

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 8, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure on behalf of my colleague, the member for Prince Albert and me to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly, some 37 Air Cadets from Prince Albert Squadron No. 38. They are accompanied by Captain McKay, Captain Barber and Lieutenant Nordall. It's a particular pleasure to introduce the group as I am a former Air Cadet from 171 Squadron Melfort and a former member of the Royal Canadian Air Force. The group ranges in age from 13 to 18. Some are in their fifth year of training. I inform the Assembly that last year this squadron won the northern drill competition. I'm sure that members of the Assembly join in congratulating you and in welcoming you to this Assembly and express the hope that you will enjoy the proceedings here and find them informative. I will be meeting with the group in the rotunda at 2:30 and later for refreshments. Welcome to the Assembly.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**HON. MR. CODY:** — Mr. Speaker, it's a real pleasure for me today to have the opportunity to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, 29 grade 12 students from the Kinistino High School. They are here today on a cop-op sponsored tour. They are with their principal, Peter Woje. They are also with Mr. and Mrs. Gerald and Faye Boyle, their worthy bus driver, Bob Granrude, and with an employee from the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, Neil Burns. They will be visiting various co-operative areas today, such as the Credit Union Central, Co-op Refinery, and Federated Co-operatives.

It's very interesting that on Thursday we had the opportunity to be in Kinistino to help these people, and in particular their principal, open up a new school — a very beautiful school in which these folks will have the opportunity to learn.

We are very happy to have you here today. I will meet with you a little later on for a picture, and I guess, a little drinks of some kind — maybe of a different variety than one would want in the middle of the afternoon. However, this is the kind which we get from the cafeteria. I want to say that we welcome you here and I hope you have a safe journey home to Kinistino.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS:

### Taxation of Payments Through Options North Program

**MR. ANDREW:** — Question to the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, I understand that under the Options North program various people from the North, mostly natives, are hired at a certain job classification and then to upgrade them so that so they fully qualify for that job, they are sent to university. I don't object to that but

it has come to my attention the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is not deducting income tax and other deductions. My question to you is this: first of all are you aware of it? And secondly, do you condone what appears to be actions by the provincial government to actively participate in what I think is a tax evasion scheme?

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, I again request from the hon. member at the end of the question period the alleged evidence that he draws our attention to. I think it is important to point out that there is more than one program supporting students from northern Saskatchewan in post-secondary education. One is the Options North program which is geared for employees. It's necessary, in order to answer the particular question, to establish whether or not salary or a student allowance is being paid and what the particular circumstances are of each of the students. Certainly there are differences between approaches in the different programs, but I assure the hon. member that there is no intention on the part of the department nor on the part of the government to participate in any real or alleged tax evasion.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Supplementary question. Is the minister aware of an investigation presently under way by Revenue Canada into that very question. And secondly, is the minister aware of an opinion by (as I understand) the provincial auditor's office that the money has been taxable and it has been illegally distributed to the recipients without tax being withheld?

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of that.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The serious part of the question becomes a matter of what happens if this is true? When the various people in the education program graduate from school they could be facing a \$25,000 or \$30,000 tax liability and they have been advised by the department that it's not taxable, as I understand. So they could be facing a \$25,000 to \$3,000 tax liability. Is that any way to bring these people into the work force, to have that type of liability fact them when they leave university?

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, it's not clear to me at this point that the facts are as the hon. member alleges. I will take notice and report back to him in the House.

### **Increased Profits by Grain Companies**

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, I'm sure you are aware that grain tariffs since 1961 have gone from 3.75 cents to 17.7 cents for a bushel of grain. I'm sure that the minister is also aware that the latest increases in tariffs took place in the 1979-80 crop year and that virtually all of our grain companies have announced record profits. I point to the wheat pool at \$54 million, an increase of about 90 per cent over the previous year. UGG (United Grain Growers) at \$20 million, Cargill at \$15 million, and so the list goes of record profits. In light of the fact that at the hearings of the Canadian Grain Commission, when this increase in tariffs was allowed, all of these companies that have just announced a record profit pleaded poverty, increased and whatever else, my question is this: does your department intend to protest? Does your department intend to investigate what appears to be a gigantic rip-off, on the part of all the grain companies, of the farmers of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — The department, at the present time, has no plans for dealing with this issue in a direct way. I assume that when the board of grain commissioners looks at further increases, as requested by the elevator companies, we will give the matter at that time some significant consideration.

