

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 17, 1980**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**HON. MR. R.J. GROSS (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and the members of this Assembly Grades 3, 4, 5 and 6 students from the Kincaid High School. I introduce them on behalf of Mr. Lingenfelter who is not here today. Thirty-eight Grades 3, 4, and 5 students who have come in from Kincaid to take a look at the session, to gain a better understanding and working knowledge of the legislative process. I wish them luck in their deliberations here and I hope that they will have a good time.

I would also like to introduce, while I am standing, 39 senior citizens seated in the Speaker's gallery here today from Herbert. They are accompanied by their co-ordinator, Mr. H.H. Anders.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.L. SOLOMON (Regina North-West):** — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and other members of the Legislative Assembly 95 Grade 12 students from O'Neill High School. They are located in the west gallery and in the Speaker's gallery as well. I would like to also introduce to you the two teachers who are accompanying them, Mr. Berezny and Mr. Hudson. I hope that all of you enjoy the proceedings this afternoon. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and your colleagues at O'Neill High School, as well as Mr. Brenholen, the principal, for the kind hospitality and the warm welcome that you gave me when I was at your school presenting the Celebrate Saskatchewan pins. I hope they find the proceedings interesting this afternoon and I look forward to joining them after the question period at 3:45 to have a little discussion with them. I would ask all members this afternoon to join with me in welcoming them to the Chamber.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, if I might be acknowledged at this point in time. It's a very real privilege for me today, to introduce this special guest. The special guest is May-Britt Carlsson who is the Labour Attaché to the Swedish Embassy in Ottawa. Ms. Carlsson, presently holds the position of Labour Attaché, a post which she has held since 1976. I think the members will be interested in knowing that Ms. Carlsson, who is a journalist by profession, has been closely identified with the trade union movement in her country. She is the first Swedish Labour Attaché to be posted to Canada as Canadian matters formerly were handled from the embassy in Washington, D.C. Prior to her present position, Ms. Carlsson had a distinguished public career, including membership on the advisory council to the prime minister on equality between men and women from 1972 to 1976 and as the Swedish government representative to the United Nations in the planning of International Women's Year in 1975.

Sweden, as you know, is a country with perhaps the highest degree of labor union organization in the world and they seem to have developed a system in which the collective bargaining between workers and employers organizations has functioned relatively well. It has increased the living standards for workers and it has, I think, enhanced the economic health for industry. There has been, in addition, a high level of industrial peace with government co-operation but with a minimum of government intervention. I know that all members will want to join with me in welcoming Miss Carlsson to our Assembly and I want to express the expectation that her several days here will be interesting and beneficial to her as well as to our officials who will be having the opportunity of talking with her. I would like to have her stand and be recognized in the Speaker's gallery: Miss Carlsson.

## QUESTIONS

### Sale of Hotel Saskatchewan

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). Mr. Minister, I'm sure you are aware from press reports over the weekend that negotiations are being held concerning the sale of the Hotel Saskatchewan. Prominently involved in the press reports are two very senior officials with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, including the chairman of the board, Mr. Dombowsky and also the director of corporate affairs, Mr. Pat Waters, as well as a former employee of PCS. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is, has SEDCO been approached in any way to be involved in these negotiations? And if so, will SEDCO be involved in any fashion as far as a loan, a grant or a guarantee? More specifically, Mr. Minister are you prepared to assure this Assembly today that SEDCO has no interest in buying back property from Canadian Pacific?

**HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce):** — Mr. Speaker, I too read that little note in the Leader-Post but at this particular point in time, I'm not aware of any applications made by anybody to SEDCO for the purchase of the CPR hotel. And, if and when an application does come we'll treat that application, I'm sure, in the same manner that we always treat every other application.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, in light of the minister's answer, the Premier may recall that approximately one year ago we went through quite a debate in this Assembly regarding conflict of interest for the members of the Legislative Assembly. I would remind the Premier, in that debate particularly during a committee of the whole, the point was raised several times specifically by myself as to the propriety of a conflict of interest as it would pertain to Crown corporation employees. I therefore ask the Premier, in light of the minister's answer, that he would treat an application from these gentlemen in exactly the same fashion as he would from anyone else, would the Premier not view a situation of two very senior employees, extremely senior employees of PCS and one former employee as being a conflict of interest?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member is assuming a good bit. So far as we are aware no employee of any Crown corporation has made any application to SEDCO for a loan in connection with any purchase of any assets of the CPR and accordingly, there is no point in dealing with a hypothetical possibility. I think the minister is correct in saying that when an application comes in it

will be dealt with in the ordinary course of events. If it raises some special problems because of the nature of the application, there will be time enough then to deal with them.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, both of the employees who are presently in the employ of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan are very, very highly paid employees. I don't know Mr. Dombowsky's salary specifically, but it must be in excess of \$80,000 by now. I do not have any idea what Mr. Water's would be, but it would be in that league. Mr. Minister, you don't need to be a PhD in economics to know that their hourly rate is valued very, very highly by the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, while these people may be very, very bright, they obviously have had to spend a great deal of time to put together a package of this magnitude — certainly with the Hotel Saskatchewan, you're talking in the many millions of dollars. Are you prepared to assure this Assembly today that the work these people have put into it (and it must have been extensive to get this far) has not been on the time of the people of Saskatchewan and that the people of Saskatchewan are receiving full value for the very highly inflated salaries that these people are receiving at PCS?

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, yes I can assure the members of this Legislative Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan that they are receiving a fair share from the endeavours of the senior executives of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. One only has to look at the last annual report and the announcement from the provincial treasurer with respect to that operation.

The member alludes to two employees of the corporation being involved in the purchase. There has not yet, at least as far as the information I have, been a purchase of the Saskatchewan Hotel at this time. Yes, it is subject to some negotiation and there is perhaps a strong likelihood of a purchase, but it does not involve two members of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. Mr. Dombowsky, I'm told has no involvement in the negotiations, never did and does not at this time. However, Mr. Pat Water, an employee, and yes, a senior employee of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, has some interest in the purchase of the Hotel Saskatchewan in the city of Regina. I have been assured by his superior, the president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, as I have been by himself, that he has not used any company time or in any way used the facilities that the company may provide to him in negotiating that transaction. Indeed, a former employee, Mr. Peter Gundy, who is now resident in Toronto, has been the principal in arranging the preliminary negotiations which might subsequently lead to the purchase of that hotel here in Regina.

### **Resignations of Senior Employees of PCS**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Would the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, I don't think the member for Moose Jaw South, with his previous involvement with Golden Acres, need comment on this. My question to the minister is, has any resignation been tendered to you from senior officials in PCS who are involved in the potential purchase of the Hotel Saskatchewan?

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, no, I have not nor would I expect to receive such a resignation. It is assumed that an individual who is a senior employee of the corporation is involved in what might subsequently be the purchase of an asset here in the city of Regina. I don't think that we would assume or expect any senior executive who may be looking at some other venture, as long as he is doing it on his own time and

with his own assets, should submit a resignation prior to concluding any kind of arrangement he may want to make with his life in the future. So I have been assured that he has not in any way used time that would otherwise be dedicated to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, or the resources of that corporation, to explore what might ultimately lead to the purchase of that hotel. When that time arrives I think it would be addressed on the merits of his involvement with that hotel.

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Do you mean to say that if these senior employees were permitted to go ahead and purchase this hotel, there would be no conflict of interest if they weren't in . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do you not feel that any employee or any part of the government is in a position to give government business to an outlet like that?

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear here. We are talking about a hypothetical situation. There has not been to anybody's mind, at least evidenced in the discussions that have taken place in this Chamber up to this point, a purchase of the Hotel Saskatchewan. It has furthermore been alluded that there are several employees of the Potash Corporation, and other persons who may be involved, in what might subsequently be a purchase. That is all hypothetical. I have conveyed to the House that there is one member of the corporation who has indicated an interest in the ultimate purchase of that hotel, but that is not by any means a fait accompli at this time. If that purchase is made I would assume that that individual would come forward indicating to the president of the corporation what his involvement might be in that operation. And I don't think that we should try to assume what should be done in the circumstances that we have available to us today.

To answer a little more specifically to the member's accusation that it may be a conflict of interest. I think that is difficult to conclude at this time as well. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is not an agency of the government. It is a Crown corporation of government. I think there is some substantive difference. Its offices are located in the city of Saskatoon, something which I might remind the members of this Chamber — at least who sit to the left of Mr. Speaker — would not be the case had they had their way in conducting the potash development of the province of Saskatchewan. This hotel is here in the city of Regina, so I think all of this is hypothetical and it should be brought to the attention of Saskatchewan people that they're trying to make a case out of something that is purely hypothetical at this time.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, if I may ask you about the hypothetical situation of which, if I may remind you, about two minutes ago you indicate some specifics when you indicated that the chairman of the potash corporation . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I'll take a new question.

**MR. THATCHER:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you alluded to the fact about two minutes ago, that the chairman, Mr. Dombowsky, of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, was somehow involved in a potential purchase of the Hotel Saskatchewan. You indicated that yourself, that you had some knowledge of it. My question to you is, if what you term a hypothetical situation turns out to be a reality and these people are successful in purchasing the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I'll take a new question.

### **Sale of Saskatchewan Uranium**

**MR. LANE:** — I'll direct a question to the Premier. An announcement last week indicated that France intended to supply Iraq with highly enriched uranium for fuel for an atomic research reactor under construction. Can you give any assurances that, in fact, it in no way is Saskatchewan uranium that is being sold indirectly through France to this unstable area of the world?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think I can give them the assurance that we have received from the Government of Canada that no Canadian uranium proceeds to France as the ultimate destination, since the Government of Canada and the Government of France have not yet concluded appropriate arrangements which permit the export of uranium to France as an ultimate destination. My qualifying phrase is because uranium does from time to time move to France on behalf of other purchasers, e.g. Britain or let us say the Netherlands, where it is enriched, but it is subsequently exported and removed from France by the ultimate purchaser. Therefore, no Canadian uranium is, we are assured, left with any French authorities for disposition either in France or to any other person named by the Government of France.

**MR. LANE:** — A supplementary to the Premier. The study recently carried out as part of the international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation — I believe there were some 66 nations and I will ask a further question on this — indicated that in fact it was impossible to police or control the sales of uranium from the source of mining to another country, in areas of the world where it would not be politically wise to supply the source. Would the Premier give his position on the study which in fact says that it's impossible to control the distribution of uranium?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not agree that the summary of that report given by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle is necessarily a full summary and it couldn't be under the circumstances. But let me answer his question by saying that our position as a Government of Saskatchewan is that the Government of Canada, during the last period of time from May until February and up until this time, is taking all the appropriate steps to ensure that Canadian uranium reaches the destination where it is intended and not other destinations, and, in the particular case of France, is not sending Canadian uranium there for ultimate use because France has not signed the non-proliferation treaty or reached another arrangement with the Government of Canada which that government deems appropriate.

**MR. LANE:** — A supplementary to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. This is not the first time that the government opposite has indicated on a question with regard to uranium development that the responsibility lies mainly with the Government of Canada. I referred in particular to the finding of radon gas in the school in Uranium City where the immediate reaction of the government opposite is to say, well, it's a federal government problem and they're going to have to step in. You have the power as a government to stop immediately uranium mining within the province of Saskatchewan. Is it not fair for the people of Saskatchewan to ask you as a government to say that, if you are going to proceed with uranium mining, you intend as a government to take the sole and full responsibility for the results of mining in markets or distribution of uranium?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — In my judgment, first the statement of fact is incorrect, and second, the policy statement requested of us is inappropriate. I do not believe that Saskatchewan can necessarily cease the production of uranium in Saskatchewan. That

may or may not be true but it is by no means self-evident that we can stop uranium mining in Saskatchewan. The provisions of section 92(10)(c) of the British North America Act are fairly explicit and uranium and uranium mining has been declared an activity for the general benefit of Canada under section 92(10)(c). It is something less than clear that the Government of Saskatchewan can stop uranium mining. I leave that. That is by no means an established principle of law.

