Liberal and Conservative governments at Ottawa. We have, as a nation, been exporting oil far too much in the past. Even in 1973, the year the

so-called energy crisis occurred, the Canadian government was exporting 60 per cent of our domestic oil production and 40 per cent of our natural gas production. And why was that, Mr. Speaker? Why were we selling our irreplaceable domestic energy stocks as fast as we could at fire-sale prices? We were doing it, Mr. Speaker, because the oil companies said we had lots of oil and the government of the day believed them.

In 1973, Mr. Speaker, OPEC began to raise its prices of oil and the big oil companies, of course, wanted to get in on the windfall profit. So they changed their story and developed the idea of an energy crisis and suggested that they would require huge profits in order to ensure that we would have a supply of oil for future generations. I accuse those major international oil companies of lying repeatedly to the Canadian people in order to enlarge their own bank accounts. And I accused the Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal government in Ottawa of being the willing dupes of the oil companies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: – Just on Thursday last, Mr. Speaker, Joe Clark, the Prime Minister announced the sale of 3.75 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to the United States of America – natural gas that will be used to heat the swimming pools in California instead of heating the houses of Canadian people during our harsh winters here. Mr. Clark is selling us out; he is selling out our children. That sale, Mr. Speaker, was a shameful act, a shameful act against the people of Canada and a shameful act against future generations. Mr. Speaker, in Missouri or Iowa or Colorado or Nebraska, it gets considerably cooler in the winter and it is nice to have their national stocks of natural gas supplemented from Canadian sources. But in Ontario and British Columbia and more particularly in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, it gets bitterly cold in our wintertime. Having natural gas to heat our homes and offices and businesses and hospitals is not just nice, it is a matter of survival.

But, Mr. Speaker, the domination of the federal government by the oil companies continues. They will get the prices for the oil that they want to charge and the export permits they request and the tax loopholes widened when they desire to have them widened and in the meantime the Clark government will continue to ignore the best interests of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see Petro-Canada, a publicly owned oil company defended in the throne speech. The Government of Saskatchewan was among the first to join the growing number of Canadians who want Petro-Canada retained. And yet Joe Clark, Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) and the federal Tory government remain determined to get rid of Petro-Canada. It is surely the best example in recent years of allowing government in its own narrow-minded way to triumph over practical common sense.

Mr. Speaker, Petro-Canada is a real success story. It is one of our most profitable Crown corporations at the federal level. In 1978, Petro-Canada owned gross revenues of over \$205 billion. Since the company is Canadian owned and operated, the vast majority of those dollars were paid out to Canadians in wages, salaries, fees-for-services and in payment for goods and supplies. After expenses were paid, the Crown-owned company was left with profits in excess of \$76 million. It paid of that amount, 55 per cent in income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, Shell Oil did not pay 1 cent in taxes, Gulf Oil paid only 12 per cent of its

profits in taxes, Texaco paid only 16 per cent of its profits in taxes and as a result, the Government of Canada lost billions of dollars in tax revenue. The private, large oil companies see Petro-Canada as a dangerous example. People are going to start asking if Petro-Can is able to pay its taxes why can't the others? That is why the Clark Conservatives are going to privatize the profitable parts of Petro-Can. Their oil company friends have asked that Petro-Can be scuttled.

Mr. Speaker, Petro-Can has had a remarkable record of achievement. It was forced upon the minority federal government at Christmas, 1973, by the New Democratic Party of the day. The corporation was established with some \$500 million in assets. And it has taken that investment and used it to create jobs for Canadian in virtually every part of our land. It has used it to find energy resources and to provide retail outlets for Canadian. Instead of being simply a \$500 million loser as Joe Clark and Ray Hnatyshyn would have us believe, it is turning out to be a real winner, Mr. Speaker. That \$500 million has been taken and turned into \$3.5 billion for the people of Canada. Petro-Canada is the greatest business success of the decade and, Mr. Speaker, I say, far from scrapping it we should be expanding it.

I, Mr. Speaker, will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): – Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I rise to participate in the throne debate. I would like to express my thanks to my constituency for their choice of me as the representative in this legislature for a second term. I would like to publicly thank now all the voters of Swift Current for expressing their trust in me and in particular, to thank those of my supporters who worked so diligently and so tirelessly on my behalf. I can assure my constituents, one and all, that I will do my utmost to represent them well in this legislature as their MLA. As always, I will be available to meet with them to represent and handle their concerns as problems arise.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to be the MLA for Swift Current and to represent a constituency that for many years sent to this legislature a man of distinction, quality, honor and sincerity. The man I am referring to is Mr. E.I. Wood. Mr. Wood was the MLA representative for Swift Current constituency from 1956 to 1975. He served our riding not only as an excellent MLA, but as speaker of this Assembly and as a minister of municipal affairs. I can assure everyone that it is a difficult task to fill the shoes of Mr. Everett Wood.

Mr. Speaker, I would like again to ask at this time, on behalf of my constituents and on behalf of the motoring public in Saskatchewan and elsewhere that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) seriously consider the installation of proper lighting along the Trans-Canada freeway through Swift Current. The minister is aware that I have been pursuing this problem since 1975 with obvious little success. The minister is also fully aware that three individuals have lost their lives at night on this freeway section and I suggest that there may be at least one of these people alive today had we had proper lighting on the freeway.

Mr. Speaker, this government alludes regularly to its concern about the motoring public and safety. While I fully support the concern for safety, it should not be necessary, Mr. Speaker, to spend time during a throne speech debate in requesting equipment that should be a matter of standard policy with the Department of Highways, as many other Saskatchewan centres require similar lighting. I, today, plead with the

Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) to take immediate steps to see that our motorists can safely drive themselves to and from our freeways and other highways without uncertainty and free of accidents.

Mr. Speaker, since 1975, in a number of speeches and representations to this chamber and this legislature, I have expressed a deep concern about the future of our province and our nation. My concern is centred, Mr. Speaker, around inflation which in my opinion and the opinion of many, is directly and solely caused by excessive government expenditure. Mr. Speaker, recently in Swift Current the citizens and tenants of the Prairie Pioneers Lodge faced an increase in rent from approximately 40 per cent to 45 per cent – rent that very few could afford. People in our society living on fixed incomes, living under inflationary times, all fear for their financial future. Indeed, they fear for their very existence. We have heard for several days now from members on both sides of this House commenting about the children in our society and the future they face in our province. It's significant, Mr. Speaker, in the Year of the Child that I should speak about the uncertainty that not only our children face but all the citizens of Saskatchewan and Canada.

In a recent publication titled *Can Government Go Bankrupt?* by Richard Bose and Guy Peters, it was stated that governments not only can go bankrupt but today all the major democratic welfare states of the West can have political bankruptcy unless they succeed in reversing established and popular trends. I repeat, popular policies and trends – votes that get people into power. For some countries such as Italy, Sweden and Britain, time has already run out. Others like the United States, France, Germany and Canada will probably stave off the day of reckoning for at least another decade. But all democracies are approaching (and many for the first time) the political end of the line, the point where government cannot any longer increase public spending without reducing take-home pay of its citizens, placing tax burdens upon the elderly and continuing to mortgage the future of our children. When that happens, the authority of the government itself is undermined. In effect, it becomes politically bankrupt. Citizens become indifferent to its laws and avoid and yes, even evade its taxes. Abroad, foreign creditors, public and private, increasingly restrain and influence policies. It sounds familiar in this province, Mr. Speaker.

This book, Mr. Speaker, is an attempt to deal with the political consequences of the modern welfare state drawing upon official government reports, interviews, as well as intimate acquaintance with the way governments actually work. The author examines the pressures which for the first time are confronting politicians in all democracies, in the United States as well as in Britain and Sweden, with the unpleasant choice: cut public spending or face political bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of publications and articles in the newsstands for the past several years warning the masters of our system (the politicians, government officials in particular) that we cannot continually spend more than we receive. The public, we all know, cannot spend more than they bring in. If they do, they face bankruptcy. We all realize that, I'm sure. Governments cannot continually run the risk of mortgaging future generations – our children, your children – to the point where we face political anarchy. Mr. Speaker, there are no free lunches. There is no blood in a stone. When government needs money for programs, we all know where they get it from. When Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan, living at what they describe as economic boom times, operating our province in a deficit financial situation (in other words, spending more money than they are bringing in), taking untold millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to invest in risk ventures in uranium,

potash and oil, spending what could be a fantastic nest egg for the future in a heritage fund on these risk ventures and then through a propaganda campaign tell the people of Saskatchewan they can thank the Crown corporations for their standard of living and social programs. The problem is Mr. Speaker (I hope the people of Saskatchewan hear this message again and again) that Saskatchewan is leading the nation in the loss of farms. There are 6,000 fewer family farms in Saskatchewan since the inception of the land bank. Yes, we are leading the nation in the loss of farms. We have the lowest per capita income in the prairie provinces – well below the national average – and yet, Mr. Speaker, we are one of the highest taxed provinces in Canada. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a sad testimonial for a government bent on a hard-line socialist philosophy . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAM: – . . . to spend taxpayers' money, yes, Mr. Speaker, even future generations' money on risk ventures.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government faces this year alone \$6 billion in interest on its national debt – \$6 billion! Another said testimony that 11 years of federal socialist philosophy by the Liberal Party. Our national debt is the highest per capita debt in the western world. It is difficult for anyone, let alone myself, to perceive the concept of billions of dollars. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we can bring this example closer to home and indicate the Government of Saskatchewan's intention to invest \$2.5 billion on resource development. How much is a billion? Well, Saskatchewan has a population of less than one million counting the children and senior citizens, in other words including many non-taxpayers. The latest investment does not include the millions of dollar outstanding for potash mines. Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Saskatchewan Telecommunications and many, many more, nor does it cover the unthinkable interest on our borrowed money.

I am sure that members of the NDP and the Government of Saskatchewan will take my statements lightly, which is nothing new. I would like to turn to a book that was recently published by one of their own kind, Dr. Morton Shulman, a past member of the Ontario legislature, a very active NDP worker and supporter for many years. Dr. Shulman has become a very wealthy man, partly as a result of his latest publication entitled, *How to Invest Your Money and Profit from Inflation*. Obviously he capitalized on inflation and government mismanagement. He should know about government mismanagement I guess being a socialist. There are three chapters in this book, Mr. Speaker, which spell out in detail the causes of inflation with reference to the serious financial situation which arose in Germany from 1919 to 1923, comparing that time to today.