I point out to the hon. member that the major companies in the area are co-operatives. They are membership-owned and membership-controlled. Therefore, I'm sure the members will deal with the elevator tariffs as well as calling upon the Government of Saskatchewan to deal with it, as the hon. member is doing.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, would you agree that his situation, with record profits in the first year of these new tariff rates, clearly demonstrates a total lack of competition among the existing elevator companies? And would the minister agree with and his department support a proposal for deregulation, which would encourage competition among the various elevator companies, whether they be co-op or private — which would effect a sure competition? Let them charge what they want but get them back to where they are competing with one another instead of being in this position where they can act like a group of robber barons to every farmer.

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — No, we would not be in favour of deregulation. I think if you ask the producers of the province of Saskatchewan, and if you ask the companies which are working with the producers, they would be opposed to deregulation. I think the hon. member would find himself standing very lonesome on the issue of deregulation. That regulation is essential; it was found to be essential a long time ago. Therefore, I think it must continue. The issue of elevator rates is an issue that the memberships of the co-operatives will deal with. The hon. member has asked the Government of Saskatchewan to look at this issue. I have responded in a positive way in terms of when we should look at it, and that is at the time when increases are forthcoming before the board of grain commissioners.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, in light of your answer, in light of the existing situation, would you agree that it would be totally inappropriate for the wheat board to make the loan suggested in some circles interest-free to the grain consortium, which consists of all of these grains companies, to build the Prince Rupert terminal? In other words, my question is simply this: in light of this situation of the wheat board, would you approve lending these robber barons \$100 million of our farmers' money interest-free over 30 years?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, the question of the loan, or proposed loan, by the Canadian Wheat Board for the development of the terminals at Churchill is a question that was raised in the assembly last week. I report to the hon. member that I have telexed the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board to get the position of the Government of Canada and of the Canadian Wheat Board with respect to this issue.

I point out to the hon. member that the \$100 million loan, as announced by the assistant chief commission of the wheat board, was an announcement made around one year ago relative to the development at Prince Rupert. The offer at that time was made by the Canadian Wheat Board to stimulate the development at Rupert. It did have a stimulation factor. We have a development taking place at Rupert. What relationship the latest announcement has relative to that development, I do not know. I am trying to

find out from the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. As soon as I find out I will provide the information to all members opposite.

### **Demand Meters for Electricity**

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — Several days ago I took notice of a question from the hon. member for Bengough-Milestone with respect to the use of demand meters. The short answer to the hon. member's question is that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation does not have any plans to decrease the number or to discontinue the use of demand meters from facilities. The reason is that demand meters are only allocated to industrial, large commercial and large farm-class customers. I want to stress particularly that no residential or small commercial customers have demand meters. It's also interesting to note that of the 340,000 customers served by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, only 6,700 are billed by the demand meter system.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Speaker, question to the minister responsible for SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation). In your answer, you completely evaded the question that I asked. I referred specifically to the recreation centres throughout rural Saskatchewan and it would appear to me that members opposite don't know the difference between a demand meter attached to a regular meter and just a regular meter in any system. Will you remove them now, realizing that you are depriving rural Saskatchewan of winter recreation?

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — The member indicates that we don't know the purpose or the use of a demand meter. I think the member should know that demand meters are a fair and equitable means of charging major energy users for the demands which they place on the Saskatchewan Power Corporation's distribution system. These meters measure the energy used by the customer and the energy charged reflects the amount of fuel that generating station uses in order to produce that amount of energy. I think it's only fair and right that these types of customers pay for the energy which they use. There's no magic about it, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps the hon. member suggests these charges should be passed on to residential customers. If that's what he's saying, I don't think, that seems to be fair or proper either. There's another device which can be used by people who use demand meters and that is the levelling out of the demand in order that their costs may be levelled out, avoiding the high peak levels, the high demand periods. This has been done very successfully by a large number of people using the meters in question.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the minister knows the difference between the demand meter attached to a regular meter, because you're evading my question completely. You are referring to businesses; I'm not referring to businesses. I'm referring to recreation facilities in rural Saskatchewan such as curling rinks and skating rinks. There is no way that you can regulate the amount of power you use at one time in a curling facility attached to a skating facility, so take them out. Will you or won't you?