May I allude to the fact that our references to radon gas at Uranium City was not because it was a matter for the Government of Canada but rather because it was a matter for the corporation which put the offending material there, namely Eldorado Nuclear, which is a Crown corporation of the Government of Canada. In that sense of the word it was a matter for the Government of Canada. The question which the hon. member direct to me — should the Government of Saskatchewan try to determine and make judgments upon where Canadian uranium moves when it leaves Saskatchewan? My answer to that is, we are interested and we would wish to be consulted but the management of the international trade of Canada is clearly a matter within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada.

For example, the oil which leaves Saskatchewan now carries a huge export tax which flows to the Government of Canada, levied by them by reason of the fact that they are controlling the export of oil. They similarly control the export of uranium. We are in no position to ask countries to sign, with Saskatchewan, a treaty dealing with the appropriate handling and distribution of uranium; the Government of Canada is. I repeat, while we are interested and wish to be consulted, we take the view that the steps which will ensure to all Canadians that Canadian uranium, whatever province it may come from, is not being used for inappropriate purposes — those steps must be taken by the Government of Canada. We will assist but we will not usurp the function which is clearly and constitutionally theirs.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — A supplementary to the Premier would be . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I'll take the Minister of Health.

#### **Response re Question re Regina General Hospital Regeneration**

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in this House the member for Qu'Appelle made a number of accusations against the board of governors of the Regina General Hospital and also against the director of planning and my department. Mr. Speaker, at that time I expressed some skepticism about the validity of the accusation. I am in a position today to substantiate my position that the accusations expressed by him have no grounds, whatsoever, in truth.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I would like to clarify. Is the minister answering a question?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yes, I am.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — All right, proceed.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I have investigated the allegations made by the hon. member and discovered in keeping with his past record the hon. member's statements are both unfounded and untrue. Mr. Speaker, quite simply put, there are no problems with the regeneration of the Regina General Hospital. In co-operation with my department, the board of the hospital has assume responsibility for the design and

construction work.

The regeneration program is under the very capable direction of Mr. Jim Morris, director of planning of the hospital. Neither Mr. Morris nor the architects have any knowledge of any major design problems in phase one of the project.

If the hon. member had done his homework and had sought out and placed more reliance on the authoritative sources he would have discovered:

1. That planning and design is being carried out in a responsible manner by fully qualified consultants;
2. That all construction activity has been carefully and deliberately considered in terms of patient convenience, cost and rational planning.

In particular I would note that one-way windows were not agreed to because they are both too costly and unnecessary and that all partitions have been installed in the proper location.

The member for Qu'Appelle has maligned the reputation of many dedicated individuals involved in planning for regeneration and has unnecessarily called the project into ill repute. Years of careful planning have already gone into the project to ensure that the people of Regina and southern Saskatchewan will be well accommodated. It is a disservice to all concerned to suggest that errors of miscalculations are being made without first checking the facts of the situation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! Does the member wish to ask a supplementary? I will take the member for Wilkie.

### **Racial Riots in the town of Kerrobert**

**MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, after a telephone conversation this morning with the mayor of the town of Kerrobert regarding the racial riots that are taking place in that town, will you please intervene in this very volatile situation before someone is seriously injured or we see a loss of life?

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I have not received any requests for intervention from the mayor or from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police on this matter whatsoever. I would say that from my understanding of the situation, based on press reports — albeit not very often the best source of information — would you allow the situation at Kerrobert to be characterized as racial riots.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think it is that kind of gross overstatement by the hon. member opposite which in fact leads, or tend to lead, to an exacerbation of the situation.

Until and unless I get such requests from the Royal Canadian Mounted police or from the Mayor of Kerrobert or some responsible elected local official on the issue, I do not intent to take any further action.

**MR. GARNER:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Attorney General maybe you are

not concerned but when I have senior citizens phone me that they are terrified at night because of what is happening in the town, I think you should be aware of it and you should act on it, Mr. Attorney General. People are scared.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I will take the next question. The member for Rosetown-Elrose.

### **Amendment to the Education Act**

**MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education.

Under The Education Act there is no provision for ratification of the teachers' salary agreement by boards of education. My question to you is, will this government introduce an amendment to The Education Act to provide for this ratification process?

**HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I currently have no plans to introduce any amendments of that sort to this Assembly. There have been no suggestions of that sort made to me with regard to amendments. I don't know how I would respond to such a request if it were made but at the moment I have no plans of the sort.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! We have reached 2:30. I wonder if the members, according to standing practice, would move down the agenda to special order and return later this date to complete the balance of the agenda?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Agreed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — We will be dealing with orders of the day later today.

### **Point of Order on Routine Proceedings Agenda**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, does it not have to be unanimous consent to move along the orders? Can a member not make a brief statement not this Assembly at this time?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Yes, it has to be unanimous consent to move down the agenda and I would cite to the members at this time that the past practice has been that members request, at this point in the agenda, that we move down to special order and return later in the day to complete the balance of the agenda which we have passed over. Now the member has a perfect right to object. That means we would go through the agenda point by point until we reached special orders.

**MR. COLLVER:** — If the House would hear a brief statement from a member then we could proceed on to special orders.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, if we are going to hear a statement from a member then we will go back and work on the agenda from the point where we left off.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Agreed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — All right. We are on special order then.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — All right. We are on ministerial statements.

## **STATEMENT**

### **Sitting as an Independent Member**

**MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement to make to the members of the Assembly.

After considerable soul-searching I have decided, effective immediately, to sit in this Assembly as the Independent member for Swift Current in order to assist the Independent member for Nipawin in promoting the eventual union of western Canada with the United States of America.

I will naturally be resigning as a member of the Progressive Conservative Party caucus, because of the national organization, my view will be an embarrassment to the caucus. I have no quarrel with the Progressive Conservative caucus or party and wish to emphasize that it is only because I consider this issue so important to the future of my children, my grandchildren and everyone else's grandchildren that I wish to devote my time and association to this cause. I wish to emphasize to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have come to this decision only after many conversations with my constituents in Swift Current.

### **Greetings to the Irish**

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would just like, on behalf of all of us here — those who are Irish and those who wish they were Irish — to extend greetings and best wishes to the Irish today.

Saskatchewan, relative to some other groups, does not have a large Irish community but we do have a very active Irish community. I am sure they will be enjoying today and I am sure all members will want to join me in sending them best wishes.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## **ADJOURNED DEBATE**

### **BUDGET DEBATE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski (Minister of Finance) that this Assembly do now resolve itself into a committee of finance.

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to state at the outset what an honor it is to be chosen to reply to the budget. I am proud that my leader has given me the honor of asking me to present our response and I'm proud that the Progressive Conservative Party has sound economic alternatives to offer, which I shall cover in the course of this speech. However, before I proceed with the assessment of the budget, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my sincerest congratulations to our new leader, Grant Devine, for winning the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party. I want to assure you, sir, that our new leader has the

support, confidence and loyalty of the members of our caucus as well as all members of our party. We all look forward anxiously to Mr. Devine's election to this Assembly, to a seat in this House and that one now being occupied by the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, 1980 is a year of special significance to the people of Saskatchewan. It marks our 75th year as a partner in confederation. This anniversary is a time for celebration, a time for pride, a time for reflection in Saskatchewan and a time for planning. The year 1980 is special for several reasons. It is not only our 75th birthday but also the first year of a new decade and the beginning of the last quarter of our first century. At this special time, therefore, it is only natural for us to reflect on our past, assess our present and anticipate the future. Mr. Speaker, the 19th century American philosopher, Booker T. Washington, once said:

A man should not be judged so much by his accomplishments but by the obstacles he has overcome.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, he could well have been describing the people of Saskatchewan. The history of our province is one of man's ability to overcome adversity — the innate ability of our citizens to persevere in spite of huge odds — and to succeed. A fierce pioneer pride has dominated the character of the people of Saskatchewan, a spirit that has manifested itself in determination, hard work and enthusiasm that we still see today. It is this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that has characterized our progress through the 75 years. There is a feeling prevalent in the province today of a new optimism, and that in the last two decades of the twentieth century Saskatchewan will rise as a major power. That optimism is well-founded, Mr. Speaker. We have been blessed with a once-in-a-lifetime gift of a wealth of non-renewable resources and an eternal gift of renewable resources tied to the land. Saskatchewan continues to be the agricultural centre of Canada.

We have the world's largest reserves of potash. We have oil, coal, natural gas and we have uranium, Mr. Speaker. In fact Saskatchewan has the non-renewable resource base to lead the nation in economic growth in the future if we invest our money wisely in renewable, long-term sustained economic activities. No other province has our balance and wealth of resources. That's why I am astounded, Mr. Speaker, at the total failure of the current government to bring that development to the people of Saskatchewan.

Having had the weekend to scrutinize and analyze last Thursday's budget, my first two comments are: it's a tax collector's budget; this government has become old, tired, decrepit and boring.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Just look at them. It's time, Mr. Speaker, they were put out to pasture. This budget, Mr. Speaker, is a tragic indictment of this government's inability to manage and handle our province's economy. This is a time, Mr. Speaker, when all objective evidence should indicate tremendous potential growth in resource revenue. It should be a time of exciting opportunities for family businesses; a time for corporate growth and therefore an increase in provincial tax revenue from corporations, increased revenue from the expansion of secondary industry, and most important, Mr. Speaker, much needed tax relief for the overburdened families and under-served taxpayers of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — But sadly, Mr. Speaker, in reality this is not the case. In fact, the exact opposite is true. The myopic and inflexible resource policies of the government are not returning anywhere near the revenues promised to the people of Saskatchewan. The total failure of government agencies such as SEDCO to stimulate each secondary industry is a sad litany of mismanagement leading to one bankruptcy after another with the people of this province left holding the bag.

Saskatchewan businessmen, facing an unfair tax burden and lack of incentives, are leaving the province for greener pastures like Alberta and the United States. The anaemic state of our corporate sector is shown in the fact that personal income taxes paid in this province account for more than three times that paid in corporation taxes. The new corporate capital tax introduced last Thursday is further evidence, Mr. Speaker, of this government's vindictiveness towards the business and resource development of this province. For the first time in our history there has been a desire by eastern Canadian firms to invest in western Canada, including Saskatchewan — not to mention foreign investments. By introducing this new tax the government has guaranteed that these investments will flow right on through to Alberta and British Columbia. The introduction of this tax, Mr. Speaker, is only the beginning. Not only is it a regressive tax, it also opens the door for more taxation. Despite a wealth of natural resources there has been no effort by this government to develop renewable resource activities which will stabilize and strengthen our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the hard fact is that the largest burden for funding of this inefficient and deficit-ridden government is being carried by those least able to pay or to bear the weight — the individual taxpayers of Saskatchewan, farm families, and rural residents and the elderly. Our province, with the announcement of this budget, Mr. Speaker, is charging head-long into a major financial crisis. Nowhere is this more evident than when we look at the ever-increasing deficit position taken by this government in attempting to handle our economy. Our current accumulated debt, Mr. Speaker, is almost \$3 billion. In fact last year, Mr. Speaker, the interest on our debt alone was \$272 million. I would like to put this amount into perspective.

Mr. Speaker, in doing some research into the interest costs of our debt in this province I've uncovered some very interesting facts. In 1966 the interest that we paid in this province was \$30 million — equivalent to the total budget of 1944. Twenty-two years later the interest that we paid equated to the total budget of 1944.

In 1979, Mr. Speaker, the interest we paid was \$272 million — more than the total budget of 1966 of \$265 million. That means that in 12 short years we have moved to the position where the interest on our debt alone now exceeds the entire operating fiscal budget of the province of Saskatchewan in 1966-67.