In chapter 5, entitled *Can Inflation be Stopped*, Shulman explains that the United States in 1979 is not like Germany in 1919; the United States is still powerful and Germany was weak. It has considerably more reserves and borrowing power and many more options open to it. However the signs are obvious to many. Often I have heard and he's heard people say, oh, I'm not worried, the government will solve our problems if things get bad enough; they have the tools to do it. He says that all the advice in this book is worthless if some genius comes along and stops inflation and the slide of our dollar. Is this possible? The answer is an unequivocal no, it is not possible. He states even as a socialist, hypocritical as it may sound:

It is not the individual or corporate spending that leads us into inflation, it is governments who year after year have spent billions more than they have received. In order to reverse this procedure they must grossly cut their

expenditures. But how will they do this? It is generally agreed that any massive cut in welfare or social programs will result in politically unacceptable violence in many cities.

Spoken by a socialist, a hard-core NDP supporter.

Just as important is that it is equally impossible for governments to encourage productivity when for two generations we have encouraged the opposite. People in government talk about increasing productivity but they don't mean themselves or their own employees. The crazy thing is that we have encouraged industry and farmers to produce more for us. For example, it's great if a way can be found to increase the workers' output at the refrigeration factory from 31 to 32 or for a farmer to increase his yield year after year, but no one even dares suggest increasing the number of students in a teacher's class from 31 to 32.

The gradual loss of productivity in government is illustrated in Saskatchewan by the fact that under the CCF in 1944 there were fewer than 1,000 civil servants in the province; today we are governed, not particularly better, by over 20,000 civil servants from StatsCan today, plus the magnitude of Crown Corporation employees, totalling a staggering 33,000.

Periodically some governments become alarmed at the increase and put a halt to their hiring. Somehow the number of employees continues to grow as the government hires those people they think they need, by contract, instead of making them actual civil servants.

Dr. Shulman's final concerns begin by asking how and when would inflation end. Every nation that has undergone prolonged period of inflation has seen it end in the same way – unless the NDP feel they can change history, and I'm sure they can't – with economic and political collapse.

Mr. Speaker, as an MLA and as a citizen of Saskatchewan, as a parent, I'm deeply concerned. We should now seriously consider where we are going and what we are doing for our children and our senior citizens. It is time for this government to review its spending priorities. Forget the socialist dogma and quest for control over our citizens and means of production. Mr. Speaker, it should be obvious to the members of the NDP that a province with so much potential wealth has fewer citizens within its boundaries today than it had in 1968. A province with, as I spoke earlier, some of the highest taxation rates in Canada and with a farm population with the lowest income on the Prairies.

Mr. Speaker, our young people do not have to leave Saskatchewan to find jobs. They want to stay home. We want them to stay home. All that is required is an atmosphere of reasonable and positive growth, less government involvement in their lives and some assurance by example that they may obtain success for the future in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech does not come to grips with the problems facing our young people or our elderly or for that matter the vast majority of Saskatchewan citizens. I will therefore not be supporting the motion.

HON. MR. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): – Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I enter the debate today and add my comments to those already made by other members of this Assembly. I would like to begin today by

expressing my appreciation to our Premier for giving me the honor of addressing this Assembly as the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: – It is indeed an honor to enter this Assembly as the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources and it is also an honor for the people of Morse constituency, the people I represent. The people of Morse and the people indeed throughout the province of Saskatchewan are proud of the kind of leadership that they have received from other NDP MLAs in that area. I speak of Mr. Engel, the MLA for Gravelbourg, Mr. Lingenfelter the MLA for Shaunavon. The people of the Southwest are looking forward to the strong voice in government, the government that they deserve.

I would also like to take this opportunity to add my congratulations to the list of those that have already been given to the new member for Regina North-West, Mr. Solomon. There's no doubt in my mind that John Solomon will prove to be an able and eloquent spokesman for the people of his constituency. John Solomon brings to this House a distinguished record of public service and I'm sure that in the future we will be able to say that he has a long and distinguished political career.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster, Bob Long, very ably seconded the motion by the member for Regina North-West. He presented the facts on the Petro-Can sell-out in a very convincing manner. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be appointed to this cabinet with some other illustrious company, namely Jerry Hammersmith, Doug McArthur, and Murray Koskie who have already proved extremely valuable members of the cabinet. The support and co-operation that I've received from them and indeed all my colleagues has made my break-in periods to this Assembly much easier.

Mr. Speaker, I think Adolph Matsalla deserves a degree of recognition for his valuable work within the Department of Tourism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: – I was among many others who were extremely sorry to hear about the decision of Adolf to resign from the cabinet post. I can testify to his tireless work in his capacity as minister because he left behind a very smooth-running and efficient department. The legislation that he piloted through on The Wildlife Act I think is an excellent contribution of the member, Adolph Matsalla. I find the act he filed it through has received very favorable comments from the public and many special interest groups in the province.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the new Leader of the Conservative Party, Grant Devine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: – Mr. Speaker, in the recent Conservative leadership (I don't know what you want to call it – a turkey race or whatever it was) I think it is interesting and significant to note the Conservative Party had to go outside of their caucus to select a new leader and were not able to stay within their caucus to select their new leader. I think it says something on behalf of the members opposite in terms of their ability that the Tory party could not conceivably find it possible to support a member within the

caucus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: – Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan has always recognized and encouraged fair and open debate in this legislature. I might add, at this point, the Speaker, you Sir, and the Deputy Speaker, have done an admirable job of monitoring debate when it takes place in this House. However, lately it has been somewhat difficult to engage in that kind of debate. After all it takes at least two to tango and we are a little short of dancing partners on the other side of the House.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Devine will offer or make a contribution whenever or if ever he arrives in this Assembly. We will look forward to his arrival and hopefully we will be able to engage in some good debate. I would like to engage in debate with Mr. Devine when he arrives. I would like to engage in debate when it comes to the area of productivity of our Saskatchewan farmers. He has made some very interesting comments in regard to that.

I would like to engage in debate with Mr. Devine on the crowrate because he has been continually attacking it. He has also attacked the institution which has made this country strong in terms of our prairie producers, the Canadian Wheat Board. He has attacked it, a long with his federal colleagues.

I am not sure the members opposite are going to give Mr. Devine an opportunity to come into this House. They seem to be very firmly attached to their seats lately over there. They somehow are not prepared to give them up. It is rumoured Mr. Thatcher, the member for Thunder Creek, was prepared to give up his seat but we do not see any evidence of that. He's gone. We have been looking forward to the former leader of the opposition (Mr. Collver) giving up his seat but it seems as though no one is interested in giving up over there. Perhaps they don't want to give up their pay cheques which they very rarely earn in this legislature.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, we ill look forward to that by-election whenever, whatever and if eve it occurs. We will look forward to another Tory leadership race after that by-election.

Mr. Speaker, before I continue on with my comments in regard to the members opposite, I would like to make a few notes about the throne speech and what was in that throne speech. It will take a great deal of time to complete it.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech is an excellent record of successes of this government in improving the social and economic well-being of the people of this province. It is also an excellent outline of the steps which this government plans to take to continue serving the people of this province. The hon. member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) has suggested the speech contains and I quote, 'Precious few items of substance.'

I suggest Mr. Berntson must have been reading the wrong speech. I don't know if he had an advance copy of the federal budget speech when he read the speech he was referring to or not, but I ask him to look more closely at that throne speech and look at plans of legislation which we are planning to bring into this House.

I note special legislation which will be of great interest to the farmers – the legislation to continue the grain car corporation; the environmental assessment act which we are

planning to introduce; amendments to The Northern Economic Development Act; amendments to The Department of the Environment Act; amendments to The Teachers Superannuation Act; amendments to The Libel and Slander Act. The list goes on and on and on. Mr. Speaker, lists which contribute to the social and well-being of this province.

Mr. Speaker, if the member for Souris-Cannington was prepared to look in detail and offer good criticism, he would have looked deeper into the throne speech and would have found this throne speech was full of good legislation. If he could not read the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, I would have suggested that he avail himself of one of his researchers and have him read it to him, if that was his problem. Because obviously he has missed the whole content of the throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, aside from new legislation, the throne speech indicates that the government will be undertaking a number of new initiatives, programs to assist Saskatchewan citizens to save energy; increased emphasis on the support to northern schools; increased training for northern people in resource development skills; improved services for injured workers and the handicapped and expanded home care programs; special facilities for handicapped citizens and new public facilities; revisions of the social studies curriculum; further recognition of the special needs of native students; improvements to the court system (an item, I'm sure the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) will be very interested in); a new capital grants program for local government and on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few on the list of the many new initiatives that we will be looking at this year in this legislature. Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne also indicates the healthy state of the Saskatchewan economy. The people of Saskatchewan must be commended for their industry and their productivity. Our unemployment rate has consistently been the lowest in all of Canada and remains so, at its present level of 2.9 per cent. The high employment picture has been maintained while the work force increasingly has increased.

Mr. Speaker, the province has been attracting a steady migration of people from other provinces, provinces such as Alberta. The Premier remarked last Wednesday, we have experienced significant increases in the number of young workers between the ages of 20 to 29. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Tories have been trying over the last few weeks and months to paint a picture that somehow we are losing our people to Alberta. They have tried for years to paint that picture. But, Mr. Speaker, the facts do not dictate that. In the first nine months of this year 1979, 6,400 people have migrated to Saskatchewan from Alberta. Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting statistic. It is contrary to the members opposite and the arguments that they have brought forward.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite should take some heed from a member on their own side of the House who has not agreed with members on that side in regard to the situation of population in Saskatchewan. In fact, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, from page 212 of Hansard, the member for Rosetown (Mr. Swan) when he talked about the migration of young people into this province. He says:

Many of the young people who have obtained employment away from their home community are now working in Saskatoon or in other areas in that general direction.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Rosetown has adequately looked at the situation and has

decided that we do not have a migration of people out of Saskatchewan; indeed our young people are staying home and they're moving within the province. They're moving to opportunities in Saskatoon and in the North. And I suggest to members opposite that they look very carefully at the words of the member for Rosetown when he talked about the migration of people not into Alberta, but the migration of people back to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the gross-domestic product shows continued real growth at 4.5 per cent in 1978. Our adjusted per capita income continues to grow. Revenues to the government and the people of this province from resource taxation are increasing and they are being used by this government to reduce steadily the income and property taxes that our people have to pay. We are improving services and we are developing a real heritage fund for the future of this fine province.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech indicates Saskatchewan is enjoying a good measure of prosperity in the face of difficult times on the national and international scene. Our government, Mr. Speaker, is proud to have been part off this success. The true credit of this success must go, of course, to the people of this province who have helped make it happen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to an area that is now concerning a great number of other people in this province and not only this province, but in this country, in the entire nation. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair comment when one says or coins the line that Tory times in this province or in this country are tough times. Tory times in the Dominion of Canada have always been tough times. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to look at what has happened on the federal scene since the arrival of Mr. Clark, I think more commonly known to Canadians as Canada's answer to Mickey Mouse. Most of us can remember some election promises made by the Tories prior to the federal election in June. Even if they can't I would like to remind them of a few of the promises made during that election campaign.