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — I guess, for about the third time, I'll have to indicate to the hon. member that I think it has been shown that the demand meters are fair and equitable in terms of charging for the cost of the production of that kind of energy for curling rinks and elsewhere. The fact of the matter is that there is no magic about it. In the event that it is not charged to larger industrial and commercial and recreational consumers, then I

presume that the hon. member is suggesting that the additional charges be charged to residential consumers and others.

### **Alternative to Demand Meters for Recreational Centres**

**MR. LANE:** — Will the minister be prepared to accept an alternative? Take the demand meters away, reduce the charges for that community recreational centres around the province and put them against the heavy industrial users as opposed to the residential users.

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — That seems to strike at the very heart of the position which members opposite have taken on a number of other occasions when they have indicated the heavy charges being levied against some of their industrial and commercial friends. I really don't believe that the member is being very consistent in his approach with respect to the levying of charges. Obviously it's not a new matter. It has been examined in some detail on many other occasions. As I've indicated, there are opportunities to level out the demand, in some instances, if customers apply themselves in that way. Charges, I think have to be regarded as not being excessive when compared to curling rinks in other provinces which provide services to facilities of that nature.

### **Minister's Support of Lewvan Rail Line Relocation**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Mr. Minister, recently you officiated at, or at least participated in, the official opening of the Lewvan rail line. I'm not sure what you call it, relocation or by-pass of the city. If the members will keep a little quiet for a minute maybe I'll get my question out. Was the participation in that official opening perhaps a showing or an indication of your support of the Regina rail line relocation?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, in the case of our support of the Regina rail line relocation, it has been stated a long time ago that we do support the principle of rail line relocation. In the case of my participation, I was invited by the city and I participated. I think the hon. member was also involved in at least part of the program in the Lewvan line opening.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Actually, I didn't attend the official opening in the afternoon; I attended the refreshments later on. That was the interesting part of it. However, not having attended the official opening, I'm advised that at that time you indicated your approval and pleasure that the removal of the Lewvan tracks within the city would provide a corridor to access to our airport for the residents of southwestern Saskatchewan, is that correct, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that during the course of the remarks I did indicate that this would help remove the line which will make the access a little better at some future date when the lines are removed. Now that the trains are not running there, certainly that's an improvement.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. You said "a future date," and I'm curious about that particular aspect of your reply. However, that being the case, why would your government now refuse to pay for the cost of the construction of the Pasqua-Lewvan expressway from Regina Avenue south to Highway No. 1, following the commitment that was made by the provincial government in 1969?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that we are refusing to pay, and of the commitments that have been made. Perhaps the hon. member could give me the details. I would be glad to check it out. I don't have the specific details.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the very same question to the Minister of Highways. I'm not sure who that is any more. Perhaps the Premier would like to answer the question.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to take notice of the question and ask the appropriate colleague to answer.

### **Appointment of Acting Deputy Provincial Secretary**

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Provincial Secretary. I asked the minister on Friday if it were true that Philip Flory has been appointed as acting deputy provincial secretary. The minister answered, and I quote from *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any appointment or proposed appointment of Mr. Flory as deputy provincial secretary.

On Friday morning last I was in Mr. Beaudry's office asking for an appointment with him. Why, Mr. Minister, did his office girls inform me that Mr. Beaudry was in New York, and ask if I would like to have an appointment with the acting deputy minister, Mr. Philip Flory? Why, after some further conversation, did they inform me that Mr. Beaudry had retired and Mr. Flory had taken his place? Now who is telling the truth, you or Mr. Beaudry's office staff?

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, there are several questions there. First of all, I indicated that there was no decision made to appoint Mr. Flory as deputy provincial secretary, and that was correct. The member asked whether or not he had been appointed a few days before as acting deputy provincial secretary and I don't believe that was the case. The member wants to know why the staff said Mr. Beaudry was in New York. They said he was in New York because he was in New York.

With respect to the question of Mr. Beaudry's retirement, he will be retiring effective December 31 of this year and any changes in position, any promotions, anyone who will be appointed to take his place will be announced in due course, but there have been no decisions made with respect to the appointment of a new deputy provincial secretary. I might also say to the member that the person who acts in Mr. Beaudry's stead when he is away is either Mr. Earl Saunderson, the superintendent of insurance or Mr. Flory — one of them; they're the two senior people in the department.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I see Friday that you have answers today but you didn't have them the other day. Mr. Minister, is it true that the ex- or present deputy provincial secretary spent last week in New York? If so, under what capacity was he there? At whose expense was he there — the taxpayers or his own? Was he on his retirement holiday? Did he have a government credit card? Come on, come clean, tell us the whole story here.