What is perhaps the most alarming about this, Mr. Speaker, is that when projected, it means we can look forward to, in the next 6, 7, 8 or 9 or maybe 10 years, an interest cost of some \$2 billion. Because, Mr. Speaker, with the ever-quickly increasing cycles of inflation, if the '66 interest costs equated to the 1944 budget and the 1979 interest costs equated to the 1966 budget, that says that sometime before 1990 the interest costs on our debt will equate with this year's budget, and this year's budget, Mr. Speaker, is \$2 billion. What does that mean to the 300,000 taxpayers in this province? It means that each and every taxpayer in this province last year paid \$900, in fact, slightly

over \$900 for interest only on the provincial debt. Ten times — ten times what the 18 cents per gallon tax proposed by the federal government last December would have cost us.

And let's take that a step further, Mr. Speaker. That is almost \$4 which, every working morning when each taxpayer gets up, he has to pay the provincial government as interest for the provincial debt. What do we have to look forward to? If we are going to be paying \$2 billion in interest within the next 10 years, and we still have only 300,000 taxpayers left in this province, Mr. Speaker, the cost per taxpayer will then be more than \$6,000 per year — in this province per year well over a 600 per cent increase, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Mineral Resources says they're all leaving and he's right, Mr. Speaker. They are leaving the province. And that's only the interest on the debt, not the principal.

Take into account the other areas of public sector debt, the federal debt, which is now over \$67 billion, and the municipal debt of each city. It doesn't even cover the cost of the debt itself, the repayment of the debt. It doesn't cover the cost of expenditures of running our government or providing the services. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the continuation of blatant deficit borrowing, a policy that has been undertaken by this government, has to be stopped or else the entire financial structure of this province could well come crashing down before the end of this century.

I think it is contemptible, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite have deliberately and deviously tried to lead the people of this province into believing that under their financial management, or mismanagement, our province is flourishing economically and making great progress. Nowhere is this more clear than in the deceptive build-up of Saskatchewan's Heritage Fund.

Mr. Speaker, this government purports to have established a heritage fund of \$915 million to be put aside for the future security and economic development of our province. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. They purport to have established a heritage fund of \$915 million.

Now, let us take a long and hard look at the actual structure of this heritage fund. The Saskatchewan Heritage Fund is like a mirage appearing on the prairie basin. This government alludes to the great wealth that is hovering on the near horizon and always out of reach. And as we move towards it, it remains out of reach, as it always has. This was fortified last Thursday by the Minister of Finance in his statements to the press that the policies that were enacted would reap benefits in four or five years. The present administration, by those statements and their policies, continues to perpetrate next year country as they have for 29 years. It is a mirage, Mr. Speaker; it's always next year with their government and their deceptions. It will only be when we are free of their tyranny that we will see real progress and real benefits for Saskatchewan people. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we must learn to control our own destiny to a much greater extent. We cannot afford to squander our resources and we must stop passing over the opportunities that are presented to us.

This government, Mr. Speaker, reports a heritage fund established of \$195 million. In actual fact, this amount is a gross inflation of the true value of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund and a gross deception, because of that amount there is only \$50.4 million in cash and marketable securities. The rest in reality is in so-called equity in potash mines, uranium mines and loans without repayment schedules (and non-interest-bearing) to Crown corporations and even to the consolidated fund. So in

reality the assets sitting on our heritage fund are nothing more than the so-called fixed assets that we purchased through the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation). It should be noted that these are not liquid assets, which means that moneys cannot be taken from the heritage fund and invested in renewable resource activities in our province. For example, we should be able to invest heritage fund proceeds into projects like gasohol plants.

So what in true is the heritage fund really worth? Mr. Speaker, I say its worthless. So immediately it becomes highly questionable as to the true benefit and purpose of what the government has allocated into the fund. Is it not, Mr. Speaker, only an attempt by this government to deceive the people of Saskatchewan in appearing to be building for them a security fund. The truth is, when you look at the increasing debt load of this government, look at its total inability to really balance its budget and at the same time provide adequate and needed services for this province, look at its attempt to try to deviously hid debts that are being incurred while falsely building up a fund of questionable value, that the entire credibility of this government is truly on the line at this time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Just last year, Mr. Speaker, \$308 million of resource revenues were transferred out of the heritage fund and back into the current fund to cover the huge deficit and to decrease it, and this year another \$387 million in this new budget. In simplistic terms this can be equated to draining your savings account to cover the overdraft in your chequing account because you cannot adequately cover your budget for your current expenses. That is precisely what this government is doing in its financial transactions. It is absolutely essential that our non-renewable resource revenues not be given away or wasted on various political whims of this generation or we will surely face a hollow heritage.

The accumulation of non-renewable resource wealth — a bona fide heritage fund — is necessary to serve as a source of revenue after the non-renewable resources are gone; to reduce our need to borrow on world markets, as is so prevalent under our current administration, to strengthen and diversity the Saskatchewan economy in the renewable, self-sustaining resource areas, to improve the quality of life for our children and to prevent a severe economic crash which they surely will face when our non-renewable resource revenues dry up. Finally, we need to increase our local control over the provincial economy, more specifically to protect this province from either emergency measures or constitutional changes that hands out untapped resources over to the federal government.

It is important for us to realize the gravity of the energy-economic situation faced by Saskatchewan and other resource based provinces and why the accumulation of resource revenues is so essential to our economic stability.

If we intentionally withhold the production of non-renewable resources, leave them in the ground as often is the case today, we run the risk of losing them to eastern Canada with an unfavourable supreme court decision. If we produce the revenues but spend it all now, future generations will be faced with a traumatic shock, a significant tax increase throughout the province, which will be necessary to maintain the standard of living and services they have been accustomed to. It is easy to predict that they won't survive. If we rationalize the non-renewable resources, provincially we lose in four ways. Firstly, we have spent our heritage fund on purchasing what is ours in the first place — in large

measure Crown land. Secondly, we have not protected the resources from a change in the constitution or a supreme court decision. Thirdly, we put an increasing tax burden on other Canadians because federal taxes are not paid, thus encouraging other provinces and the federal government to look with envy on our resources and provide them with renewed arguments to divide up the pie. Finally, we are unable to convert our non-renewable resource wealth into renewable industries that have the following advantages, they are less cyclical, sustainable over time, less subject to federal takeover, and are excellent for rural and rural non-farm growth.

In a global sense the world is short of real savings and long on large deficits. The \$3 billion debt carried by this province and \$67 billion at the national level are cases in point. It is a credible social objective for the people of Saskatchewan to save our non-renewable wealth for generation to come, and it is an essential economic objective if we are to be anything more than hewers of wood, and haulers of water, all living in one town at the end or turn of this century. The failure of the heritage fund underlines the shortcomings of NDP resource policies during their nine years in power. It was this government that decided to embark on a policy not only of resource management but resource ownership and control. They deliberately went out to discourage and alienate the private resource sector of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we all recall that in 1973 Bill 42 was brought in by this government, which began an attack on the province's oil industry, which created the alienation that still has not been reversed and drove many good performers from Saskatchewan. Oil exploration activity and development in this province has been far less than it should have been in the last seven years. It's tragic that the bungling of this government, through this bill, is now costing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan \$100 million to entice them back. Added to that consider the losses in government income from royalties and taxation — hundreds of millions more. We are double losers, Mr. Speaker.

In the development of potash, certainly there is no question that revenues to the public treasury are increasing because of the world demand for potash in the last five or six years, not because of the public ownership of the PCS. However, it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that this government has very much cooled its policy of further ownership of this industry, now realizing that the heavy capitalization already involved in purchasing the mines it now owns has greatly accentuated and extended the province's long-term debt, most of it being used to cripple the heritage fund. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is within this policy of purchasing back what we already own in terms of existing mines that we can see the fallacy of the NDP stand on resource policy.

This government should have stuck to a policy of royalties and taxation that would bring the people of this province revenue only from the resource development and allowed others to come in and develop it and pay us for the right to do so. We would be financially much further ahead today, Mr. Speaker, than in the long-term deficit position that we are currently looking at. In fact, Mr. Speaker, through an enlightened policy of royalties and taxation of the existing potash industry, it would have been possible for the Government of Saskatchewan to create an even greater return from the potash industry in the last year without owing a single mine.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that if the PCS had remained in the private sector the government last year would have made \$93 million instead of \$46 million — a 100 per cent increase in added revenue of our treasury — not to mention an increase of \$600 million in cold cash in our heritage fund, a sum which would now be increasing at a rate of 17 per cent or more per year, which in itself is over \$100 million per year. This is just

one example of how this government should have accumulated significantly more wealth from our resources. Last Thursday's announcement by the Minister of Finance of some \$70 million profit in PCS's latest report does not impress me, nor will it impress the people of Saskatchewan when they realize the government would have made over \$100 million in interest alone with the amount invested in these mines, not to mention added corporate income taxes from the private corporations.

It should be noted, when talking about resource policies, that the leading province in this country in terms of resource revenue is Alberta, a province with a Progressive Conservative government which has now been able to salt away more than \$6 billion in liquid assets into its own heritage fund.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure they heard that last figure. I think for their benefit I will repeat it. Alberta, a province with a Progressive Conservative government has now been able to salt away more than \$6 billion of liquid assets into their heritage fund. I hope you are hearing it this time!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — They are making money. They are making rural Alberta grow and boom again.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, growing at the rate of the last nine years, they have had a 60 per cent increase in their population as compared to 1 per cent in Saskatchewan. That is what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, we do own and control our resources by constitutional right. By purchasing existing mines in this province, we are only trying to buy back what was already ours. And, in fact, we have created more of a debt situation which is to our detriment rather than an advantageous situation at this time.

One of the most alarming things of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund is the fact that in this session this government has introduced an amendment which would allow them to deposit any form of revenue collected by the government into the heritage fund. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, includes personal income taxes, corporate taxes, sales taxes, and so on.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this government is looking for any means to artificially inflate the holdings of the heritage fund and try to present to the people of Saskatchewan the image that the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund is storing vast sums of money for future generations, which just isn't true.

While we are on the topic of public investment in resource industries, let us look at the record of this government with regard to uranium development in Saskatchewan. At this time, Mr. Speaker, this government has invested over \$300 million in exploration and discovery of uranium in the North.

This government has sunk so much capital into uranium that it now cannot afford to turn back the course of uranium development in this province. Quite frankly, when you look at the overview of the financial status of this government, in total deficits, in its inability to build a realistic heritage fund, it cannot afford to turn around to the people of Saskatchewan on top of all else, and admit it misspent that much money in trying to develop uranium.

As a result of this we are now seeing a government whitewash of the uranium issue and

a down-playing of any potential environment and health hazards presented by uranium development in our province. This is why the people of Saskatchewan are having trouble believing government sponsored inquiries like the Bayda commission or the Key Lake Board of Inquiry as to their impartiality, because the government has already proven by its active partnership in the uranium industry, that it is not impartial on this subject.

It is abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that this government now more than ever desperately needs windfall revenues from uranium to cover its overextended borrowing, its increasing debt and its inability to make real economic progress from the resource revenues of potash, oil, gas and coal.

This is indeed a critically dangerous situation, Mr. Speaker. If problems or potential hazards do arise from uranium development, this government is in the position of a conflict of interests. They are in a position of being judge and defendant in the court of law. They would cause the problem and have the advantage of absolving themselves of any wrongdoing. If a potential hazard were to arise, is it not conceivable that cover-up of Watergate proportions could easily occur? For that matter it could be happening now, especially when you consider the unauthorized draining of eight lakes in the Key Lake area.

It is a firm belief of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan that the government must be an impartial referee in the development of uranium in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The role for the government is not to be the developer in this situation, but to be the referee, the overseer and the protector of the public's rights and interests. An impartial, balanced investigation and public information and education about the potential benefits and hazards of uranium development are needed so that the public can make an informed choice. And, Mr. Speaker, that is not being done by this government. As my leader, Grant Devine, pointed out last week, if this government had spent as much money on informing the public of Saskatchewan about uranium as it has on Celebrate Saskatchewan, then perhaps we would have some real insight into the development in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Perhaps it's true, Mr. Speaker, that this government does not want to inform the public about uranium. There seems to be a belief that by totally avoiding the issue, perhaps many citizens in the province will forget about it. However I think it's quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that it is not about to happen.