For example, Joe Clark stated in the House of Common on February 13, 1979, days before the recent federal election, that he was very disturbed with the fact the Liberal government had taken the stand it did in regard to interest rates. I know there is a very noticeable lack of attention on the opposite side in regard to interest rates. The members opposite don't want to talk about interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from the House of Commons Hansard in regard to what Joe Clark said about interest rates before the last federal election. I find the quote very interesting, Mr. Speaker:

Although this government seldom does anything sensible (referring to the former Liberal government) there is nothing less sensible than their determination to increase interest rates . . .

That was the Prime Minister of Canada, then Leader of the Opposition.

. . . raise interest rates to record levels. That idea of theirs has led to the most expensive monetary policy in this country's history. We are told the government has no choice, they must maintain interest rates above those in the United States. In suggesting this the government forgets there were times in history when interest rates were lower in Canada than they were in

the United States without undue harm to this country. But more important still, Mr. Speaker, this government admits Canada has no choice and must be a follower rather than a leader whatever the consequences for Canadians and/or our economy are.

That was the Leader of the Opposition, Joe Clark. That was his idea of interest rates. That was how he would handle the grasp on interest rates. Mr. Speaker, I ask you what has happened since then? Have interest rates gone down as suggested by the Prime Minister? Have they gone down? Not at all, Mr. Speaker. They have gone up four times to a record level of 14 per cent. Mr. Clark, when he is confronted with the issue of interest rates has only one rebuff. He blames it on the Liberal Party. He blames it on the former Liberals who were then the Government of Canada. I assure the member opposite that that line will not last for long. They are now the leaders of Canada. They are now the Government of Canada and it is up to them to do something about interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the promise made by the Joe Clark Conservatives back in February of 1979 was a deliberate deception of the people of this country in order to get elected. Mr. Speaker, the prime interest rate today is 14 per cent. On February 22, 1978, the prime interest rate was 7.5 per cent. In 22 short months the interest rates in this country have climbed from 7.5 per cent to 14 percent prime interest rate – an intolerable rate, Mr. Speaker.

I have taken the liberty to do a little costing, a little example of what interest rates are costing the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada. The member for Wilkie (Mr. Garner) asks if that is for a 40 quarter-section farmer. Indeed it is not. The example I want to use, Mr. Speaker, is on a person who has a \$100,000 mortgage. I'm talking about a young farmer or a small businessman in Saskatchewan with a \$100,000 mortgage, Mr. Speaker, 7.5 per cent on a \$100,000 mortgage over a 25-year period, 22 months ago would amount to a service cost to carry that loan of \$8,971. Over the life of that 25-year loan the interest charge would be \$124,280. But, Mr. Speaker, things have changed since February 22. We don't have a 7.5 per cent prime interest rate. We are now at a 14 per cent prime interest rate. (Double or nothing, Mr. Robbins adds.)

December 9, 1979, the interest rate at 14 per cent for that same \$100,000 parcel over a 25-year period is now \$15,005.90. That's almost double, if not double the interest rate 22 months ago. That is the legacy the Tory Government has left us in Saskatchewan and indeed Canada. Mr. Speaker, if you subtract the top from the bottom, you find we have a difference from \$8,971 to \$15,005. We have a difference of \$6,034. that's an incredible cost to be born by the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada for interest rates. Mr. Speaker, I am told that it is a continual process and a process that's going to increase dramatically after Christmas this year. We're told that the amount of mortgage refinancing that is going to go on because of the higher interest rates is going to be incredible. We understand there's going to be a tremendous increase in people jingling keys, turning in farm equipment, business men cashing in because they won't be able to afford to handle it.

Mr. Speaker, when I began to talk about the federal government I said that there is a peculiar resemblance of this federal Tory government to other, or past, Tory governments in Canada. I think a statement that was made by Walter Baker, the Conservative government House Leader is quite adequate in explaining this situation with the Tory government in Ottawa. Walter Baker was quoted as saying after the Tory

slump on the polls, he wasn't surprised because the Conservative government had been making some unpopular but economically necessary decision. Mr. Baker bears resemblance to a fellow used to be the prime minister of Canada, a former Tory prime minister, Mr. Speaker, I add, a member who brought us the depression. Members who are much older than I am can appreciate who that was. His name was R.B. Bennett. He was the fellow brought us the Bennett buggy. Everybody knows who R.B. Bennett was. Mr. Speaker, in 1931 there was a statement in the House of Commons that is of interest and is very similar to the quotation that I just quoted from Walter Baker, the now House Leader of the Tory party. The statements that Mr. Bennett made, and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

This course may result in hardship. It may entail sacrifice, but in the long run it will result in less hardship and will call for less sacrifice than which could flow from a policy less courageous.

Mr. Speaker, that policy was not courageous of R.B. Bennett. It was bankrupt. That policy of R.B. Bennett's was as bankrupt as the policy of Joe Clark and our friend, Mr. Baker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: – Mr. Speaker, the statement made just months ago by Walter Baker is almost identical to the statement made by R.B. Bennett back in 1931. The course that Tories embarked on in 1931 is the same course that Tories are embarking on in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, another item that I would like to briefly make mention of in the throne speech in the area of Crown corporations – another area of Tory bankruptcy in terms of current federal economic policy. Probably the most glaring decision that the federal Conservatives have been able to put together and put on the chopping block is the plan to dump Petro-Can. Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this country who has come out solely on side of the Tories in regard to Petro-Can. Mr. Speaker, not even the president of Imperial Oil supports what the Tories are planning to do to Petro-Can. Gallup Polls that have been recently announced indicate to us that people have not accepted their policy on Crown corporations, have not accepted their policy in terms of the economy and have shown their frustration in the recent Gallup Polls.

Mr. Speaker, the last item I would like to talk about in a little more detailed way is an area that is very clear to me, agriculture and transportation. Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to that important area and discuss some of the problems that have developed in that area since we've had a new government in Ottawa. Agriculture is still the number one industry in this province and will continue to be the number one industry, I would predict for a fair amount of time to come. Mr. Speaker, our rural way of life has been threatened over the last ten or fifteen years. It used to be the Liberals who posed that threat, but now, Mr. Speaker, we have a new monster on the horizon called Tories. Mr. Speaker, it is not only threatened by federal Tories in terms of what was happening in agriculture and the policies of transportation, but it's also threatened by provincial Tories.

Mr. Speaker, the stance of the provincial Tories on the family farm in Saskatchewan is incredible. Their stance on orderly marketing and the Canadian Wheat Board is also incredible. Mr. Speaker, their stance on the crowrate and branch line abandonment is highly questionable. You know, Mr. Speaker, I kind of feel sorry for the new Leader of the Conservative Party. I don't know if he's in the House today but he usually sits up

over there. But I really do feel sorry for the member for – wherever he is – university extension. I feel sorry for him because he must get awful lonely sitting in the galleries. I know he has some company the odd time with Ted Malone, few and far between, but I feel sorry for him because he must be lonely. Mr. Speaker, we would like to have that present leader have the opportunity to come into this House. We would like to have him come into this House and give us his words of wisdom with regard to agricultural matters because he has some very interesting pearls of wisdom when it comes to agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: – Mr. Speaker, members opposite clap. I am glad they have clapped. I'm glad they've put on record, for the people of this province who are listening to this broadcast today, that they support 100 per cent the policies of the now new Leader of the PC Party. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Devine is an agricultural expert; he is a professor of agricultural economics, to be exact. Mr. Speaker, he hasn't done much farming. His record shows that he has not been an active farmer but he knows a lot about farming. He is one of those farmers that farm paper. You know, Mr. Speaker, farmers out there have not much appreciation for that. Mr. Devine is one of those agricultural efficiency experts – the efficiency experts the Liberal task force in agriculture talked about and said we needed more of.

Back a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, Liberals recommended that two-thirds of the farmers should be removed off their land because two-thirds of those farmers were inefficient. Mr. Speaker, what do the provincial Tories say about that figure of two-thirds? Do they agree with the Liberals when they talk about two-thirds of our farmers being inefficient and unproductive? Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the Tory party says but I know what Mr. Devine says and it's not very kind to farmers. Mr. Devine is not very lenient to the Liberals. He feels that they were incorrect in their figure of two-thirds. He feels that 80 per cent of our good farm folk are inefficient and should be misplaced. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious our friend the Leader of the Opposition has no love for the family farm or for most farmers for that matter. He has neither time nor patience for 8 out of 10 of our Saskatchewan farmers whom he thinks are theoretically inefficient.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of members opposite who haven't taken time to find out who the Grant Devine fellow is, I would like to read into the record, into the benefit of Hansard, who Grant Devine is and I would like it recorded that what I am reading from is Business Review in the winter of 1977 – a nice picture of the new fearless leader of the Tory party, Grant Devine. It is entitled Marketing Boards Economic or Social Policies. On the first page of the article, Mr. Speaker, the top headline reads: 'Society may not wish to support higher food prices or producer security so that the non-productive 80 percent of the farm population can live in the country at a profit.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is just a quote from the article but I want to go to the article; I want to read the paragraph that is referred to Mr. Devine – that Mr. Devine has been quoted on. He says, "Realizing that most of our food is produced by less than 20 per cent of the farmers who tend to be good businessmen as well as producers, society may not wish to support higher food prices for producer security so that the non-productive 80 per cent of the farm population can live in the country at a profit.' He doesn't want 80 per cent of our farmers to live at a profit. He doesn't want 80 per cent of the family farmers to live in this country and that is a direct quote from Mr. Devine. That's the agricultural economics professor from Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, you can't call that

sympathetic to the family farm. You can't call that sympathetic to rural communities. You can't call that sympathy to our world businessmen or our world farmers. Mr. Speaker, that is what you call Tory inaction in regard to support of our family farms. Mr. Speaker, I want to challenge the phantom Tory leader to poke his nose through the House whenever he gets the opportunity to be elected, if he ever gets that opportunity. I want to see him try and defend his open market logic in regard to this article and in regard to many articles he has printed and published about our inefficient family farmer. I don't want to challenge the leader of the Tory party, Mr. Speaker, I want to challenge other farm groups in this province to take a careful look at the policies of the new Tory leader of Saskatchewan. I want to have them take a look and see what that political party really purports as their facts of life. Mr. Speaker, day after day, we have heard the Tories talk about their protection and how they believe in the family farmer, but they've got a new leader who has a different idea.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that Mr. Devine is not a friend of our family farmer, but he is an agent, an activator and a leader of a philosophy that runs counter-clockwise to the philosophy of Saskatchewan. If Mr. Devine were ever to become premier of Saskatchewan (and that will never happen, I can assure you) agriculture would be plunged back into the dark ages, back into the dark ages of open marketing. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Devine will see that inland terminals will become a reality in Saskatchewan. He will make sure that Cargill Grain is well represented in this province and that family farms are squeezed out of existence. We'll have Devine dunebuggies!