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that last week Mr. Beaudry was in New York and I believe it was at government expense, but I certainly wouldn't want to mislead the member in any way, and so I will take notice of that question and provide

him with all the details of Mr. Beaudry's trip to New York if indeed, as I believe it was, it was a trip involving government business.

### **Filling of Cabinet Posts**

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, today's question period, I think, exemplified or provided another example of the problems and difficulties facing an opposition when a premier reneges his responsibility and leaves two . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Does the member have a question? I want to hear it.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that I am allotted a brief statement before my first question. My question to the Premier is this: why, Mr. Premier, since you have that bevy of talent across the way, have you not yet chosen a new minister of mineral resources and a new minister of highways?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the question answers itself. It's because there is such a bevy of talent that I have great difficulty making the choices.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COLLVER:** — Since the Premier is having difficulty in making up his mind, perhaps he would allow us in the opposition to make up our minds as to which of the members opposite might be the best minister of highways and minister of mineral resources. Would you allow me the opportunity to choose from that bevy of talent?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I know that they hon. member for Nipawin has been promising cabinet posts to a very large number of people (two or three as the minister of agriculture, as I recall it, in 1978), but I certainly would be happy to have his suggestions and he can certainly pass them on to me and I will add them to the very extensive list I already have.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

#### **ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Nelson for an address in reply.

**MR. BAKER:** — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to take part in the throne speech debate. I would first of all like to congratulate my colleague, the member for Yorkton, who made skilled and thoughtful remarks in moving the address in reply. The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg also demonstrated his personal competence and the strong record of this government in seconding the address. I would like to extend a warm welcome to the fine people in my Regina Victoria constituency and extend also an especially warm welcome to those recently added to my constituency through redistribution. The new polls in my constituency return the privilege of serving most of the people who were in my constituency after the 1964 election and consequently I regard them as old friends.

It is also a pleasure for me to welcome the three new members elected during our recent by-elections. I am confident that all three will serve their constituency to the best of their abilities.

In my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the responsibility of democratic and parliamentary governments and of highly developed and industrialized countries, not only in the role they must play at home but also in the role which humanity requires they play with regard to the Commonwealth countries and other undeveloped peoples and nations. When I look at the Speech from the Throne, I see how truly fortunate we are in this province. We are blessed with abundant natural resources and a government which has developed these resources for the benefit of the people.

I have recently returned from a worldwide conference in Lusaka, Zambia, sponsored by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, which has given me the opportunity to view our achievements in Saskatchewan from a broader perspective. I thank this legislature for affording me the opportunity to attend the commonwealth parliamentary conference for Saskatchewan. I may also report that Mr. Gordon Barnhart attended as Clerk of the Assembly. He made a fine contribution to the conference and is held in high regard.

The purpose of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is to promote knowledge and education about the constitutional, legislative, economic, social and cultural systems within a parliamentary-democratic framework with particular reference to the countries of the Commonwealth of Nations and to other countries having close historical and parliamentary associations with it. The conference I attended involved 44 countries, taking in a third of the world's population — well over a billion people. The most significant thing about such a gathering is that no translations were required and that we were able to speak our common language, namely English. While many dialects were recognizable, the fact remained that we were under one tongue, with the majority of delegates and guests being of a different colour from white. Being side by side with people of different races, colours and creeds for over two weeks indicates to me that co-existence is not only a must, but that all barriers can be eliminated if people and nations show tolerance.

In my remarks today I will try to outline some of the outstanding happenings in the Commonwealth and reflect on the needs of the third world or undeveloped countries which in many ways can be found in the country we visited, namely Zambia.

With regard to agriculture, many things were revealed to us in our tour. In conversations with several white and black farmers, we found the agricultural potential in Zambia is great. They claim Zambia could produce enough food to feed at least 150 million people, and that 80 per cent of the land could be used to produce almost any cereal, vegetable or fruit crop. At present only about 4 per cent of the arable land is in use. The Canadian delegation spent time with the Canadian wheat specialist working in Zambia, Dr. Hurd from Regina and Swift Current, who introduced many of our western wheat varieties. Many experiments have been undertaken and are continuing. It appears now that the resistant varieties known as rain-fed wheat will be suited for the many rainy seasons where plant diseases are severe. Other varieties have been produced for dry-land farming and irrigation projects. The present food grown and used as a flour base in Zambia is maize which looks like white corn. It is high in protein and when mixed with Canadian wheat produces an excellent type of flour.