Mr. Speaker, looking in this budget, one of the most confusing aspects of the way the NDP government operates is the fact that it purports to help the average citizen of this province by providing a high degree of services at low cost. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this is a complete myth. Personal income tax in this province of Saskatchewan now stands at an astronomical 53 per cent. That's a full 18 per cent higher than in the neighbouring province of Alberta and an increase, Mr. Speaker, of 45 per cent since they came to power in 1971.

Saskatchewan citizens pay a 5 per cent provincial health and education tax on

necessities like clothing, school books and many others. The fact is this government is involved in More taxation, both direct and indirect, than any other government in Canada.

Was this what they promised in 1971? Mr. Speaker, in reading over some of the previous budget replies, I was astonished at the one made in 1971 by the current Attorney General who was at that time the financial critic. Time will not permit me to read it all, Mr. Speaker, but let's briefly look at what he said in 1971 and what it is today.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Don't bore us too much.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — All right. In 1971 he complained the sales tax was expanded to cover everything. In 1979 it's exactly the same. The 5 per cent regressive sales tax remains under this government. In 1979 have they reduced these taxes? Of course not. All are increased. In 1971 he complained of a population exodus. In 1979 has it changed? Mr. Speaker, we have had a 1 per cent increase in eight years while our neighbouring province of Alberta has had a 60 per cent increase. In relation to the population of Canada, we have gone down from over 4 per cent to under 4 per cent of Canada's population.

The city of Calgary alone increased at the rate of 2,500 people per month. Think about it. Calgary from January 1, 1979 to May 1, 1979 increased its population as much as all of Saskatchewan did in nine years. We need not guess where most of the Calgary imports came from — from Saskatchewan, escaping the syndicate of tax collectors. That is where the Attorney General said they were going in 1971. In 1971 the Attorney General bitterly complained and attacked the government, saying they had not balanced the budget. Again I quote:

If it wasn't for Otto Lang and Pierre Elliott Trudeau coming in to help out the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, this government would be broke.

He went on to say that they saved the bacon for the treasurer — \$70 million in equalization payments. He went on to say again that they are putting into the coffers of the public, from the Crown corporations, a total of \$16.1 million. You add that \$70.5 million and the \$16.1 million and you have \$87 million, the Attorney General said in 1971 and that if it weren't for the Crown corporations the government would be flat broke.

Here is a stronger statement he made. He said that I oppose this form of activity, Mr. Speaker, because it is a form of taxation. These corporations, if they are making profits, are there to provide a service at the least possible expense to the people of Saskatchewan, but they are taxing them through the back door, taxing them to the tune of \$86 million.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Attorney General. We in the Progressive Conservative Party oppose the method of backdoor taxation and the reliance on the federal Liberal government to balance our budget, but the current Attorney General and the cabinet today are using that very mechanism that they so strongly opposed when they were in opposition in 1971.

Let's look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. In 1971, out of a \$700 million budget, \$70 million or 10 per cent came from the federal Liberals. Today, in 1979, an astronomical \$462.5

million — 24 per cent of this budget — comes from the federal Liberals.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — How much?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The figure is \$462.5 million, an astronomical 24 per cent. The NDP government is twice as reliant on Pierre Trudeau as the former provincial Liberal government was in 1971.

In 1971, Mr. Speaker, they complained about Crown corporations making profits for transfer to the consolidated fund of \$15 million because those profits are in fact nothing more than regressive taxation on the people of Saskatchewan. In 1979 the amount transferred was not \$16 million, but \$27 million from the same Crown corporations which they opposed in 1971. It was wrong in 1971, Mr. Speaker, when the Liberals were in power and they were defeated for just such actions. I maintain that the continuation of such actions by the NDP will render them the same political fate in the next election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — It was wrong in 1971, Mr. Speaker, and it's even worse in 1979. Consider this, Mr. Speaker. In 1971 the price of a barrel of oil was \$2.50. Today that same barrel yields \$32 on the world market. Where is the benefit of our resources? In 1971 (as I said earlier), our personal income tax rates was 40 per cent. Today, it's 53 per cent plus a 10 per cent surtax at certain levels.

This government last Thursday told us we are now wealthy. If we are so rich, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Finance where is the money? Where indeed! If we were a have province we wouldn't have to go, cap in hand, to the Liberal government in Ottawa for almost one-quarter of our fiscal budget to allow us allegedly to balance the budget. This is particularly disconcerting when we are about to enter a new round of negotiations with the federal government in regard to resource pricing. How can we take a position of strength on one hand and a position of weakness on the other? By this financial mismanagement we are playing into the hands of central Canada; we are foregoing what should be our natural position of strength.

What is most interesting about this government is their hypocrisy. They have always stated that people should be taxed according to their ability to pay and that the rich and high earners should pay more. But, Mr. Speaker, this government doesn't do that. Of all the taxes raised this year from individuals over 60 per cent of them are of a regressive nature and only less than 40 per cent are progressive taxes, which take into account the individuals ability to pay according to their income. The problem with these regressive taxes is the lower your income, the higher rate of tax you pay. For example, if you earn \$30,000 a year (that's not as much as the members opposite earn, Mr. Speaker,) and you pay \$1,000 in sales tax and other regressive taxes, that would account for 3.3 per cent of your income. But if your income is only \$10,000 a year and you pay the same \$1,000 in regressive tax, the same amount, now you are being taxed on a 10 per cent rate. That's grossly unfair, Mr. Speaker.

When you look at the means by which this government is moving towards raising money, whether it be through a 5 per cent sales tax on the necessities of life or by charging inflated rates on public utilities, so Sask Tel and Sask Power can make huge profits that can be channelled back through the consolidated fund, then I say, Mr. Speaker, this government is financing itself on the backs of our citizens less able to

pay . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — . . . the senior citizens, those living on low and fixed incomes. The minister shakes his head. Is that the socialist way, Mr. Speaker? It certainly isn't the Progressive Conservative way. Mr. Speaker, we would work to abolish regressive taxation. Upon looking at this budget, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure the people of Saskatchewan are going to come to the conclusion that they will continue to pay more money in taxes for less and less services all the time.

Let us examine some of the cutbacks in vital services to our citizens in recent years by the Blakeney government. First of all the loudest rallying cry of the NDP in this province has been medicare. In the 1978 election this government campaigned for re-election on the slogan that told the people of this province, 'Don't let them take it away from us,' inferring that another government, a Progressive Conservative government, if elected would take away health care, medicare.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Tommy said that.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes, he did. Tommy said that and they said it. But the irony of that slogan, Mr. Speaker, is that they were in fact preparing the people of this province for the cuts in the health and medicare programs they themselves were planning.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, this is not an idle statement that I make. It is a fact! Let me show you why I say it is a fact. Let's look at the figures for health expenditures, Mr. Speaker. It is true that this government estimated expenditure in health of \$435 million in 1978-79, and it is true that this amount was approximately an 8 per cent to 9 per cent increase over 1977-78. But let's look at the truth of those expenditures — and that is only an example, because every department suffered the same deception in their estimates. The fact of the matter is in 1978-79 the actual expenditures were \$417 million — \$18 million less than they estimate, 5 per cent less than they estimated. This means health care was only given a 3 per cent increase when inflation was running at 10 per cent. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan health care system really, in real dollars, lost 7 per cent. And they said they didn't want anyone . . . don't let them take it away, they said. By a strange coincidence I believe he was the same minister, the Minister of Health in 1978-79 is today the Minister of Finance. In 1977-78 the actual expenditures were \$394 million — \$9 million less than what they estimated.

Let us look at health as a percentage of total budget expenditures — last year down to 24.6 per cent of the exact (I notice the minister making a note and I want to be exact, absolutely sure) 24.6 per cent of the total budget. This year if we are to believe them, and I for one cannot, 25.9 per cent. Last week, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba government announced their budget for the 1980-81 fiscal year. It is interesting to note that the Progressive Conservative government in Manitoba spends 29.3 per cent of their total budget on health and medicare — and they don't have uranium, gas or potash . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, they find it very funny. I would like to repeat that because I want them to know what they are doing. It is interesting to note, as I said, that the Progressive Conservative government in Manitoba spends 29.3 per cent of their total budget on health and medicare. Compare that to health's 25.9 per cent share of Saskatchewan

total expenditures — if we can believe them because they have never met their budget.

Now let's move on to another department on which the government prides itself on its benevolence to the people of Saskatchewan. I will go on to the Department of Education. Mr. Speaker, the minister has asked me the per capita expenditures — I related to him in this House last week and to save him some embarrassment. I will not repeat them again today, but they were higher than Saskatchewan's.

The Department of Education — when this government came to power in 1971, the budget that year, under the previous Liberal government, provided 33.63 per cent of the total budgetary expenditures on education. What is it in 1980? In 1980, Mr. Minister of Finance, for your information it is 22 per cent. Twenty-two per cent is all and it is in your budget. He's making another note. The exact amount if I recall correctly was 22.2 per cent, Mr. Speaker, that was a drop of 11.5 per cent from the 1971 budget. These are only two examples. There are many more in that budget of last year and this year's broken promises of misleading projections of the services that this government intended to provide. What has this government provided, Mr. Speaker? Increased heating bills and decreased funding for such necessities as health and education and not a single decrease, when we consider this reduction of 11 per cent in education and yet this government tells us daily how wealthy we are.

Last year this government, as an example, promised, and I quote from last year's budget, a quote by the last year's Minister of Finance. And he said:

Natural gas rates (I want the minister to hear this one and I want him to listen very attentively) were not increased last year despite increases totalling more than 16 per cent in the cost of Alberta gas. An increase held to a maximum of 7.5 per cent has been announced for residential rates this year, effective on June 1, 1979.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they lived up to their promise. They did increase it 7.5 per cent in June of 1979 but they went on in August to increase it some more. That wasn't enough. They went on again in February to increase it some more. So, in the fiscal year that we are talking about, from last year's budget we received in this province three increases in the price of natural gas. Do you know what those were? Do you know what those amounted to, Mr. Speaker? Those increases amounted to . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . 6 per cent?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — . . . not 8 per cent, no . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . 9 per cent?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — . . . not 9 per cent, Mr. Speaker, 15.5 per cent — more than double the 7.5 per cent that was promised us last year. That promise, Mr. Speaker, amounted to a guarantee to the people of this province that the natural gas rates would not go more than the 7.5 per cent increase. That's double what they promised, Mr. Speaker. It's more than double — it's a double-cross. There are more examples.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — How much did Sask Power dump into the consolidated fund?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — They're afraid to tell us but it was well over the \$10 million. There are more examples. SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) rates have recently

seen a jump of 20 per cent by the government, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to that, citizens of this province pay a 5 per cent per gallon provincial tax which goes straight to SGI, on every gallon of gasoline that they purchase in this province. What is the reason, Mr. Speaker, for the 20 per cent increase?

**MR. CODY:** — How much goes to SGI?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The Minister of Telephones asks (and I will answer his question) how much goes to SGI? By your own report last year, Mr. Minister it was over \$11 million.

What is the reason for the 20 per cent increase? Another \$20 million in premiums are paid by the motorists of the province to SGI. Would that increase (I wonder) have been necessary if SGI had not spent that amount of money on a new building with gold plated windows for the express purpose of erecting a shrine to the former treasurer of this province, one C.M. Fines!

Everywhere we turn, Mr. Speaker, we see an unending loading of huge taxation on the private citizens of this province. whether it be through personal income taxes, inflated rates paid to public utility companies, indirect forms of sales tax or other taxation. The individual is the one who is financing and paying for the running of this province. In this budget the minister has made the statement that he will not increase personal income taxes. However, he said he will increase corporate taxes.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think what we have outlined in terms of increases in utility payments and other forms of taxation, that this is clearly not true. As a matter of fact, looking at the figures, I noticed the individual income tax increased by some \$30 million, or close to \$30 million.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — In 1971, the Attorney General called that back door taxation!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I wonder what they call it today?