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Devine has educated a few young university students to his ideals. That is indeed sad to know. But I can assure Mr. Devine and members opposite that he will not have the opportunity to educate the people of this province in regard to the philosophy he believes in.

AN HON. MEMBER: – How are you going to get back the 6,000 family farms you lost?

MR. GROSS: – Mr. Speaker, we never lost them. Mr. Speaker, my time is coming to an end and I don't want to put my whip in an incomparable position. But, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Saskatchewan know very well who grant Devine is. They know very well what the Tory party opposite is. They know exactly the philosophy of that party opposite, that they support the concept of open marketing and do not support the concepts of the orderly marketing system, the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. G. MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): – I would say at the beginning of this throne speech debate, I want to offer my congratulations to the mover of the address in replay, the member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) for a very commendable job on his first speech in the Chamber. I would also say the member for Regina North-West did a very commendable job on winning the by-election in that fall. He took the deposit of the candidate of the official opposition party and that doesn't happen too often in the history of Saskatchewan parties.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate as well, the seconder, the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long). and I say this sincerely, in more ways than one Bob Lang stands tall in the constituency of cut Knife-Lloydminster as he stands tall in the legislature here in Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: – Mr. Speaker, I want additionally to congratulate the hon. member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) on his appointment as Leader of the Opposition. I have a great deal of respect for the hon. member for Souris-Cannington and I'm sure the members on this side of the House share that respect for the hon. member. Mr. Speaker, having said that I must say I was much disappointed in his remarks in the Assembly, his maiden remarks as the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. Leader of the Opposition talks of doom and gloom. Almost every independent observer agrees that Saskatchewan is one of the better places to live in this country today. We have the good fortune of having better times than most other people on the North American continent, yet the opposition sees only the negatives. The Conservative Party should ask itself, why out of the last 35 years, right-wing parties have held office in this province for only seven years? The Conservative Party opposite should ask itself why, in those 35 years, it has only been the CCF and NDP that has made Saskatchewan grow.

If the Conservative leader or the Leader of the Opposition in this Assembly wants to look at population figures from the time the free enterprisers under Anderson, later Gardiner, took over our province in 1929 to the time Tommy Douglas took over in 1944, Saskatchewan's population dropped by 47,000. From 1944 to 1964, under the CCF, the population increased by 114,000.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the lean years of the Thatcher administration, the population again dropped by 24,000. Under the Blakeney government since 1971, Saskatchewan's population has again increased by 30,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: – Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps the reason the right-wing parties, the Liberals and the Tories, are losers in Saskatchewan is that they have consistently sold the people of this province short. They deal always with the business economy from a position of weakness. They deny the legitimate role of government in economic development. They stay away from partnerships and joint ventures, refusing a positive role for the public sector. They apologize for being in office to represent people's interests. Much worse, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are proposing the Sterling Lyon formula for Manitoba on Saskatchewan – academic theory, emotionalism nostalgia from the past – a formula for failure because it just doesn't deal with the reality of a western economy today.

This old time philosophy tells Saskatchewan people they should never ask for more from a resource developer than that he might do us the favor of locating a branch plant in Saskatchewan. We must bow low. We must be humble if we want to develop, go about with our cap in our hand. They would make out that our province is a poor relative, a beggar at the door of the corporations. They sell Saskatchewan short making our people feel small, belittling our assets and down-playing our abilities.

I say in this Assembly today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Saskatchewan people do not accept this nonsense. They didn't accept it from Ross Thatcher and they are not going to accept it from Grant Devine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: – I ask the members of the Assembly to consider the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) last week. Did he chart a new course for his

party in Saskatchewan? I said as I started, it was a disappointing speech because it was really just a retread of the old Liberal Party line for 20 years ago. The only change that the hon. member for Souris-Cannington seems to have made is to add some snide remarks about orderly marketing – yet another example of how little that party opposite understand what is really going on in Saskatchewan, understands the history and the development and the future of this province.

Not only, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has the Conservative Party introduced no new ideas, but they have also managed to avoid the facts so obvious to everyone else in Saskatchewan and in Canada today. The truth is that even the eastern business community no longer expects Saskatchewan to behave like a beggar. They know better. They know what this province wants and are prepared to pay the price because they know that conditions today make active government participation a fact of life in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members opposite have heard about the Financial Post conference in Saskatoon last fall. They have heard this province acclaimed nationally and internationally for its bright climate today and its exciting future tomorrow. They have heard about the conference – the same kind of conference in Calgary at which most of the talk was about Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Conservatives opposite do not seem to have understood that a good deal of the excitement about the future of the province is the way we do things in Saskatchewan. I think it is time the members opposite learned something about Saskatchewan. We are different in Saskatchewan. We have always been different. While other are busy figuring out how to make a buck, Saskatchewan has been figuring out how we can work together to get a job done. Maybe it is our circumstances – maybe it's our history which has forced us to be that way. Maybe it is our climate – maybe it's our long distances which give us not choice but to work together, to be concerned about each other, often, in the end, to do it ourselves in order to do it right. Whatever the reason there is a difference. People who come to Saskatchewan notice it. The difference is part of our tradition. It's part of our heritage. It is part of what we celebrate next year – 1980 – in this province's 75th anniversary.

We are different in our resource policy. Private enterprise is very much a part of our development – but so is public enterprise and so is joint enterprise. The people of Saskatchewan have a very real say in what resources of our province are developed, how they are developed, when they are developed, and by what standards. Public ownership also gives them a share in the benefits of that resource development.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are different in agriculture in Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan we are about the producers – and there are our producers out there – 70,000 strong operating on a family farm basis.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I go to meetings across this country discussing agriculture issues and everybody talks to me about the grain trade. They talk to me about the grain industry. They talk to me about the system. I always talk on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan about the producers. Interestingly enough, Saskatchewan is really almost the only province left talking about the producer. Manitoba is going into vertical integration, contracting, sunflower production. Quebec has vertical integration in the hog industry – packing plants contracting a certain number of hogs, feed mill supplies, specifying the rations. For many farmers (and I know them) in the golden triangle in Ontario, around Windsor, if General Foods doesn't need their tomatoes they are left in the fields to rot. The farmer

can't even touch them.

Mr. Speaker, in that kind of a system the farmer becomes a laborer implementing someone else's decision.

This does not mean that Saskatchewan producers are inefficient – they are the most efficient producers in this world. Indeed, Saskatchewan's producers are among the most innovative and the most progressive in the world. The difference is that in Saskatchewan the producer makes the decision, not someone else for him. Producers in Saskatchewan realized early if they were not to be subject to someone else's decision – to middlemen who could exploit them or grain companies which could force farmers to sell when the price was low – they would have to get together and do something about it. So Saskatchewan producers built a system – the co-operative system. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool now dominates not only the Saskatchewan scene but commands national and world-wide respect in the grain business. The beauty is that Canada's largest grain handling organization has a head office in Saskatchewan in Regina and it is controlled by the producers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: – Mr. Deputy Speaker, when president Ted Turner or vice-president Don Lockwood of Sask Pool votes at the annual meeting he is voting as a delegate representing his district. When he speaks at the annual meeting he speaks as a delegate. He has one vote like every other delegate to the annual meeting. Grain is not the only area, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where Saskatchewan producers recognize that if only they work together they can control their economic and their social future. Producers have built strong retail co-operatives; they have built the country's largest financial co-operatives.

The face of Saskatchewan is built on producers, small businessmen, the co-operatives that have been established to supply the producer's needs. So the face of rural Saskatchewan is really the producers, the villages, the towns. I say to the members in this Assembly isn't that great? Why should anyone want to destroy that? Yet that is exactly what is being proposed in the changes being put forward.

And who is calling for the changes? Those who speak for the grain trade. Those who speak for the industry. Those who speak for the system. Those who speak for Alberta. Those who speak for British Columbia. Those who speak for Manitoba, who say we should do away with the Hall recommendations, who say we should do away with the crowrate in favor of something they call crow benefit, or crow advantage, or crow value.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was disappointed to hear again the same story from those people yesterday at a meeting I attended in Winnipeg. What are they saying? These trade, these system and these efficiency people – they are saying the farmer will really be helped, the producer will be helped if the crowrate goes. They don't understand the towns and the villages and the 70,000 owner-operated producers exist because of the crowrate.

Amongst all the things the producer has to fight in his struggle to farm he's always known one thing for sure, he knows his rate to move grain Semans is going to be what it was last year. He knows what his rate to move grain is going to be in Tisdale, and in Southey, and in Blaine Lake. It's going to be the same. They want to take that away. The producer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is being handed policies by the federal government

which affect the cost of two of the most critical inputs – capital and energy.

There has been a lot of talk about the federal government's high interest rate policy. The country is told that if the interest rates are high enough people will stop borrowing and they will buy less. And when they buy less, demands for goods will go down, and the prices and inflation will drop. So maybe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that will work for the guys who want to buy candles, or for the guys who want to buy the extra car, or for the guys who want to put a fancy carpet out there in the furnace room. But what about the producers, the farmers and the small businessmen who have no choice in many cases but to borrow to operate just to survive from one month to the next? What is the producer, the farmer supposed to do?