Canada has given considerable financial input by setting up unit farms for training native farmers who will learn to set up independent farming operations.

It is important that the native people be trained to help themselves. There are many



small-scale farming schemes in most parts of Zambia promoted by countries like Canada under the Canadian International Development Agency known as CIDA, and this is one of several programs they promote. These small-scale schemes are important as a development tool to improve the living standards for a large number of people. Irrigations schemes have great potential for large-scale production of wheat and would move Zambia toward self-sufficiency in wheat. Most of the management for large-scale farms is white, but Zambians are learning. It will likely be 15 years before Zambians are experienced enough to take over all production. However, with outside help Zambia will probably be growing all of its own wheat in eight years time.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Zambia received its full independence as a parliamentary democratic nation in 1984. Dr. Kenneth Kaunda became president at that time and still holds office. He is a very capable, highly intelligent leader trying to steer his country along democratic lines even though they use the one-party parliamentary system. They claim a one-party system is needed to meld all the tribal groups together to avoid revolutionary tendencies that could destroy their progress. While I do not agree with their one-party system, perhaps it has merit until the country becomes more self-sufficient and stable. However, I still think a two- or three party system could achieve the goals desired with complete freedom.

Zambia is a country of six million people. We were told over 2.5 million people still live in the primitive villages, some of which we visited. There you see, in terms of our lifestyle, great poverty and backwardness. However the Zambian government is trying to educate Zambia's youth and the Zambian people fully support the education of their youth and adults too.

On our week's tour we visited a good part of the country. Our flights took us to the northern part of the country in the highly developed copper-belt area. We visited their strip mines, their underground mines, and saw the industrialized and technical way they have of producing a very high grade of copper. Thousands of people are engaged directly and indirectly in copper production. Copper is their main mineral resource and is the largest source of the country's wealth. It is so important to develop agriculture there because Zambia could become the main food basket of Africa with foodstuffs as their largest export. This could take a severe load off the developed countries by providing food when drought and starvation strikes other African countries.

We were told that in the neighboring country of Mozambique there has been three years of drought which would cause 1.5 million people to suffer from malnutrition or starvation next year. The threat of drought means that one of the immediate needs for countries like Zambia is the development of safe water supplies. Many deaths and illnesses are caused by blackwater fever or other related illnesses caused by river water. It would seem to me a province like Saskatchewan could undertake a project of this type on its own by drilling wells for consumption and in places for irrigation. This would speed up food production and get rid of many health hazards.

Mr. Speaker, many of the conference discussions took place surrounding the Brandt report and its recommendation which were a plea for change, for peace, justice and jobs for developing countries. Brandt's report divides the work into a north-south perspective, depicting most of the North as the highly developed economic and industrialized world versus the South, while most countries and nations are underdeveloped or developing. I am unable to cover the full commission report, which is voluminous, so I will give you a summary with certain recommendations that they provide. They claim an action program must be launched comprising both emergency

and long-term measures to assist the poverty belts of Africa and Asia. Such measures would include large regional projects of water and soil management, the provision of health care and the eradication of such diseases as river blindness, malaria, sleeping sickness and other fevers and plagues from which we witness many people suffering.

Solar energy development, mineral and petroleum exploration, reforestation, support for industrialization, agriculture and transportation are other areas which need attention. The report suggests that plans would require additional financial assistance from the developed countries of at least \$4 billion per year for the next two decades.

Population growth, movement and environment. In view of the vicious circle between poverty and high-birth rates, the rapid population growth in developing countries gives added urgency to the need to fight hunger, disease, malnutrition and illiteracy.

The Brandt report recommends that development policies should include national population programs aiming at a satisfactory balance between population and resources, and making family planning freely available. Migrant workers throughout the world should be assured fair treatment. The rights of refugees to asylum and legal protection should be strengthened.

Disarmament and development. The public must be made aware of the terrible danger to world stability caused by the arms race. They must be made aware of the burden it imposes on national economies and the resources it diverts from peaceful development.

Every effort must be made to secure international agreements preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. More research is necessary on the means of converting arms production to civilian production which could make use of the highly skilled scientific and technical manpower currently employed in the arms industries.

Industrialization and world trade. The industrialization of developing countries as a means of their overall development efforts must also be seen as important by developed countries. It will provide increasing opportunities for world trade and should be facilitated as a matter of international policy.