The real tax burden on the individuals of Saskatchewan is increasing at an alarming rate. This year, as the budget indicates, \$81.5 million in direct taxes. No where have the failings of the NDP been more obvious or more extensive than in the developing of a strong, private sector in our province. The inability of the NDP to build a flourishing economic market place for the businessmen of Saskatchewan has been a continuing failure. The continued increase of corporate tax rates in this province will mean only one thing, an added incentive for Saskatchewan businessmen to move their businesses out of our province to more attractive environments of Alberta or the United States. This is indeed a true tragedy, Mr. Speaker! It is the strong corporate sector which provides the broad and rich tax base from which to provide services.

If this government had any understanding and appreciation of what a strong business sector could do for the community, it would not be forcing endless taxes on the individual taxpayers of this province. It would be at a point where it could start truly reducing the rates of tax for Saskatchewan citizens and not increasing them.

Mr. Speaker, we should be able ultimately to remove the unfair 5 per cent sales tax in this province. A Progressive Conservative government would. But because of the

economic mismanagement of the government and huge deficits in probably will never happen while they are in power. this government is one which introduced many years ago SEDCO. SEDCO's record in the private sector is a sad litany of failure upon failure and bankruptcy upon bankruptcy. Let's look at the list very briefly, Mr. Minister: Prostar Mills, Fibro Industries, Ebidisco Manufacturing, Mossbank Foods Limited, and just recently, Mr. Speaker, the Idylwyld Motel in Saskatoon, which has left a \$2.5 million debt bill which will have to be picked up by SEDCO and ultimately by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

The ill-advised investments of SEDCO have cost the people of Saskatchewan millions and millions of dollars. The minister in charge of the Crown corporation claims that the actual loss ratio of money borrowed from SEDCO is 1 per cent. However, this is in fact a Blakeney distortion. When all the moneys are counted, Mr. Speaker, the actual real losses will be much higher if the opposition could ever get the truth.

The real reason that SEDCO has failed is because it has looked in the wrong direction to develop business. The fact is, if we had a proper business environment in this province, Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't even need SEDCO. If we provided the proper incentives we would be able to allow businesses to establish and to grow and to flourish in this province. We could encourage more and more Saskatchewan citizens to avail themselves of the opportunities of going into business. This government does not believe in that type of activity, Mr. Speaker. This government even goes so far as to actively discourage it even though it desperately need it. The fact is that politically the New Democratic Party sees business as an enemy to its political goals and achievements. As a result, the NDP is never unhappy to see a flourishing business pack up its bags and leave the province.

The NDP is not looking to attract aggressive and ambitious businessmen to Saskatchewan because it believes that they will not politically support it in its activities. This is a shameful and tragic situation, Mr. Speaker. There are so many opportunities that have been squandered by the NDP, ways in which we could develop and diversify our economy for the future benefits of Saskatchewan people but this government continually refuses to do anything about it.

That leads us to agriculture, our fundamental and most essential activity in this province. Mr. Speaker, when this government came to power in 1971, one of the reasons it claimed victory at that time was that it was given a mandate by the people of rural Saskatchewan to turn around the sad situation of decay and economic recession that had set in in rural Saskatchewan. What did they do? Nearly a full decade later they have accomplished absolutely nothing and in fact the situation has disintegrated considerably since that time. There has been further decay.

Let us look briefly at the record of the NDP in rural Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan has lost 8,000 family farms since the formation of land bank. The feedlot industry has moved, despite our natural competitive advantage. Now Saskatchewan only feeds one-third of the feeder cattle in this province. I am hoping the Minister of Agriculture is listening very closely. The packing plants have closed, leaving only one remaining hog-processing plant. We now export 150,000 live hogs annually to Alberta for processing because we don't have this capacity. Our hog industry has declined dramatically. The dairy industry has declined to the point where we cannot even adequately supply our own domestic needs.

Food processing and manufacturing has all but ceased in Saskatchewan and now we

import substantial volumes of hamburger from Alberta to restaurants in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the notion of importing hamburgers into Saskatchewan should be akin to the concept of hauling coal to Newcastle. This is how far the agricultural industry's decline has gone in this province.

Saskatchewan farmers have experienced the largest decline and deflated net income in the prairie provinces. Since 1955 rural farm prices have been going up. Yet while real net farm incomes are going up in Alberta and Manitoba, they are going down in Saskatchewan. The NDP government has raised the rent on leased land — as my colleague has called it, state land — with no regard for land productivity. The NDP government has misallocated livestock and community pastures, so pastures go unused and neighbouring family farms sell off cattle for lack of ranging facilities . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you don't know the facts, I would keep quiet. The record of the NDP government in supporting diversification in agriculture is dismal. We import beef for retailers in Saskatchewan from the province of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, 80 per cent of our farmers do not have natural gas yet in Alberta 85 per cent have it. Where are their priorities? Agriculture always has been, is today and always will be the backbone of the economy of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Grain farming . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the Minister of Natural Resources is getting a little loud, a little noisy. I wish he would just hold it down because I want the Minister of Agriculture to really hear this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well maybe that's why he's hollering. Grain farming will no doubt account for the largest volume in agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture doesn't necessarily agree — just listen, Mr. Minister, you may learn something. Recently he stated and let me quote, 'If Saskatchewan farmers hope to cash in on a profitable world grain market, the changeover to straight grain production is necessary.' The Minister of Agriculture said that. This statement, Mr. Speaker, is a totally defeatist statement by the minister. Many farmers in Saskatchewan, despite the government's attitude, have been successful in livestock, in dairy farming, in hogs and sheep and poultry, in horse enterprises and in market gardening. And he says to go straight grain farming.

Here is another quote, Mr. Speaker, that I want to repeat — he is quoted again in the same article where he said, 'Cash money men and outside investors are driving up prices but there isn't much we can do about it.' Now how times change and how quickly one can do a 180 degree turn. Ever since the formation of the land bank commission, this government has denied charges that land bank purchases were responsible for higher land costs. He said that's right, well that's not what the minister said last week. Read his statement, that's not what the minister said. Is the present government not the largest cash money man in this province or are there others we haven't heard about that have spent over \$100 million in purchasing farm land? I don't think there are. In truth, Mr. Speaker, it's like everything else they do; they are incompetent and lacking in sound judgment when it comes to agriculture.

There are so many economic activities that relate directly and indirectly to agriculture in this province that this government will not avail themselves of — for example, a rural gas distribution network which will provide the 80 per cent of Saskatchewan farmers, who don't have natural gas, with it in their homes and on their farms.

What about the meat processing industry in this province, Mr. Speaker? It is a shock and a disgrace that there is only one meat packing plant left in this province. As I

previously stated, in many instances the hamburger and beef that we eat in this province are imported from the province of Alberta. If we could feed all the cattle and the hogs raised in Saskatchewan — I want the member to hear this — if we could feed all the cattle and hogs raised in Saskatchewan, we could bring a half-billion dollar industry back into this province every year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — However, this government has not had the foresight to do so and as a result our cattle and hogs are being exported at an alarming rate. And now, as an admission of total failure, we hear the Minister of Agriculture advocating that all Saskatchewan farmers get totally out of livestock and totally into grain. What a wasted opportunity, Mr. Speaker. there is no question that the livestock industry can provide a good living in this province to farmers and, as well, create a productive industry — an industry which can be based in rural as well as urban Saskatchewan for meat processing, feeder lots, warehousing, distribution and sales. All of this revenue which we need so desperately to cover our deficits is being exported, Mr. Speaker.

Saskatchewan dollars are going out of this province to purchase meat from other provinces. This is simply not acceptable, Mr. Speaker. And I want to state at this time that the Progressive Conservative Party stands for a sane and rational policy of agricultural development.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — We believe in a diversified agricultural base. We believe we must bring back these industries to Saskatchewan. We believe that there must be proper support programs for Saskatchewan farmers who do want to diversify and that they should be able to do so without the risk of losing their capital investment. It is clear after nine years of NDP rule in Saskatchewan that the regressive, totalitarian-oriented rural policies of the government are failing dismally.

Land bank is not a method by which the NDP is trying to get your farmers back onto the land. It is merely a way of owning and controlling the farmland of Saskatchewan. They now control over one million acres of rural Saskatchewan farmland which they have brought up since 1971. The direct result, as I stated earlier, is that there are now 8,000 fewer family farms in the province. If land bank was a way to get people back to the land, then why are we 8,00 farmers short? Answer that, Mr. Minister of Agriculture.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the NDP is not interested in allowing young farmers to get into agriculture. The NDP wants ownership and control of Saskatchewan farmland. Take this into account — the truth. With their moves to nationalized farm credit, their desire to limit farm size, their love of mandatory commodity marketing boards, you can easily see they want to make the farmer of Saskatchewan totally dependent on this government for survival.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — That is the only rural strategy of the NDP government. In many ways, Mr. Speaker, I fear the decline of rural Saskatchewan and the departure of farmers and rural people from our rural areas only makes their takeover of that area that much easier.

As I stated at the outset of this speech, in this, our 75th anniversary year, it is a good time to look back and reflect, to assess the present and to look ahead to the future.

In the 75 years that our province has been in confederation a full 29 of those, or almost half, have been spent under an NDP, CCF, socialist government. And we can now see the results of what the so-called enlightened socialists have done for the province of Saskatchewan.

We have had an unprecedented population decline in this province under the NDP. Nowhere else in Canada can a province look to a type of population drain that we have experienced in this province. On a continuing basis, we have exported our greatest resources, our young people, for several generations now. The graduates from our universities, secondary schools and technical schools are in large numbers leaving this province to find employment opportunities that are more plentiful in places like Alberta and British Columbia.

All too tragically, Mr. Speaker, many of our senior citizens are left alone in Saskatchewan because their children and their grandchildren are living and being raised in other parts of the country. It is a sad and destructive thing for the family unit and I have always felt that it is time, in this province, to build the type of economy and the type of community where, instead of having homecomings every 10 years or so, we can provide the type of environment where people will finally start coming back to stay. We need to reunite many, many families in the province and we need, for the young families that are starting out today, to provide the environment for their children to grow and thrive, to stay and work so that we can remain together as good, strong family units here in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Probably what is most incredible is why this is so necessary. With a resource-based diversification, the strength of our resources, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan should be looking to become the brightest of all provinces in the future. However, the growing provincial debt, the inability to properly handle the resource revenues and the failure to build a strong heritage fund are undermining this in Saskatchewan today.

The government must not be allowed to squander the heritage of its citizens through economic mismanagement. We must work toward balanced budgets. We must expand our family business and corporate tax base and develop businesses so that more and more people can pay less tax rather than fewer and fewer Saskatchewan residents paying more tax. We must have a more sensible and planned approach to resource revenues. We do not need to race out and invest millions and millions of dollars in buying back what we already own. To lighten taxes and royalties we can collect far more money for the treasury without incurring any form of indebtedness for the people of Saskatchewan, and we can build the type of heritage fund that our neighbours in Alberta have provided for their citizens. We must look toward forms of renewable economic activities, areas such as gasohol development in rural Saskatchewan, which will allow Saskatchewan farmers a major form of brand new income that they can look to year after year into the future. If we can investigate new energy opportunities, wind power, solar power, a natural gas distribution system that will work in rural Saskatchewan.

We need a detailed and progressive plan for development of northern Saskatchewan, one that protects the environment while at the same time providing productive and rewarding jobs for the citizens of the North, to provide them with a meaningful future. We must take a stronger stand in the future, Mr. Speaker, with the other western

provinces in a fight to defend and protect our right to control and benefit from our own resources. There is no question that in the next few years this province, and the other western provinces, are going to feel the effects of pressure from central Canada not to allow the western provinces to become economically dominant in this country. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we must learn to control our own destiny to a much greater extent. We cannot afford to squander our resources and we must stop passing over the opportunities that are presented to us. And in doing so, I want to sound a warning to our Premier.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . tell him.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I know you will tell him. I know you will pass on the information.