The federal government tells us that energy prices must rise. If conventional crude is running out then we must pay higher prices in order to meet world prices. But have we given the producer, the farmer an alternative technology? He can't build his own tractors. Even with the co-operative he finds himself at the mercy of world technology in heavy equipment. When it's time to seed and when it's time to summerfallow and when it's time to crank up the old combine, he has to have fuel. But he's being told that it may cost \$1.50 a gallon, \$2.00 a gallon, \$2.50 a gallon. What is he to do? In the face of this uncertainty which the farmer doesn't know how he can possibly adjust to, the three provinces which surround us want to do away with his one point of stability – the crowrate. If the crowrate were to go, the railways would charge what the traffic would bear and of that there are ample precedents. They're asking the producer to bear this on top of an interest rate policy which makes it impossible for him to operate and an unknown future for energy costs. Those who claim that they're speaking for the producer when they say that, I say are not speaking for the producers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, producers did one other thing in those early days of prairie farming. They realized that even with their returns pooled to help to protect them from the boom and bust cycles, farmers could still not be assured a fair price for their products. Producers lobbied to have the federal government establish a board which would market grain in producers' interests. A voluntary marketing board was established in 1935. With additional pressure, the federal government made the Canadian Wheat Board the sole marketing agent for prairie wheat in 1943 and added oats and barley in 1949.

The Canadian Wheat Board is one of the most highly respected marketing boards in the world. Its power to call forward grains through quotas ensure equal opportunity for all producers. Strict standards of quality have gained Canadian grain an international reputation.

The Canadian Wheat Board takes very seriously its mandate to maximize producers incomes and the board has been imminently successful in doing so, but the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is being challenged. We all know about the domestic feed grain policy which saw the domestic feed grains come off the wheat board under the guise of giving producers the right to choose. The Saskatchewan Natural Products Marketing Council has estimate that for the crop years ending 1977 and 1978, producers lost \$50 million to the private grain trade by selling their feed grain on the open market. The council's preliminary estimate are that producers if they follow the same pattern, will lose a further \$50 million for 1978 and 1979.

You know about the food crisis that is coming; it's coming after the energy crisis. The private grain trade will see great potential benefits in supplying a world desperate for

food and the pressure for them to capture a greater share of the market will obviously increase. When the federal Minister of Transport verbally supports the wheat board (which he is doing), he has not hesitated to weaken the board by taking away certain powers when the idea of the co-ordinator came long. The members opposite support this attack on orderly market. Indeed, they imply that orderly marketing has caused a reduction in farm numbers in Saskatchewan. If they want to talk numbers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can talk numbers too, and I can talk farm numbers. The members opposite fail to mention that Saskatchewan has 6.9 per cent of its total farmers under the age of 25. Tory Alberta has only 3.5 per cent of its farmers under the age of 25. There are 4,800 farmers under the age of 25 in Saskatchewan, 2,100 farmers under the age of 25 in Alberta and in Manitoba, the figure is even less than 1,500. These are 1976 figures. With in excess of 2,400 on the land in Saskatchewan through land bank, in excess of 3,400 through FarmStart, I'm sure we will see an even more dramatic gap in the figures in the next census.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: – Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the marketing institution which has given prairie farmers their prosperity in jeopardy, we went to Ottawa on July 30 to ask the new federal government through their new Minister of Transportation to set aside the clamour from the other provinces on a national policy and on a crowrate debate. We ask the federal government to get on with the job of meeting the real needs, the needs of the Canadian Wheat Board and the needs of the producers of western Canada. We did some checking. We began to learn there was a real North American shortage of hopper cars. We talked to our potash people. We became convinced the purchase of hopper cars was a sound business investment as well as an absolutely critical need if the Canadian Wheat Board was to do its job.

A hopper car holds 3,000 bushels, A thousand cars which make a trip to the port in two and one-half weeks can move 57 million bushels of grain a year – 57 million bushels of grain at an initial price of \$4.25 means \$242 million or a quarter of a billion dollar cash injection into the farm economy each year.

The Canadian Wheat Board has an option on car manufacturing space which would allow us to get the cars by next fall instead of waiting in line for two years or three years. We ordered the cars. The cars will be operated by the railways at no lease fee to move grains under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board – that's wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax and rapeseed – within the western division. The western division means the area from the Lakehead to Vancouver, including the ports of Rupert and Churchill. This means that the cars will be used primarily for export movement. If our cars are used east of Thunder Bay for domestic use of feed grains the railways will pay the normal lease fee. The cars will be maintained in Saskatchewan wherever possible. The cars will be allocated according to Saskatchewan grain movement percentages. This is important for the producers – 530 cars allocated to CP (Canadian Pacific), 470 to CN (Canadian National). We look forward, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to receiving the cars off the assembly line October, November and December of 1980.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it's my duty to report to the assembly on a meeting the federal Transport Minister (Don Mazankowski) held yesterday in Winnipeg. Saskatchewan went to the meeting wanting to raise the issues: the issue of branch lines, Thunder Bay movement, interchange agreements for Rupert and Churchill, the Second Narrows bridge on the west coast, legislation for the co-ordinator. In addition we went under the understanding that the federal minister wanted the meeting to make

an important announcement. In all cases, I think in a very general way I can say we came away from the meeting lacking. There is no Murta report, although it had already been tabled in the House of Commons. There were no copies available to the prairie ministers. There were no copies available to us yesterday. There was no Neil report on branch lines. There was no interchange agreement for Rupert even though the presidents of the two railways in January of this year in Winnipeg said we would have one in 30 days. Therefore, in turn, there is no interchange agreement for Churchill. There is no real solution offered to the problems of Thunder Bay movement for next year. True, we were told that exports are up 4 per cent over last year. But what is up? Rapeseed and barley exports are up but wheat, the bread and butter of Saskatchewan, is down by 18 per cent. Why? Because of Thunder Bay congestion, because of the Second Narrows bridge in Vancouver.

Now with respect to Thunder Bay. The proposal is to move one million tonnes to eastern Canada by rail to make up for lost movement on the lakes. Normal movement is 300,000 tonnes, increasing that to one million.

We asked some very legitimate questions: Where are we going to move it to in eastern Canada? To the seaway ports or to Halifax and St. John? What is the implication for this movement so far as rolling stock available for movement to the West Coast? Are we going to take hopper cars from movement to the West Coast in order to make this movement? Who is going to pay? Is it going to come from the producers' pool or is the federal government going to pay for these extra costs? The answers were not provided. Mr. Speaker, we have to wait. And fine, negotiations are going on. But neither were the answers provided to how we're going to overcome the shortages in shipping capacity at the Lakehead on the Great Lakes and in the seaway next year, other than a report – we held a meeting. I guess there's no problem so great that you can't hold a meeting.

This is interesting, Mr. Speaker. We were told by the federal minister that the repairs to (I call it the Buffalo Narrows Bridge; I get mixed up) the Narrows Bridge in B.C., in Vancouver were proceeding on schedule. It should be completed by January 28. The B.C. Minister jumped up and said, I'm sorry but the key engineering decision has not been in fact made and will not be made until Christmas Day. The key engineering decision – whether they're going to jack the bridge or whether they're going to have to rebuild the tower . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and rebuilding would take several months.

What about legislation regarding the coordinator? The coordinator says, I don't need any more power. Well it's probably true he doesn't want the monkey on his back. But I indicated to him that I was going to put the monkey on his back and the federal minister agreed. He said that's where it should be. We should give him some power, because he doesn't have any power now beyond car allocations. One of the interesting things that happened at the meeting, Mr. Speaker, is that Saskatchewan was asked to develop a proposal which will in fact give the coordinator effective control regarding the railways and regarding marine. And, I can say in this House, thank goodness we have available to us, on a consultative basis, the former chief justice, Emmett Hall who is going to help us to deliver that proposal.

What was the major announcements, that it was important for Saskatchewan to go to the meeting in Winnipeg for? Was it to be the announcement regarding the abandoned rights of way? We heard a policy proposal put forward. You remember the policy proposal of the former Liberal government that they should transfer rural rights of way to the federal government, which would in turn transfer them to the municipality. Well,

they made a change in that Liberal policy. They said, we will transfer the rural rights of way, and that's got to be clear, from the federal government to the Government of Canada and the Government of Canada will transfer them to the province for distribution.

I asked some legitimate questions on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. I asked what about the urban rights of way? What about some prime recreational land? I asked, what about the mineral rights? Is the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) going to keep the mineral rights? What about compensation for road costs and the loss of taxes? What about the legal fees, the registration costs, the searching for the titles and the working out of searching for the agreements? Who is going to pay for them? There were no answers. Was the major announcement to be the Canadian Pacific and its purchase of 75 locomotives? It's hard to believe. The minister left during the meeting to get a call from CP and we'd known that anyway, because in our negotiations regarding Saskatchewan hopper cars, they said clearly and emphatically, CP, CN, that we will provide the locomotive power. Was it to be the rehabilitation money for branch line? Seventy million dollars anticipated for 1980 – not a new plan. The former member for Saskatoon-Humboldt – policy of Otto Lang. but does that announcement mean that the Conservative election promise of implementing the Hall report is down the drain? What came out of the meeting? What was positive? We think what was positive was an update of happenings since July 30 when Saskatchewan requested that the issue as to who was to equip the system be set aside in order to tackle the grain movement question, give strength to the operations of the wheat board. What has happened? Saskatchewan – 1,000 cars ordered coming on stream, October, November and December of 1980; Ottawa – 2,000 cars leased at \$10 million a year for 20 years; Alberta – an announcement of 1,000 cars but no orders place; Manitoba – a lease announcement but no cars; CN – a call for bids but no orders.

Saskatchewan once again at the meeting yesterday proposed that we should set aside the issue of who pays, of who equips the system. We should continue to concentrate on solving our immediate movement problem which has really not shown any sign of improvement this year over last year and thank goodness. Mr. Speaker, the meeting agreed. What is the next step? What's the next move? It's not clear. It cannot be assessed, I don't think, until we know where Alberta is really at, where Manitoba is at, whether CN is, in fact, going to order cars and most importantly where the federal government stands. But whatever we must do, we go into it with a clear confidence that Saskatchewan's initiative has again led the way – the flexibility, the co-operative spirit, the willingness to do things in order to get something done and most important of all, to put our producers first. In short, the Saskatchewan difference will serve us well in the future as it has in the past. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): – Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to rise and address the Saskatchewan Legislative Chamber today. Thank you. I am proud to be here representing the people of the Wilkie constituency. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express some of the concerns of the people from my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to this Assembly's attention a small town by the name of Tramping Lake. Last year they presented me with a petition of over 500 names from the town and area asking for bus service to their town. The petition was supported by letters of reference from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix circulations manager, Mr. Ward, so that the people could receive a daily paper. The local co-op store also sent a letter of

request for this service to their community to assist them in providing a better service for their customers. After consulting with the Minister of Telephones (Mr. Cody), he promised to look into the matter for me. Mr. Speaker, he did. Also we asked the STC company to do an in-depth study with regard to service to Tramping Lake from Highway 21 or as the people call it – Kramer's death road or Kramer's cow path No 21; and Mr. Speaker, even the cows aren't safe walking on that road.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: – Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to thank the Minister of Telephones (Mr. Cody) for looking into this problem and giving me a very prompt reply. But, Mr. Minister, in your letter dated April 11, 1979, you stated:

We will review this situation again in six months and see if anything has changed. However, at this time, I feel we will not extend service to the community.