Fair labor standards should be internationally agreed in order to prevent unfair competition and to facilitate trade interchange.

It was also suggested by the conference, Mr. Speaker, that mechanisms should be agreed for creating and distributing an international currency to be used for clearing and settling outstanding balances between central banks. Such a currency would replace the use of the national currencies as international reserves.

The conference recommended that timetables be adopted to increase official development assistance from industrialized countries to the level of 0.7 per cent of the gross national products by 1985 and to 1 per cent before the end of the century. Canada is now at 0.43 per cent.

There must be effective utilization of the increased borrowing capacity of the World Bank resulting from the decision to double its capital to \$80 billion.

Discussions indicated that consideration be given to the creation of a new international financial institution, a world development fund, with universal membership and in which decision-making is more evenly shared between lenders and borrowers.

The conference recommendations stated that there must be a substantial increase in the transfer of resources to developing countries in order to finance programs to alleviate poverty, to expand food production and to explore and develop energy and mineral resources. It was indicated to the developing countries at the convention that there would be a tightening of the International Monetary Fund (the MF) policies. This brought out a howl and cry against the industrialized West, which said it was necessary for world economic recovery. Third world countries criticized the International Monetary Fund for demanding purse tightening policies. This, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, would set back programs for the underdeveloped countries needed so desperately.

Mr. Speaker, I believe increased attention should be paid to educating public opinion and the younger generation about the importance of international co-operation. More limited Commonwealth summit meetings of our leaders should be considered to advance the cause of consensus and change.

What a blessing for us to be able to live in a land of plenty, a land of the free, among a compassionate people in Saskatchewan who, I believe, do think of the needs of others. Yes, let's look beyond our borders and also do more for that hungry world in sharing some of our blessings.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SOLOMON:** — Mr. Speaker, to begin I would like to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the member for Yorkton and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. It is indeed an honor to move or second such an address, both for the hon. members and the constituents they represent. That honor was bestowed upon the member for Regina North-West and the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster last year.

I am glad of this opportunity to speak in support of this government's Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne says very important things about our government. It is a government with strong morale, a government with steadfastness, courage and hope, a government with confidence, zeal and loyalty to our country, a government with a spirit of courage and determination.

The policy of this government, as shown in this throne speech, is not directed against the rest of this country or against any political doctrine, but against desperation and chaos. Its purpose is the building and maintenance of a working Saskatchewan economy in Canada so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which we can continue to live in dignity and independence.

Mr. Speaker, that morale and that spirit of Saskatchewan were never more evidence than during this past year, a year marked by celebrations, a year when we looked backward to our roots to recapture the elusive past as we look confidently toward the future. Saskatchewan sparkled with verve and vitality as people drew on their imaginations

and memories to create special events. This last year was a milestone in Saskatchewan history. It was more than a birthday. It was a clear sign of the calm confidence of Saskatchewan people in their ability to forge ahead into the next 75 years of our future.

Mr. Speaker, the enthusiasm we all shared was in some measure due to a people who are able to look back on a decade of sustained growth and prosperity for Saskatchewan. While we took part in special events and activities, Celebrate Saskatchewan was essentially about people — people working co-operatively, people trusting in their own good judgment, people seeking and finding solutions to how best to work and live together. The people of Saskatchewan made our celebrations this year a gigantic success.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SOLOMON:** — Today I would also like to pay tribute to three of our members who have retired this year — the former members for The Battlefords, Kelsey-Tisdale, and Estevan. Each of them in their own way personified some of those things about Saskatchewan I have mentioned.

Eiling Kramer, with 26 years of service to the people of North Battleford and Saskatchewan, was a man who demonstrated rugged strength and character in the way he fought for the things in which he believed. His contribution to the lives of Saskatchewan people will be long remembered.

Jack Messer, first elected in 1967, was a pillar of strength in this government for a decade, possessing that rare combination of determination and endurance so necessary to this government as it introduced new programs and policies for people.

And Bob Larter, the member for Estevan — though he was not a member on this side of the House, he exemplified the best qualities in a representative and a person.

I salute these men, Mr. Speaker. While their abilities are lost to this House, I am certain they will continue to be active in their respective communities.

Our province has a wealth of talent to draw from. Not only is it blessed with able people, but it is equally blessed with committed people who take matters of government seriously. Last November 26, three members were elected to replace those who retired. I congratulate and welcome the new members for Estevan, The Battlefords, and Kelsey-Tisdale, and I look forward to working with them over the months ahead.