He must remember the favourable press notices in The Toronto Globe and Mail and MacLean's magazine, for his personal political image at the federal level is not the mandate given to him by the people of Saskatchewan. His mandate is to fight for the rights and the revenues from our resources that constitutionally belong to us, and I say this, Mr. Speaker, in light of his astonishing proposal of a so-called national energy fund, which in reality, if implemented, would become the central Canadian energy fund, shielding the interest of Toronto and Ontario from the realities of higher energy prices because they are too short-sighted to realize their necessity.

We could expect such a complete sell-out of western resource revenues from federal Liberal politicians but from the premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker?

What we need and what the Progressive Conservatives will bring to the province is a Saskatchewan energy fund. We will collect the money from our resources, not Pierre Trudeau. We will allocate these funds as the people of Saskatchewan see fit and for their benefit.

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan stands up for Saskatchewan's right to be master of its own destiny. But to do that properly we must put our own house in order. The future is ours and is for the taking, if we want it.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I therefore would like to move, seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington, Mr. Berntson: That all the words after 'that' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

This Assembly expresses its profound regret that in this budget the government has again failed to provide leadership or programs to give Saskatchewan residents:

1. A healthy agricultural industry;
2. A rejuvenated rural Saskatchewan;
3. Adequate funding for environmental protection;
4. Relief from a disproportionate tax burden.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

**MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very shocked, and I think we all on this

side are very shocked at the events in this House that we witnessed today. Never in my life and certainly I imagine not in yours, Mr. Deputy Speaker, did I imagine that we would witness the spectacle we witnessed today. I never imagined that I would witness in this House the formation of a Yankee party. I don't imagine that you would either — one more desertion from the PC caucus for a Yankee party, Mr. Speaker.

Here we see a supposed regenerated PC Party; here we see a PC leader, a newly-elected PC leader, and we see a member of that caucus, today, following their old leader. And members here have rightfully asked, Mr. Speaker, who is next in this PC caucus to flee the ranks? Who's next to desert their cause and their country? Mr. Speaker, it would almost seem that we will have to arrange for wheels underneath the chairs so that they can scuttle across to the other side. Mr. Speaker, I'm amazed and sad that the members of the opposition should find this so humorous. Here we have a Yankee party and it's been established this month.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — We could have some order in the House. I'm having difficulty hearing the hon. member for Yorkton.

**MR. NELSON:** — Here we see a Yankee party established this month, and today we see that its strength has been doubled — a 100 per cent increase. Who's next, Mr. Speaker? I view this as a matter of grave concern for my country that we've elected officials who decide to leave, to desert their country, and lead the retreat rather than lead in the building of the land that gave them birth.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be a member of a party that believes in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be a member of a party that builds. I'm proud to be a member of a party that brings a social conscience in, along with a sound business management that makes Saskatchewan a source of pride throughout the whole of Canada — yes, that makes Saskatchewan an example for the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of the elements of this budget that will continue the common-sense economic policies that have made Saskatchewan the best place in the world to live.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — I'm amazed too, at the financial critic from the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina South. I'm amazed at his great concern that he has expressed for the little man, his concern for hospitalization and medicare. I notice the member for Moosomin heading out the door. I'm afraid he can't take the facts at all . . . I'm sorry, Souris-Cannington.

Mr. Speaker, I'm amazed that they should express concern for medicare, for all you need to do is make a few comparisons. Let's look at ours; let's look at our medicare plan; let's look at simple the number of hospital beds — 7.6 beds per 1,000 for Saskatchewan. In Alberta, more? Oil rich Alberta where they should be able to afford more — no, the line-ups are long — 6.4 per 1,000. What about good old, blue Tory Ontario with its powerful, blue Tory machine and its population disappearing? What about the hospitals there, Mr. Speaker? they recent set up a goal for their hospitals, a bed-count goal. What is that goal, Mr. Speaker? It's 3.5 beds per 1,000.

The member for Regina South expresses great concern for the little man. I'm amazed at him. He talked, too, about the Manitoba budget and at the great wonders of what the PC Party is doing for Manitoba. The 1979-80 budget gave a 2.5 per cent increase in the health budget — 2.5 per cent, Mr. Speaker. The workers of the Victoria General Hospital in Winnipeg were asked to take a 3 per cent reduction in their salaries. Great things that the PCs are doing for Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, great things.

I'm amazed, too, at his great concern over the power and telephone rates and the SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) rate increases. What he fails to do is to make any sort of comparison with other provinces. We've gone through them many times before, and sometime I will send over a list of those comparisons for them to study before they make the rather foolish speeches, so that they can see what good management means to the province of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, only today I rode to Regina with a businessman, a Mr. Bill Lemko. He expressed pride in being a Canadian and being able to watch our Premier and his cabinet at work and showing all Canada what a strong businesslike government can do — practically his very words, Mr. Speaker.

It is a great pleasure for me to enter this budget debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As the Minister of Finance said last Thursday, this budget we are presently considering is the ninth such document presented to this Assembly by the New Democratic Party Government of Saskatchewan. For each one of the previous eight New Democratic Party budgets, the people of Yorkton constituency have had a representative in this House who supported the budget, and Mr. Speaker, I want to say right at the outset of my remarks that the pattern will not be altered in 1980.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — Mr. Speaker, as we enter the first year of this new decade, I think it's useful to recognize the sound economic base that has been built in this province in the decade of the '70s. It is important to our province to have the present solid economic base which will permit Saskatchewan and her citizens to move forward from success to success. Mr. Speaker, the budget is another step forward by the Blakeney government. It has something for everyone — taxpayers, municipal governments, conservationists, environmentalists, small business, farmers, senior citizens, wage earners, native people medical researchers, and the list goes on and on.

It is a sound and sensitive budget, a budget that will allow Saskatchewan to make good on its prospects because as the budget speech said, our prospects have never been brighter.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is inevitable that people will compare this budget to the last federal budget which was brought down by the former finance minister, the Hon. John Crosbie, on December 11 last years — that fateful December 11 — and a budget which in turn brought down the Conservative government a week later. The two documents demonstrate the very fundamental difference between the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party.

The Saskatchewan budget forecasts revenues of \$2.019 billion and expenditures of

\$2.018 billion, for all practical purposes, a balanced budget. But what about the federal Conservative budget, Mr. Speaker? What about the federal Conservative budget, a budget of a political party that professes to believe in responsible economic and fiscal policies? Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, after campaigning for years against the spending excesses and the large deficits of the Trudeau government, and that was so, the Tories finally got their chance. They finally got their chance on December 11. And what was the results? Did they have a balanced budget? No. Did they have a modest surplus? No. Mr. Speaker, a \$10 billion deficit, a deficit five times as large as the entire revenue side of the Saskatchewan budget. And yet, the member for Regina South today had the audacity to complain about the debts and the interest rates that we are having here in Saskatchewan.

What about the interest rates and the debts that would have been built up in Canada, that would have continued to build up just as they had come to us from the Liberals if this PC Party had continued in power in Ottawa? Unimaginable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the difference between the two approaches to government is clear. If you want sound, efficient management of the public purse your political choice should be the New Democratic Party. If you want huge deficits, \$10 billion in size, if you want spending priorities similar to those of drunken sailors, the Conservative Party is the one for you.

The Saskatchewan budget of 1980 carries an NDP tradition of recent years and provides a tax cut which will remove some 2,500 taxpayers from the provincial tax rolls.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — This is in line with our election promise to continue to reduce taxes on the ordinary people and where possible to collect revenues from resource royalties and the big corporations.

What about the promises made by the Clark Conservatives in the spring of 1979 to cut personal income tax by \$2 billion? Mr. Deputy Speaker, they said \$2 billion! Whatever became of the Tory promise? Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Conservatives won the May 1979 general election and formed the government. It was a Conservative finance minister who drew up the December 11 budget. It was a Conservative cabinet which revealed the budget, a Conservative caucus which approved it, so you might have expected the Conservative election promise of a \$2 billion tax cut to have been part of that budget. But was it? Was there a tax cut of any kind for the average Canadian? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no tax cut. But there were tax increases by the Clark Conservatives, increases for the Canadian taxpayers to the tune of \$3.4 billion. The member for Regina South has the audacity to say we are the party of the great tax collectors. They put all the people to shame!

The Saskatchewan taxpayers have been watching recent events. When I was home in my constituency of Yorkton on the weekend I had a number of people comment to me about the difference between the federal Conservative budget and our newly unveiled provincial budget. The consensus seems to be that if you want massive tax hikes for the average income earner and a free ride for the barons of Bay Street and the large corporations, you vote Conservative. If on the other hand you want tax cuts for working people, farmers, small business and pensioners, you vote NDP.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Saskatchewan budget does a number of other important

things. For working people there are well-planned capital projects by government departments and Crown corporation to keep our unemployment rate among the lowest in Canada. For senior citizens there is a \$50 tax cut and an increase in assistance for residents of special-care homes. For farmers there's a continuation of the farm cost reduction program — \$15.6 million has been earmarked for Saskatchewan farmers to help offset the cost of farm fuel. The budget also made the first payment from the heritage fund to purchase the 1,000 steel hopper cars to move prairie grain to market. There is also more money made available to the land bank and FarmStart in response to the large number of applicants which they have had for these very popular programs in recent years.

The Saskatchewan budget sets out a major expansion of the provincial government's activities in energy exploration, research and conservation to secure a future supply of energy resources to heat our homes and places of work, drive out transportation system and power our agricultural industry.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have done all these things, and many others in the budget which time does not permit me to mention, while government-directed spending is only increased by 6.1 per cent. That in a time of drastic inflation, Mr. Speaker. Also we have held the line on hiring civil servants for the past six years. That, Mr. Speaker, is an excellent record, one in which New Democrats everywhere can take great pride.

But what about the federal Conservative budget again? How does it compare to our provincial budget in those areas which I just mentioned? The Crosbie budget did nothing for working Canadian but raise their taxes and raise their unemployment insurance premiums from \$1.35 per each \$100 of insurable income to \$1.60 and raise the federal excise tax on gasoline from 7 cents a gallon to 25 cents a gallon for every Canadian who drives to work or drives for a living.

For farmers, the Conservatives spent most of their time talking about putting an end to the crowrates and naming studies and commission which in turn recommended hundreds of miles of branch lines be abandoned. It is important to remember the Neil report conducted by the Conservative member of parliament, Doug Neil of Moose Jaw. He recommended more miles of Saskatchewan's network be abandoned than added to the permanent network.

Then there was the famous Murta report which suggested that the port of Churchill is a luxury. Just imagine a Manitoba PC member suggesting the closure of the only prairie seaport — great progressive, conservative thinking, Mr. Speaker.

The federal budget will certainly linger in the memories of farmers where energy is concerned. Yes, it will linger forever. The budget called for a fast rise of the price of a barrel of oil from \$13.75 to \$17.75 by October 1, 1980 and a \$4.50 a year rise thereafter until January 1, 1984. The fast rise was to pay for some of the election gimmicks and the half-baked idea that the Clark government implemented in an unsuccessful bid to buy votes, mainly in eastern Canada.

The big hike in energy costs in the Conservative budget hit farmers particularly hard. Every five gallon pail of chemical spray, every pound of fertilizer and every gallon of farm fuel was immediately worth 15 per cent or 20 per cent more. And as if that were not bad enough, the Clark Conservatives also applied more than triple the federal excise tax to farm fuels. The Conservative Party talked a great deal about energy self-sufficiency prior to their December 11 budget. But once the budget came down, Mr.

Speaker, there was nothing of any consequence in it.

The Crosbie budget did say that the large increases in energy would amount to \$90 billion over the next four years which is \$4,000 for every man, woman and child in Canada. Canadians, no doubt, would have looked more favourably on higher energy bills if the money had been earmarked for developing Canadian-owned and controlled energy resources, such as Petro-Can. But that was not the Conservative plan.

Mr. Speaker, \$33 billion was to go directly to the oil industry, with no strings attached; no guarantee, not even an assurance from the oil companies that the \$33 billion windfall would be used for exploration or research or anything else of value to the Canadian public. It was simply another massive giveaway to the corporate friends of the Tory party.