Mr. Minister of Telephones, this all I me with the village council of Tramping Lake and their request was would it be possible to try this service for one? If the town and area do not support it, they have assured me they will understand if you withdraw the service after they've had a chance to try it for one year. Mr. Minister, they are only asking for a chance for bus service to their community as there are a large number of senior citizens who don't have transportation to the city for doctors' appointments or to visit old friends who are far away from their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss another area which concerns me very much. It has to do with the young people working in Alberta who were born and raised in Saskatchewan. I will give you a prime example of why the socialist government of Saskatchewan doesn't want the kids to come back to Saskatchewan to work and live. In the last provincial election (1978) I was in my office early one morning when one of these young former Saskatchewanites came into my office to ask for a PC sign. This was quite a surprise because I knew his parents had a socialist sign on their lawn before. After questioning him as to why he wanted a sign, he very bluntly told me that after arriving home late the night before from Alberta and finding a socialist sign on his parents' lawn he went into the house to question them as to why they had that sign on their lawn. Well, Mr. Speaker, his parents told him it seemed like the NDP was offering everything free and were going to put Saskatchewan on the map. I said to that young man, Mr. Speaker, that yes, everything will be free, but they will be taxed to their deaths and as far as putting Saskatchewan on the map – they will. And it will be known as the state of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this young fellow very plainly said, Jim, I want a sign because I want a Progressive Conservative government in Saskatchewan. I want to come home. I want to live here and I want to work here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: – Mr. Speaker, still on a constituency note, after hearing the Premier the other day expound about how successful small businessmen in Saskatchewan are, I would like to bring to his attention that he is wrong and that he must have been referring to small businesses in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, I had a young businessman call me last Tuesday night to express some very real concerns he has, and some very serious problems the socialist government is causing for his own personal business. Mr. Speaker, at that time I asked him if he felt strongly enough about it to write me a letter

and I would read it to this legislative Chamber. Mr. Speaker, this young businessman who isn't afraid to put his name and his business on the line, sent me that letter and at this time I would like to read it to the Chamber – and hope that there won't be any socialist retaliation against this young energetic businessman from the town of Kerrobert.

Dear Jim: I am very concerned about the Saskatchewan retail sales tax which I am obligated to charge my customers. A lot of trade which should come to Kerrobert goes west to Provost and other Alberta towns. Many customers who live west of Kerrobert are travelling to Alberta to do much of their shopping. They save 5 per cent on the purchase price of the good they buy, plus they usually fill up with gasoline and save 20 cents per gallon on that. I must prove that Tory Alberta is a pretty nice place to live. It is sure tough living in this socialist Saskatchewan.

Concern number two, our provincial government cannot possibly justify the 20 cents per gallon difference in gasoline prices between one side of the border and the other. Our socialistic government claims that they are helping the people of Saskatchewan. How? They are using taxpayers' money to gain control of our resources. First it was timber products, followed by telephone and power utilities, then potash mining. I believe that next we will hear the oil industry in Saskatchewan is in big trouble, so we, the Government of Saskatchewan will take over the oil business and save the people of Saskatchewan. Another one down!

It reminds me of the land bank. (Mr. Speaker, I sure hate to call it land bank but I have to repeat what my constituent wrote). History shows that without exception government control of resources and essential services leads to communism. What direction is our NDP government heading? Look closely people of Saskatchewan. What kind of life will your children and grandchildren have if they all work for the government?

Sincerely, Ken Clark.

Mr. Speaker, this is a letter from a small businessman in Saskatchewan who is staying here fighting against the socialist odds in Saskatchewan and receiving nothing but trouble and taxes from the present NDP government.

Mr. Speaker, I have to admire a man like this very much because he has more nerve and guts than the whole ND Party in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: – He is also a very religious man, Mr. Speaker, and a man who is not only concerned about his family and his business but concerned about his country which he lives in. He wants to stay to raise his family in what we now call the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, now I would like to turn to another fine town in the constituency and that is

the town of Unity. It is a good town in a good district and a good bunch of people live there. They are a very progressive bunch of people.

Other MLAs have bragged about their towns and areas but I believe the town of Unity is the most progressive town in Saskatchewan today. Yes, and even the Premier will remember this town because last spring the Premier and Mr. Tchorzewski, the Minister of Health, went out there for the first recognition of Celebrate Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, even if it took a lot of begging the Premier finally took me on the state's airplane and I thank him very much for it.

I think the most disturbing point of all, Mr. Speaker, is what the Premier did after he got to the town of Unity. We were met at the airport by the RCMP, the mayor, the Celebrate Saskatchewan Committee, and we were just given a royal, red carpet – oh pardon me – blue carpet treatment. I'm not too keen on that read. I have to deal with that every day in this House. We arrived at a residence in the town of Unity, and the lady very courteously asked the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) if he would like to freshen up before going down to the all to start the ceremonies, which was a very nice gesture on her part, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier did. He went to freshen up. At least that's why he left the mayor, president of the Chamber of Commerce, the Celebrate Saskatchewan Committee, and even his Minister of Health in the front room. And yes, the Premier will remember this, he snuck out the back door. He went downtown to open the local federal socialist committee rooms or otherwise known as the NDP committee rooms. About three-quarters of an hour later, he snuck back in the back door again.

Mr. Speaker, I had a lot of respect for the Premier before that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well of course we didn't find out until two weeks later when the local paper came out. We didn't know where the Premier had been or what he'd been doing. He didn't even have the courtesy to inform the people of Unity, the mayor, and everyone else what he was doing. He didn't have the nerve, he didn't have the guts to walk out the front door. He had to sneak out the back door. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone would have minded if he would have simply got up and stated, well, I have to go and open the federal NDP committee rooms. No one would have minded. As I stated earlier, I had a lot of respect for the Premier of Saskatchewan at that time, but after pulling a move like this, and looking down on the intelligence of the people of Unity, Mr. Speaker, now I know why the ND Party is low and nothing but a bunch of snakes in the grass.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: – Mr. Speaker, any Premier that would do this, any man who is supposed to be the Premier of our fine province and would pull a stunt like this, Mr. Speaker, doesn't deserve to be the Premier of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . further, Mr. Speaker, the good people of the town of Unity didn't deserve a dirty shot like this. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the Premier what his real goal was. What was his real decision for going to the town of Unity? Camouflaging the recognition of the Celebrate Saskatchewan Committee, or was it just to open the NDP committee rooms, which was a waste of time anyway? Mr. Speaker, to me now and to many other people in Saskatchewan he's known as our backdoor Premier . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: – Mr. Speaker, now I would like to talk about a subject that is not too pleasant to the socialistic government here in Saskatchewan, and that is their state farm program. I call it for what it is. It is state farming. It is state control over our agriculture

today . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I would like to express to this House and just give an example of one case that I went through last summer. I had a young man, 35 years old. This young man was a butcher by trade; it's too bad he couldn't have cut up some of the dead meat that's in this House. Mr. Speaker, this young man was led on by the great deals of Saskatchewan, the great deals of the NDP government – get a lease on a state farm and you're set for life. Mr. Speaker, this young man went on the state farm, a couple of thousand dollars in his pocket, a car and a half ton. Mr. Speaker, four years later, after trying hard, his lease was cancelled. He borrowed money; he bought machinery; he left a good job to go where he thought there were better things. Mr. Speaker, it turned out to be one of the personal disasters of his life. After four years of farming on alkaline land, poor crops, very poor crops, bad weather – just nothing seemed to go right for him, Mr. Speaker – the sheriff came in, seized all his chattels and sold them by public auction. The man was left some \$30,000 in debt. Four years of his life wasted, wasted because of a state farm, a big dream in the sunset. Mr. Speaker, he had suffered a lot through loss of income, loss to his family that can't be described. Mr. Speaker, after meeting with the former minister of agriculture (and I emphasize that former minister of agriculture), last summer and asking him for a little forgiveness on that money that was owed to the state farm commission of Saskatchewan, the former minister very bluntly said, well, some make it and some don't.

Mr. Speaker, his attitude was very depressing to me at that time and in this time, Mr. Speaker, as much as we have the backdoor premier, that was one of the smartest moves he ever made, getting rid of the dead weight in agriculture and appointing a new minister in right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: – Here we had a young man, Mr. Speaker, who wasted four years of his life on a state farm and ended up by leaving that state farm about \$30,000 in debt. He lost the car, still had the old truck that was completely worn out that he had come with to that state farm. Mr. Speaker, this was a young man who had tried because being a butcher by trade he set up and he cut meat in a little shop on the farm. His wife was a hairdresser. She had ladies in, in the afternoon and evening and did hair to try to make a go of this state farm. They both tried, but try as they might with one thing after another, they just didn't make it, Mr. Speaker. They failed. The lost and the only one that gained was the province of Saskatchewan, the socialist Government of Saskatchewan. They gained four years of that young man's life. It will take him a lifetime to pay that debt back.

Mr. Speaker, if this is the way the state farm system is to work in Saskatchewan, how many other people have been hurt and destroyed by this government that is supposed to be helping the people, helping the young farmer? Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to read a little advertisement that appears in all of the papers. It says land bank (boy it sure hurts me to say land bank) keeping you informed. Since it was established in 1972, the Saskatchewan Land bank Commission has been accepted as an adventurous way to help young people enter the farming business. As land prices continue to rise, more and more farmers are turning to land bank as a realistic alternative to the high price of land ownership. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hear all of the members opposite going hear, hear, hear, hear! Well, it's right here, Mr. Speaker, and that's why we've lost 6,000 farmers since state farming has come to Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: – Mr. Speaker, this concerns me very much because I am a family man. This government can hurt the adults all they want, but I'll tell you, when you starting hurting kids, I get goldarned mad!