Ottawa's share of the \$90 billion over the next four years was to be \$17 billion, the vast bulk of which was not to go into any kind of energy self-sufficiency fund but was to be used to pay for Conservative election promises such as the badly watered down mortgage deductibility plan. Only about 2 per cent of the \$90 billion hike in energy prices was destined to go into the Tory energy bank — not even enough to seriously begin to work on one of the oil sands plants.

For senior citizens, the federal budget of December 11 did nothing. Quite a record, isn't it, Mr. Speaker? A \$33 billion gift to the oil companies which had the most profitable year in their history and nothing for senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that I live here in Saskatchewan and that most of my family is here and that most of my friends are here, because here in Saskatchewan we have a government that cares about the financial well-being of the senior citizens much more than the profits of the large oil companies.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — Mr. Speaker, before I resume my place I would like to say a few words about what eight and now nine New Democratic Party budgets have meant to the constituency of Yorkton. The member for Regina South complains about business failure in Saskatchewan. I would like to deal with my constituency to show him and the PC caucus what progress and prosperity is all about. Mr. Speaker, Yorkton's population has been growing at a good steady rate in recent years. In mid-1979 the population was 15,530, up from 14,000 in 1969. The population of the trading area around Yorkton is up from 250,000 in 1969 to over 285,000 today. The gross income of the people of Yorkton was estimated at \$130.1 million in the calendar year of 1978, a four-fold increase over the 1968 figure of \$31.5 million. The total retail trade doubled between 1968 and 1978 and the value of manufactured goods increased by more than six times in that 10-year period. If that's what you call failure, PCs, I like it. The number of industrial plants in Yorkton increased by seven between 1969 and 1979. The manufacturing payroll increased in that same 10-year period from a little over \$2 million to well over \$13 million last year. I want to tell these Conservative members that my figures are not just something that I've dreamed up. They are from a magazine called Trade and Commerce, the July 1979 edition. This well known periodical out of Winnipeg has been publishing business articles for some 74 years, and is not an organ of the Saskatchewan government or of the New Democratic Party. I should name some of the reds that are in it that are publishing it. I would recommend at any rate that the Conservative MLAs pick up a copy of the magazine.

The July edition which I have here has Leon and Ray Malinowski on the front cover. Now it's funny, Mr. Speaker, how the PCs keep talking about business failures in Saskatchewan. It's funny how they don't seem to have heard about Ray Malinowski. I'll have to inform Ray the next time I see him that the PCs have completely forgotten all about him and the successes that he's been having. And inside this magazine, Mr. Speaker, is a story about how their manufacturing company has prospered at Yorkton, Saskatchewan. The company is currently undergoing . . . oh, no, Mr. Speaker, back in 1974 they were given a handsome grant, a start-up grant for their ram industries, and Mr. Ray Malinowski at that time said if it hadn't been for that grant he would not have been able to make it go.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON:** — The plant is currently undergoing a \$1 million expansion including \$400,00 for new equipment. According to the article there will be 60 new jobs as a result. That same July issue of Trade and Commerce also devotes a six page section to Yorkton and the excellent economic growth the city has achieved in the 1970s. The recent construction in Yorkton includes a new 107 suite senior citizens' apartment complex, a new \$650,000 service centre for Sask Tel, a waste water treatment plant worth \$2 million, a major new addition at Logan Chev Olds and Eftoda Pontiac Limited, a new addition to the Yorkton fire hall, an addition to the shopping plaza, extensive renovations undertaken by tenants in the three-year-old, \$10 million Parkland Mall. In fact, Mr. Speaker, both large malls in Yorkton are fairly new, as is the \$3.8 million Parkland Agriplex which was completed just over two years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the Parkland Community College has expanded in Yorkton in recent years. Scott national opened a warehouse in the industrial area two years ago and Atomic Trucking opened a new building recently. A new apartment complex valued at \$1.3 million is under construction and well over 700 new single family houses have been built in Yorkton in the past five years for a value of \$26.3 million. In that same period 44 new commercial properties have been developed, valued at \$15.2 million.

And just while I am on the subject of articles, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the November-December 1979 issue of Saskatchewan Business which is edited by Mr. Don Humphries, formerly of the Regina Leader-Post.

Saskatchewan Business has a series of articles in the November-December issue about Yorkton businesses that are prospering right here in NDP Saskatchewan. Again I would invite all Tory members opposite to read and learn. On page 7 in this magazine is a story about one of my former students, Mr. Ken Propp of Mid West Packers, who is doing very well, thank you, in the meat packing business. The company recently got some assistance from the provincial Department of Industry and Commerce to design a logo and label.

On page 12 as an article about new manufacturing and retail businesses in Yorkton, some of which I have already mentioned. On page 14 is a story about mayor John Wytrykush who predicts continued steady growth for his city. On page 21 is the story of Brown Brothers Implements, one of the largest machinery dealerships in east central Saskatchewan. Brown Brothers have recently opened a 15,000 square foot office, showroom and service building to supplement their older 4,000 square foot building which the company still uses.

On page 31 is an article about Marchenski Lumber Company which moved in from Winnipegosis, Manitoba in 1977. Funny he had to leave Manitoba to come to Saskatchewan. We get lots of that in Yorkton though. The lumber company now has annual sales of over \$7 million and has started a new home construction business on the side. The only problem Marchenski Lumber has had is finding qualified employees to hire due to Yorkton's low unemployment rate. He told me personally that he didn't have any of that sort of problem in Manitoba. There were lots of people and very few sales.

Mr. Speaker, each one of the articles in the magazine described progressive, dynamic, prosperous companies planning to say and expand in Yorkton. And Yorkton is typical of Saskatchewan as a whole. The days of declining population and boarded-up businesses are gone. We are now realizing the benefits of a decade of New Democratic Party government and the people of Yorkton are realizing it.

Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . list to them out there from the North. Oh, he's sure telling it the way it is. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I like the new prosperity in my constituency and in my province. I will be voting for the budget to see that that prosperity is continued and I shall certainly not be supporting the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, before I enter into the heart of my remarks on the budget debate, knowing the regulations governing the debate, I would like to beg the indulgence of the House to allow me to make a few remarks regarding my resignation as Deputy Speaker at the adjournment of the fall session of this 19th legislature.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I was suffering from a very bad case of laryngitis, as I think you all remember, as well as some emotional feelings after listening to the kind words expressed by you, Mr. Speaker; by the Premier, the member for Regina Elphinstone; my colleague and deskmate, the member for Regina Rosemont, and equally appreciable the comments from the member of the opposition for Indian Head-Wolseley, Mr. Taylor, and the member for Qu'Appelle, Mr. Lane.

I can assure all of you, Mr. Speaker, that my five years as Deputy Speaker were a challenge for me and one that I shall always remember. The co-operation I received from all of you, at most times, was greatly appreciated and I take this opportunity to thank you for it.

I ask that you give the same co-operation to my successor, the member for Rosemont, who I have every confidence, Mr. Speaker, will fulfil that position well.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — When we take our oath of allegiance to Her Majesty, The Queen, on entering this Chamber as a member of the legislature, I think this is a very serious oath — one which is not only an obligation to us, as members in Saskatchewan, but to the consideration of Canada, and I say we must play our part and share our responsibility as well, as members of the British Commonwealth.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to be a member of that commonwealth and I hope that I have not, in any way, broken that oath of allegiance to my Queen. I am proud to be a

Canadian and to live in this province of Saskatchewan.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to participate in another budget debate. I have heard the merits of many budgets discussed in this Assembly and I want to say at the outset, that this budget is in the finest tradition of the Tommy Douglas, Woodrow Lloyd, and the previous budgets of the Blakeney administration. I also want to congratulate the finance minister, the member for Humboldt, for remembering, respecting and carrying on the good work of his predecessors in this, his first budget.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it often seems that the more things change, the more they stay the same. Members come and go, leaders come and go, and even parties come and go, but the principles of the Blakeney government and its predecessors do not change. I say that in this budget, as in all of our previous budgets, we remain committed to three principles.

The first of these principles is to put people first. The central goal of this and previous budgets has been to ensure that the needs of the people of Saskatchewan are met by maintaining and expanding government programs and services.

The second of these principles is to make each budget another step in the long-term economic strategy, a strategy based on careful management of the province's resources, and to smooth out economic cycles to provide stability and prosperity instead of the boom and bust which once plagued our economy.

The third principle of this and previous CCF and New Democratic Party budgets is that we fulfil our election promises. The few election promises or commitments from 1978 which were not implemented in last year's budget have been implemented this year.

These principles of service, honesty and sound management have served the government well and more importantly, they have served the people of Saskatchewan well.

I will be discussing how those principles are reflected in some of the major features of this budget, but first, Mr. Speaker, I want to focus on the budget's direct impact on the Weyburn constituency.

Nearly \$3.25 million has been committed in capital spending in the Weyburn constituency this year. The Department of Agriculture will be doing extensive work on the Souris Implementation Program this year. Mr. Speaker, \$350,000 will be invested in Weyburn channel improvements and property acquisition. Nearly \$120,000 has been committed by the Department of Education to addition and renovation projects at Creelman High School and at Haig High School in Weyburn. The Department of Mineral Resources has chosen Weyburn as one of the locations for its excellent housing retrofit program in the coming year.

The rural municipalities in my constituency will be receiving nearly \$400,000 for maintenance of farm access roads. The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation will be spending more than \$600,000 on a rural housing project in Stoughton and a non-profit housing project in Weyburn.

And finally, the Department of Urban Affairs, under various programs, including community capital fund, business improvement districts, the municipal water assistance board and the water development board agreement will contribute over \$300,000 to capital projects in the constituency of Weyburn this year.

Mr. Speaker, the expenditures on various programs which I have outlined do not, of course, give the whole picture. They do not include programs and services such as health care and social services which are provided on an ongoing basis and they do not include important special projects such as the Weyburn Square. But I think they do give my constituents some idea of the benefits for all citizens that result from a strong well-managed economy.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that I would spend some time discussing how the principles and traditions of the previous CCF and New Democratic Party budgets have been upheld in this budget.

Health services to Saskatchewan people have always been a top priority in our governments. This budget upholds that tradition. We introduced universal hospital plans and medicare to Canada and Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan has always been a pioneer in the development of health services. In the decade just passed, we introduced dental care for children; aids to independent living; the prescription drug and hearing aid plan; and we began a major program of building and updating hospitals in Saskatchewan.

Now that the hospital rebuilding program is well under way, Mr. Speaker, this budget has provided for the increased staff and equipment required to ensure that our hospitals provide the best possible services to Saskatchewan people. The increase of 13.7 per cent in funding for the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan will be welcome news to all residents of the province and it confirms that health care remains a top priority of this government.

As well as a major increase in funding for the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan the budget provides, Mr. Speaker, for continued hospital construction and renovation. The \$24.9 million budgeted for capital projects this year represents an increase of some 12.3 per cent.

The budget contains other initiatives in the health care field. Planning costs have been budgeted for a new provincial laboratory. The dental plan has been expanded to cover ages from four to fourteen years of age. A grant of up to \$25,000 per doctor has been established to attract certain kinds of specialists who are in short supply in Canada today. The externship program in rural areas for medical students, Mr. Speaker, will be continued and a similar program will be set up for dental students to be operated by the college of dental surgeons. More emphasis will be placed on prevention and encouragement of healthy lifestyles. Initiatives in this area began in the last decade and they were so successful, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that they will form a very important part of this government's health care strategy in the 1980s.