Mr. Speaker, now I have a few remarks to address to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). Mr. Speaker, in the back alley of politics and away from the tape recorders and cameras, some of the members opposite are starting to play the same dirty game now that they did in 1978 and the Attorney General is now in the same back alleys, slumming, starting to lead his troops against our new leader. Mr. Speaker, he ridiculed Grant Devine's reference to God and the family as an appeal to the ignorant and superstitious, and in so doing, he scoffs at the family structure and indeed at our Lord. Yet when the lights are on and the cameras are rolling he too professes to believe in the very things that only moments ago he mocked in jest.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention again to the Minister of telephones (Mr. Cody) and it has to do with mobile telephone service in Saskatchewan. Many times I have heard this government comparing Alberta and Saskatchewan. Well, I would like to compare Alberta and Saskatchewan telephone rates for mobile phones. In Saskatchewan the fee is approximately \$95 to have a mobile phone installed in a vehicle. Mr. Speaker, the installation charge for a mobile phone in Alberta is \$50 – half as much. The monthly rent in Saskatchewan for that same mobile phone is \$81. Mr. Speaker, the monthly rent in Alberta is \$46. No wonder they have such a large heritage fund. They only charge half as much but they don't tax as much compared to the NDP government. There's an imbalance in the scale somewhere there. I don't know where our money is going, Mr. Speaker, in addition on the mobile phones, the province of Alberta has almost total mobile phone coverage. In Saskatchewan, we still have a lot of holes on the map.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to some of the new appointments that the Premier has made in Saskatchewan in his cabinet shuffle. As I stated earlier, I think it was a very good move on the Premier's part to get rid of the dead weight that was in agriculture before and bring in the Hon. Mr. Gordon MacMurchy. I think that was a very smart move on behalf of the Premier. But then I don't know what happened. He must have gone to sleep or gone for a walk because when he went to Gross for tourism, Mr. Speaker, that was the most gross error he'll ever make in his life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: – Mr. Speaker, after hearing the member for (I don't even know where he is from. He's such a nothing member.) Morse (Mr. Gross) get up and give his reply to the throne speech, all he talked about was the federal thing. Everybody's talking about the crow. I tell you, it's right in his department because crows and ducks are in his department. He can't even take care of them. In his reply, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing about his department, nothing about tourism in Saskatchewan. I would like to give you one example, the Meadow Lake provincial park, one of the finest parks in Saskatchewan, but we've been piecemealing it all along. Mr. Speaker, I'm calling right now on this government to do something. Complete this Meadow Lake Park because otherwise we can only accommodate x number of people. People want to go to this park even if we do have a correctional facility in it. They're not happy about that but the park is so good, it will make up for it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

What's the matter, Herman? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, well they're saving a

spot for you, Herman. It's O.K.

Mr. Speaker, another thing in the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources; I called for it last year and I'm calling for it again this year. I'm concerned about our young hunters entering the field today in Saskatchewan. Many organizations want a mandatory firearms training program in Saskatchewan. Will the minister (hopefully the minister will; I think the minister want to; it's some of the dead weight in the cabinet that doesn't want to let him push it through) bring in this mandatory firearms training program so that maybe we can save some young lives?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on now to the strike that's affecting people in Saskatchewan. It's affecting many people in the Wilkie constituency and all over the province. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) seems to skate down the highways today – mind you, that isn't hard to do because they're icy enough. Mr. Speaker, we have kids – not kids, young people – trying to obtain an education today. The parents are footing the bill. The government seems to sit there with a couldn't care less attitude. They aren't going to pick up the tab. Once again the people of Saskatchewan will have to pick up the tab and the young people still won't get their education.

Mr. Speaker, I think it just goes back to the 1978 election and I'm to borrow a phrase from our labor critic, the perfect marriage. I think that suits it up . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You stay onto the back alleys. The perfect marriage, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and the NDP. Mr. Speaker, in the next provincial election it's going to come back to haunt them.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a very small part of some of the topics I wanted to bring up today. I have no choice but to be voting against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member will permit a question before he takes his place?

MR. SPEAKER: – Order. Will he hon. member permit a question before he resumes his seat?

MR. GARNER: – . . . (inaudible) . . .

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): – Mr. Speaker, as I rise to reply to the Speech from the Throne, I do so with mixed feelings. Completion of my first term as a member of this legislature has left me with a sense of honor in having the opportunity to participate actively in the democratic process. But it has also left me with a feeling of frustration, frustration caused by the apathetic attitude of the members opposite. The flippancy displayed by members opposite on matters of concern to the people of Saskatchewan makes one wonder whether this whole process has become nothing but a futile exercise.

The concerns expressed by myself in the spring on behalf of my constituents were not addressed in the throne speech. I have stated before that my constituency is one of varied beauty. The Cypress Hills present a quiet environment both summer and winter. This is contrasted by the stark beauty of the great Sand Hills, Canada's only true desert.

My constituency is populated mainly by ranchers, farmers and small businessmen.

They are all hard-working independent people, the type of people who want the chance to work and succeed unimpeded by excessive government control and restrictions, the type of people who still believe that hard work and productivity has its own rewards.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Free enterprise!

MRS. DUNCAN: – Right.

There was and still is great concern expressed by the agricultural sector of my constituency over the arbitrary attitude of this government with reference to its restrictive lease land policies. Many ranchers and farmers in my area would like the opportunity to buy parcels of their lease land. But barring this concept, Mr. Speaker, they would like some assurances from this government that their lease land could be transferred at the time of sale to buyers other than family members. When I raised this major concern to the former Minister of Agriculture last year his reply was that he knew of ranchers in my area managing 36 sections of land. He replied that instead of one family controlling that much land he felt that six or eight member families should have that land. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the days of the vast ranches are gone. Today the majority of ranches and farms are much, much smaller. Of course, this attitude would be absolutely in line with a resolution passed with an overwhelming majority at the recent NDP convention in Saskatoon calling on this government to introduce legislation which would control land size. Mr. Speaker, this attitude reflects the paranoia of the socialist government against successful farmers and ranchers who often exercise prudent judgment and personal sacrifice to become successful in their chosen field.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that should this government attempt to bring in restrictive land size legislation they would no doubt have strong opposition from some of the members opposite who control substantial tracts of land. This government, Mr. Speaker, cannot believe that an individual, whether he be a rancher, a farmer, a small businessman or an employee, is capable on his own of becoming successful unless the government directs, impedes, or restricts his every move.

Another issue I raised last spring concerns the plight of our senior citizens, not only in my area, but in all of rural Saskatchewan. Rural areas do not have the facilities nor the proper staffing to care for level IV patients. Senior citizens requiring this specialized level of care are forced to move many, many miles from their homes – away from family and friends at a time in their lives when the support of their families is vital to their well being. The high cost of nursing care is still a major concern yet there was no hint in the throne speech that this would change. Many of our senior citizens through a sense of pride and personal sacrifice have set aside savings to sustain them during their retirement days only to see these savings quickly depleted when they enter a nursing home.

I suggested last spring, Mr. Speaker, that this government, the so-called champions of the elderly, follow the examples of other provinces in charging one basic fee for nursing home care and discontinue the discriminatory practice of charging different fees for different levels of care. Gerontology is a specific branch of medicine and should be treated as such.

The deteriorating conditions of the No. 21 and No. 32 highways are another concern. Residents for years have been asking for these two major links to be widened and repaved. They would also like to see the government pressure Ottawa for an extension

of the four-lane No. 1 from Swift Current to the Alberta border. It should be noted that the new Progressive Conservative government in Ottawa quickly came to an agreement on the cost-sharing terms of the Fort Walsh access road and I am pleased to say that the construction of this road is progressing well. This year there was over a 10 per cent increase in attendance at Cypress Hills Park. It has become one of the major recreation centres in the whole Southwest. The park staff under the supervision of superintendent Terry Swystun have done an excellent job in maintaining the high standards the park is noted for.

It is a credit to the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources to have such dedicated personnel on staff. Also the services provided in the park by private individuals are done with the same pride and efficiency and reflect the dedication of these individuals as well. There have been expansion plans for Cypress Hills on the drawing board for many years. I believe the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources recognizes the impact this area has on the Southwest. It is evident in the project started this year – the construction of a new and badly needed cafeteria and the expansion of the existing ski facilities, widely known as one of the most excellent ski areas in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak a few minutes on the health care delivery system in Saskatchewan. We all know that Saskatchewan was a pioneer in providing health services for its citizens. I am sure we all look upon this with a sense of pride. But, Mr. Speaker, the health care delivery system in Saskatchewan has been deteriorating over the past few years. The blame lies squarely on the shoulders of this government. There have been continual cutbacks in services and programs. There have been severe cutbacks in the number of hospital beds. People requiring elective surgery must often wait four to six months for a hospital bed. Comprehensive and meaningful programs for the handicapped do not exist. Many rural areas in Saskatchewan do not have the services of a doctor and the list goes on and on. But the pertinent question to ask, Mr. Speaker, is, where do the priorities of this government lie? Each day it is abdicating its responsibilities in the area of human and social resources. This government is putting dollars before people, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: – This government continues to invest tax dollar in high-risk ventures. The consensus is that the uranium market will soften in the '80s, yet does this government pay heed to the projected demand forecast? No, it doesn't. It continues on with reckless abandon – committing one-half billion tax dollars to the development of uranium. This government has no conscience.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble). His concerns about the expansion of nuclear technology are not peculiar to the people of Saskatoon. Indeed, these concerns are being voiced by people across Saskatchewan, across Canada and around the world. The question of waste disposal should be enough to cause concern and alarm in the dark recesses of the minds of the members opposite.

The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) can swagger – I mean stand – in this House and say the controls in the uranium industry in Saskatchewan will be as advanced as technology allows. This is of little comfort to me, Mr. Speaker, as this is the very area in which scientists admit technology has not kept pace.

I challenge the government to review and rethink its policy on uranium development. I challenge the government to listen to the growing concerns of the people of Saskatchewan. It seems ludicrous to me that it would take four to five years of study to implement a comprehensive program for the handicapped, yet take only 16 months to complete an inquiry as broad-ranging and in-depth as the Bayda inquiry into the implications of the nuclear industry as a whole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: – Some of the areas studies in the Bayda inquiry were radioactivity, biological radiation, health and safety of workers, nuclear power and its implications, environmental considerations, national and provincial control arrangements, economic and social effects, uranium development in the North, nuclear proliferation, moral and ethical issues. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and members of this Assembly, is it possible to study and thoroughly report on all of these issues in 18 months? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Window dressing, right.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my next comment to the plight of our native people. I believe Saskatchewan Indians can be referred to as the Saskatchewan boat people. They are Saskatchewan born people drifting in their own sea of misery. This government professes to have a patent on the solution to native problems – but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite, has the plight of our Indians improved in the last eight years? Statistics clearly show we are failing to help these people in a meaningful way. Witness the alcoholism. Witness the infant mortality rate. Witness the suicide rate. Witness the poverty, the disease, the deplorable housing conditions, the child neglect, the number of natives in our penal institutions. These statistics are growing higher and higher each year and are simply appalling, Mr. Speaker. Yet, what do we offer them? I say that this government is using the natives as nothing more than political pawns, in a game they are playing. Recently Mr. Rob Milen, a Saskatchewan civil servant spoke at the New Democratic convention in Saskatoon. He chastised the federal government for what he called stalling tactics in settling Indian land claims, but he praised the New Democrats. I find this totally unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, that this government under the leadership of Premier Blakeney would be so bold as to invite – or perhaps, order – one of the civil servants to address a purely, partisan political function escapes me. This reflects the total arrogance and the contempt this government has for accepted political principles. I say that the Premier should dismiss Mr. Milen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: – Mr. Speaker, on another matter, the Premier made reference the other day to the Regina North-West by-election, and said that the campaign waged by the Progressive Conservative Party did not do them credit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: – Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Premier, who is portrayed as a knight in shining armour, that his hands are not so lily-white when it comes to campaign tricks. The campaign waged in the Maple Creek riding did no credit to the New Democratic Party. The voters in my area rejected a campaign which, I regret to say, had heavy overtones of rumor mongering, preying on the fears of the elderly, and other questionable tactics. Your people fostered and promoted such irrational statements at

the door as, we gave your medicare; don't let the PCs take it away. The PCs are attacking the principle of medicare; the PCs will return to the days when sickness forced you to mortgage your house and lose it. All of this, Mr. Speaker, was slickly merchandised into television and radio commercials, and embellished by horrible rumours at the door. The campaign waged in maple Creek by the New Democratic Party was nothing more than sophisticated political terrorism. I say that the members opposite are power hungry. They have exchanged the well-being of Saskatchewan citizens for the lure of dollars.

The throne speech was a complete sham. It totally lacked substance of any kind. The throne speech did not address itself to the everyday problems of our citizens. It did not address the problems facing our natives. It did not address the problem of a decreasing health delivery system. It did not address the problems in the educational field. It did not address the problems facing small businessmen. It did not address the ever-increasing tax burden. It did not address the ever-increasing utility rates. It did not address the ever-increasing bureaucracy. Mr. Speaker, it just did not address itself to anything. Government has become more secretive. People know less and less. The arrogance coming through is more than one can visualize. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): – Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to participate in the throne speech debate of the current session. I am proud to represent the constituents of Saskatoon Nutana who have sent me her for the fourth time and prevented divine intervention in this legislature.

I would like first of all to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. John Solomon made a commendable contribution and I am certain he will contribute more useful years to the political life of this legislature and this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: – Mr. Speaker, not many governments have the good fortune to have a Solomon grace their benches.

Bob Long continues the CCF-New Democratic representation from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, representation which has been continuous since 1944 during the Nollet and Kwasnica years. Even prior to that time, Mr. Speaker, this constituency showed good judgment in electing A. MacAuley as one of the original CCF members in this province. The current member has shown conclusively that he will represent his constituents well and serve the province in an admirable fashion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: – Mr. Speaker, a word of congratulations to the hon. member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) as the spokesman and representative in absentia of the current Leader of the PC Party, Mr. Grant Devine. I think if anyone needs divine intervention it is the federal government at Ottawa. He should offer his services to Prime Minister Clark. It is not an envious position for, Mr. Speaker, any serious student of politics will soon surmise and conclude that the true-blue Tory is simply an individual who is dedicated to a serious attempt to postpone the arrival of the future. Any of them, Mr. Speaker, who do not fall into this particular category fall into the second category comprised of those who merely wish to return to a golden era of the past which was

non-existent for the vast majority of the members of our society. In reality, it is merely a figment of their imagination.

Mr. Speaker, a goodly number of speakers have covered many subjects in the current debate. It is my intention to digress a bit from the general trend.

Mr. Speaker, most of us I am sure, will agree that inflation is a major problem in our national economy and, therefore, in our provincial economy. It is obvious that we cannot isolate ourselves from the impact of inflationary forces. Mr. Speaker, this country did not have indexation of exemptions and the marginal rates of income tax until the year 1974. The national government of that day instituted indexation to popularize its cause in the October 1974 general election. The argument they put forth was quite convincing. Inflation is eating away the value of your hard-earned dollars. We are going to assist you in your individual battle against the inflationary trend.

I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that all provinces, regardless of the political persuasions, were opposed to that proposal at that particular time. Now what has been the results, Mr. Speaker? Actually it's a cruel fraud that has been perpetuated on the Canadian people. I can readily understand indexation related to exemption levels. That approach has merit and treats Canadians on a fair and equitable basis. However, the indexation of marginal rates of income tax simply does not. I will give you a few examples to illustrate.

Mr. Crosbie, the federal Minister of Finance, recently announced indexation of the marginal rates at 8.9 per cent in the current year, related to the preceding year. This means that the Canadian citizen paying at the lower levels on the income tax table – at the 6 per cent to 16 per cent level – will save approximately \$13 on the current year's income tax when compared with the prior year. When one's income gets into the 32 per cent – 36 per cent tax bracket, that individual saves more than 10 times as much by indexation as that person at the lower level. When one looks at the 36 per cent to 39 per cent bracket the indexed savings are more than 30 times greater. Going to the 39 per cent, 43 per cent bracket takes them to some 70 times greater in savings in relation to that individual at the lower level.

We pride ourselves in the progressiveness of income tax and then permit this distortion through indexation of the marginal rates which defeats progressiveness and creates gross inequities in the entire system.

It should be apparent to the most casual observer that indexation of the marginal rates of income tax provides the least protection to the individuals in our society who suffer most severely from inflation and it provides the most benefit to those in our society who least need protection. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, even those who currently benefit may well find it to be a rather hollow assistance.

Our current national government will have a budgetary deficit in the range of \$11 billion to \$12 billion in the year ending March 31 next. These sums are borrowed at high interest rates and the carrying costs add to the future tax burdens and additionally escalate the inflationary trend. If federal Finance Minister John Crosbie had the will to remove indexation of the marginal rates of income tax, he would reduce the federal budgetary deficit by some 20 per cent and ease the impact of inflation on our national economy. He said when he introduced these rates that it would save \$1.425 million. You may argue that would be taken away from the general public but the fact is, it's taken away in any event, because through the budgetary deficit process that money is

borrowed and the thing is multiplied and the factor simply grows.

I know Mr. Crosbie fairly well. I used to meet him at finance ministers meetings when he was the Minister of Finance in Newfoundland and I was Minister of Finance here. He might have the will to do it but I doubt very much whether Clark courage will permit the deletion of indexation of marginal rates of income tax and the obvious positive results that such action would attain.

Additionally I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the people in our society who have all the benefits basically related to things like RRSPs (Registered Retirement Savings Plans) and so on in terms of income tax deduction are not the people at the lower levels of income tax returns.

Mr. Speaker, I currently have responsibility for the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Crown corporation. That corporation is having a difficult year. The implications of an attitude which ignores realism in relation to automobile operations are obvious and they should be obvious to all of us. For example, my home city, Saskatoon, has had over 12,000 automobile accidents to the end of October in 1979, compared with 8,000 in the year 1978. In October a good driving month, we had the worst automobile accident record in our history with claims exceeding for that one month \$19,900,000 or approaching \$20 million. A booming economy appears to generate an easy-come, easy-go attitude which ignores reason and rationality. At the same time the number and severity of injuries has declined because this government, Mr. Speaker, had the courage to institute seatbelt law, despite the wails of the opposition related to infringement of the rights of the individual. Individuals have rights but they also have responsibilities in our society and often we need government action to ensure that occurs.

Mr. Speaker, our auto accident rate might be expressed with a bit of verse:

Two men had cars they thought were perfection,
They met one day at an intersection.
The tooted their horns and made a connection,
A policeman came and made an inspection.
The ambulance came and made a collection.
Now all that is left is a recollection,
And two less votes for the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: – Mr. Speaker, the throne speech mentions additional supplemental assistance for retired civil servants. I am certain these people need assistance because of the inflationary facts in our society and I have previously referred to them. We should be striving for a long-term solution to this problem. It is erroneous in our modern-day, Mr. Speaker, to consider a pension as a reward for long service. It should be considered as a deferred wage. I hope the members will read the Economic Council of Canada's report entitled, One in Three Pensions for Canadian in the year 2030. Currently roughly 1 in 10 Canadians is over 65 and on pension. Twenty years from now it will be approaching the figure of 1 in 3. The implications for this province and for Canada are severe and awesome.

A declining birthrate and an increasing longevity rate herald increasing difficulties for public and private plans. May I illustrate with a simple example. Susy Smith is the

average Canadian girl. She works for \$10,000 a year at a job, whether it's public or private is immaterial. She is told when she enters employment that she must be an active participant in a pension plan, usually those are unit benefit or allowance systems. They take 6 per cent off her pay. They do that for 5 years. Maybe she's 20 years old. At 25 she's being married. She has paid \$3,000 into that pension plan. Her employer has not paid in one cent. He has an unfunded liability.

But if the employee leaves and withdraws her equity, obviously then, the unfunded liability disappears. That young person perhaps comes back to the work force at the age 45. There is simply no way that that person will become a viable economic unit in our society in terms of the pension she will receive. If instead, that person had a matching locked-in-vested pension approach, had 3 per cent taken off her pay, matched by 3 per cent by the employer and was told the day she started to work that there would be no repayment when she terminated employment, she would have \$3,000 at age 25. That money could easily earn 7 per cent and that's a very cautious figure.

If that money earned 7 per cent compounded until she was 65 years old, without another cent being put up it would pay her \$400 a month for the rest of her life based on current annuity rates. In addition, she would have \$218.08 a month from the Canada Pension Plan and she would have \$179.02 from the Old Age Security. She would have an income of \$797 a month, or almost \$800 a month – almost \$9,600 a year. If we took action now we would have a reasonably satisfactory solution to the pension problem 30 years from now but it does not show up quickly, Mr. Speaker, and you must make that start. I simply raise these points for the consideration of the members of the Assembly and hope they are alerted to those very major and very basic problems. Mr. Speaker, it will be obvious to all that I will support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.