All in all, the health care initiatives in this budget add up to the continuing quality and growth of Saskatchewan's health care system. This is especially important at a time when health services are deteriorating in some areas of Canada. At a time when some of the other provinces are busy devising new taxes on the sick, new ways to starve their health care systems for funds, we remain, Mr. Speaker, committed to a national universal comprehensive and accessible health care system.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Saskatchewan intends to lead by example. We intend to show the other provinces and the federal government that these goals can be achieved. As we stand on the threshold of Saskatchewan's best years ever in the 1980s we hear a lot of talk about the potential of the years ahead and the opportunities that await the young people of this province. That is as it should be, but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it would be very unfortunate if, in concentrating on the future, we forgot about those who built this province into the land of opportunity it is today. I refer, of course, to the senior citizens, to the province's senior citizens. I am extremely pleased to note that this budget maintains again, the CCF and NDP tradition of concern for the needs of the elderly men and women who made this province grow. The Minister of Finance for Humboldt said in his budget address, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has matured and come of age. I agree with him and I think anyone who reflects on that observations for a moment will find their respect deepened for those who worked to bring this province through its infancy and through its adolescence.

This budget contains increased support for senior citizens in four main areas. First, assistance for special care residents will increase to over \$35 million including \$3 million for a major restructuring of long-term nursing care in Saskatchewan. Assistance to nursing home residents will increase on an annual basis by over \$10 million.

Second, the expansion of the home-care system will continue at a cost of \$10.3 million in 1980. Measures will be adopted to improve co-ordination of the home-care system and the provision of chronic care, including an assessment, and placement services which will be started as a pilot project this year in the Saskatoon area.

Third, Mr. Speaker, a new tax cut for senior citizens of up to \$50 has been instituted for 19890. This will increase the maximum general tax cut for senior citizens from \$160 to \$210 and it will reduce provincial income taxes by \$1 million.

Finally, the renters' property tax rebate program has been expanded to include senior citizens who are living in tax-exempt properties and who are not receiving the subsidized nursing care.

Mr. Speaker, taken by themselves, these measures are not dramatic initiatives in program for senior citizens but they are built on a solid foundation of program that are already in place, programs which make Saskatchewan a leader in ensuring that all senior citizens enjoy the decent standard of living they so richly deserve.

My constituency is a blend of urban and rural, I think that all residents, whether they live in Weyburn or the rural area, will recognize the importance of agriculture to the economy of our part of the province.

The tradition of the CCF and the New Democratic Party governments standing solidly behind the farmers of Saskatchewan goes back to the early days of the Douglas administration when that government fought a successful battle to save Saskatchewan family farms from the clutches of many of the eastern money lenders. That commitment continued in the 1970s as the Blakeney government established such programs as FarmStart, land bank, and took action to help producers deal with the cost-price

squeeze, including \$45 million for hog producers in 1973 and 1974 and \$80 million in grants and interest-free loans for beef producers between the years of 1974 and 1976.

Mr. Speaker, with its maintenance and expansion of agricultural programs this budget once more upholds tradition. With inflation continuing to eat away at farm incomes the announcement that the farm cost reduction program will continue through 1980 is extremely welcome news. The program will put \$15.6 million into the pockets of farmers this year. The increase in funding for the land bank and FarmStart programs is also good news. Present economic conditions dictate that these programs must be in place if most young people are to have any chance at all to get started farming.

Some of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have been speaking at length about the purchase of 1,000 hopper cars which was confirmed in this budget. I agree it was a good initiative that had impressive results. But I do not think it should be considered surprising or unusual. It is a move in the long-standing CCF-New Democratic Party tradition of acting decisively whenever Saskatchewan's farming community has a problem that they provincial government can do something to alleviate.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed just health services, senior citizens' programs and agriculture. But any part of this budget can be subjected to the same kind of scrutiny and it will bear up just as well as a continuation of the long-standing principles of the former CCF and New Democratic Party governments in this province.

As I said earlier, these principles of service, honesty and good management have served the province well. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that 10 years from now when we start the next decade and this government presents its nineteenth budget, they will still be serving us well.

The Minister of Finance, Hon. Ed Tchorzewski, concluded his budget speech by saying that we have a good reason to celebrate Saskatchewan's 75th anniversary in 1980. I couldn't agree more, Mr. Speaker. We have more to celebrate than a proud heritage of working together to overcome the challenges of demanding climate and geography to build a province, more to celebrate than a present which finds the province reaching its economic, social and cultural maturity. We have also to celebrate, Mr. Speaker, a very bright future. Nowhere in the world are prospects brighter than Saskatchewan's as we enter the 1980s.

So I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that because this budget lays a solid foundation on which our future will be built, and because at the same time it reasserts the principles of the CCF and New Democratic Party budgets that came before it, I am proud to support it. I will be voting against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** — I rise in this debate with some pleasure, and I think a great deal of disappointment in some of the performances we have witnessed since this House opened, which I shall not go into in great detail. It saddens me as a Canadian to witness what we have witnessed here. Mr. Speaker, it bothers me no end. I stand in this House after 28 years and all my life as a Saskatchewan citizen and all my life as a born Canadian. In that time, Mr. Speaker, I have never witnessed this kind of performance and never expected to. When I took the oath of allegiance 28 years ago, before I entered this House, I thought it meant

something, and it did. When I took the oath of allegiance as a peace officer in the city of North Battleford I thought it meant something, and it did. I believe that those people who take that oath lightly enter this House now as traitors to Canada, and I would think in spite of the fact that I don't believe in capital punishment, in other days and times there was a very, very good method used to dispatch traitors.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the Conservatives in the House, we have witnessed what's left of the Conservatives standing there, and we don't know how many there are going to be tomorrow . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you'll have to go some to be around longer than I've been. Mr. Speaker, I want to say over the years that I have sat in the House and have been active in politics both provincially and federally, I have looked at the Liberal and Conservative parties in Canada and in Saskatchewan and I have said there is no difference. There hasn't been. Their policies are the same. They differ only in name and time and place. The only value I can see for the Conservative Party in Canada, Mr. Speaker, is to get elected once in awhile and behave so badly they make the Liberals look good. That is their function. That is the function of their masters in Bay Street, the masters of both those parties on Bay Street and in New York and wherever the funds come from is to have the two horses in the stable. Every once in a while they send out the yellow horse, run him and he runs so badly — it took R.B. Bennett four years to be so bad, Mr. Speaker. The Liberals look good. He made MacKenzie King look good. It took John Diefenbaker only five years to do the same things. But Joe Clark was a master. Joe Clark was a genius. He performed . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KRAMER:** — . . . our genius, Mr. Speaker, what John Diefenbaker could only do in five years and R.B. Bennett in four — he did in eight months. He made the Liberals look good.

He scared those eastern Canadians so badly that they ran back into the burning barn like a horse. Even if the barn is as dirty as some members of this legislature, they still would go back into it.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing I could say about Tories, they are consistent — this group especially. There is some consistency here. They never get tired of being wrong. They keep on coming with the slander year after year. Once upon a time we had two Lanes, the back Lane and the dirty Lane, but now we have only one. He is getting better. He's making up for the two with slander, untruths, half-truths.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Kramer vs. Kramer!

**MR. KRAMER:** — Yes. It's a mighty popular show, Mr. Speaker!

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KRAMER:** — We heard from this group opposite. I thought they would be better when they had 'Devine' guidance. But they haven't changed. The former member for Prince Albert — torture camps, the slander about torture camps, the innuendo — proven wrong. The dirty hospital slander from the dirty Lane who is no longer here. Now we have the crooked partition, crooked window hospital from the new Lane — again wrong! I could chapter and verse, Mr. Speaker. Time after time history has given us ample proof that these people are inconsistent. They wish for 10 minute glory. They don't care whether it's proven a lie tomorrow, as long as they can grab a headline. That's

the way they operate. Small wonder that when they had the by-election in Regina North-West, they lost their deposit and ran third to the Liberals.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KRAMER:** — That is the harbinger, Mr. Speaker, which is going to spell their demise and will return once more (if there's any opposition left) the Liberals, because they make the Liberals look good. They make the Liberals look good!

Well, Mr. Speaker, we heard from Pierre Rousseau — no Paul. I thought it was Pierre! You sound like him. The same sanctimonious, the same sanctimony as the famous Pierre — the dehydrated Frenchman! Anyway, I would like to draw your attention . . . he said something about the Progressive Conservative way — well let's take a look at the Progressive Conservative way. The best example is historical Ontario where their deficit, the debt this year in their budget was larger than our total budget for Saskatchewan: \$2 billion. that's the Progressive Conservative way. A deficit of \$2 billion, my goodness! And that's the Progressive Conservative way. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that in good old Conservative Ontario a family pays nearly \$500 for their medicare and hospitalization and they're closing down hospitals. Shame, is right. They don't even have dirty hospitals there; they're shutting them down. These people that say the Conservatives are concerned, Mr. Speaker, with people: the average shows the poor people pay more in hospitalization, medicare tax than the multinationals that have been dragging the ore out of the ground in Ontario for years. More money is collected from the people. I ask leave to adjourn debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I was about to call the members to order because I was having trouble hearing the member from The Battlefords. However, the member has asked leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — We now return to the agenda where we left off earlier today. Is there anything further on orders of the day?

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Provincial Intermediate Senior Playoffs

**MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate the Raymore Senior Hockey Club on winning the provincial intermediate senior playoffs on Friday night. They had to work very hard to get by Blaine Lake-Hafford Combined Hockey Club and I want to congratulate them on a victory. I know that our hon. member for Last Mountain-Touchwood is most happy because his son plays on that team and I offer my congratulations to him as well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I recognize the member for Moose Jaw North.

**MR. KRAMER:** — I have asked the page to distribute Saskatchewan flags, with your permission.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I have been trying all day to get the member for Moose

Jaw North on the agenda and I am going to get him on now.

### **Canadian Men's Senior Curling Championship**

**MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave of the House, I would like again to draw attention to the fact and offer congratulations, I'm sure on your behalf and on behalf of all the members here and all of the people in Saskatchewan, for the winning of the Canadian Men's Senior Curling Championship by a Moose Jaw rink. Earlier I mentioned that the skip was Terry McGeary, the third was Don Berglund, the second was H. Thompson and the lead was C. Ramsay. I think it's very significant that this adds to the growing number of Saskatchewan rinks that have been winning the championships throughout the entire breadth of Canada and that it really adds to Celebrate Saskatchewan and the 7th anniversary. I am certain that all members on all sides will agree with me that we are very, very proud that a Saskatchewan rink has again brought the honours back to Saskatchewan — truly representative of all of Canada and of all the provinces within Canada.

**MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all members of the official opposition — and I specify official opposition — on this side of the House, I too would like to congratulate the Terry McGeary team for winning the senior men's curling championship. This is the third championship brought to our province this year, with Marj Mitchell winning the ladies', Rick Folk the men's and now Terry McGeary the seniors'.

In light of that fact I would suggest to the Premier, and I would like somebody opposite to convey this message, that he invite all these reasons to the Assembly at the end of the curling season so they can be honoured for their accomplishments.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Wilkie Outlaws Win Intermediate B Hockey Championship**

**MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time congratulate the Wilkie Outlaws on being the Intermediate B champions for 1979-80. They defeated the Indian Head Combines. Sorry about that, Graham, but it is the first time that Wilkie has ever won the intermediate B final and to all of them I say congratulations and better time next year.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Raymore Rockets Win Intermediate Hockey C Championship**

**HON. G. MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to the Raymore Rockets in winning the Intermediate C championship for the sixth time. It is a record so far as Intermediate C championships are concerned. I think congratulations should go to their coach Wayne Back, to their offensive co-ordinator Gordon MacMurchy and their defensive co-ordinator Kevin Pal.

I want to extend my congratulations also to the winners of the North in the Intermediate C, that is the Blaine Lake-Hafford Imperials. It should be known in the final that the games were split, with Raymore winning the first game eight to three and Blaine Lake coming back to win the second game five to three, for an eleven-eight score on the round. I think all players are to be congratulated. My congratulations also to the Wilkie

team for winning the B championship for the first time. It is always exciting to do something for the first time and I am sure they are very happy in Wilkie. Congratulations to the Indian Head team, which had the opportunity to play because they were involved in the same league as the Raymore Rockets. They had a fine hockey team and they are a tribute to the town of Indian Head.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 5:08 p.m.