Our celebration year is coming to a close. As it does, we see new and disturbing challenges ahead for Saskatchewan and Canada. In the light of these new challenges, Mr. Speaker, I think it right and proper to take a look at some of the things the New Democratic Party government of Allan Blakeney has been able to achieve, not simply as a record, but so the strengths of this government can be viewed in the context of the new challenges facing our people.

Saskatchewan is an important supplier of many primary products. We produce 60 per cent of Canada's wheat, one-third of its oats and barley, and 30 per cent of its oil seeds; Saskatchewan is the second largest supplier of potash in the world and the nation's second largest producer of oil, to mention only a few of the products. This range of productive activity represents a major departure from Saskatchewan's historical dependence on one export commodity, namely wheat. Near-exclusive reliance on a single crop, however, brought large and abrupt fluctuations in output and income,

variable revenues and periodic population declines. This was true, Mr. Speaker, until the decade of the 1970s, the decade the government of Allan Blakeney came to power, the decade when our Saskatchewan economy was transformed from a narrow to a broadly based export economy. During this past decade the conscious efforts of this government in promoting an aggressive policy of diversification to promote stability, to produce jobs and income opportunities, and to gain benefits for Saskatchewan people from resource development, have resulted in even greater promise for the future than our forefathers could have envisioned.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SOLOMON:** — Our population has risen to its highest level ever, to an estimated 970,000 people on July 1, 1980. Saskatchewan's unemployment rate has consistently been ranked among the lowest in Canada. Natural resource revenues accruing to the province have risen nineteenfold since 1970. Today, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is one of Canada's growth centres, and that growth is in large measure due to this government's aggressive development of Saskatchewan natural assets. This, combined with careful fiscal management and progressive social initiatives, provides a sound basis for confidence in the future of our province through the 1980s.

This past year alone saw a continuation of good government in Saskatchewan. Our recent provincial budget reflected good government. There were tax cuts adjusting the income tax rates payable for inflation, which meant \$26 million in income tax savings. Increasing the tax reduction for senior citizens from \$160 maximum to \$210 resulted in a \$50 tax cut, which meant savings for our senior citizens. The maximum Saskatchewan mortgage-interest tax credit was continued, giving some relief to an estimated 100,000 home-owners by approximately \$18 million. The renters property tax rebate program was expanded. This year our government continued its commitment to health care. We chose not to desert our commitment like provincial Conservative governments. This year SHSP funding was increased by almost 14 per cent. There was almost \$18 million for the Regina hospitals regeneration program. Fourteen-year-olds were added to the Saskatchewan dental plan. Funding for the cancer foundation was increased to \$7.8 million. These were just a few of the measures in this crucial area.

Added to these were such useful and important programs as the community schools program and the native training and employment program.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on, a list of positive moves on the part of this government during our celebration year to keep Saskatchewan in the forefront of economic and social progress in Canada. If any one thing has marked this government's approach to people, it has been a positive response to the need of local communities. The people of Regina have reason to be pleased with that response. It is, as the throne speech so aptly point out, a positive response to realities. Although time doesn't permit me to list them all, I would just like to mention a few of the ways the city of Regina has benefited over the past year from a government which cares, the government of Allan Blakeney.

Grants to urban affairs, including revenue sharing, water pollution, neighborhood improvement, ambulance and fire, will total some \$16 million for Regina, almost 19 per cent over the previous year. In fact, grants to the municipality were up to \$21.8 million, a 25 per cent increase over the previous year. that's not all. Local authorities and organizations also received increases in their funding. Public and separate schools in Regina received a 10.7 per cent increase, a total of \$35.6 million for operating and

capital costs. Continuing education — our universities, community colleges and institutes — received grants totalling \$34.5 million in Regina, up by almost 8 per cent over the previous year. Operating grants to hospitals and other related grants for health services to Regina were increased to \$87 million in this fiscal year. Cultural activities in Regina received a total of \$2.8 million. Operating grants for libraries were up. Grants for government services were up. Grants for social services were up. This government believes in supporting local communities, Mr. Speaker. Total provincial government expenditures in Regina in the current fiscal year are forecast to be over \$202 million. That is over \$1,275 for every man, woman and child in Regina. That is what I call a clear example of commitment to community.

Mr. Speaker, as a resident of Regina I'm pleased my provincial government sees fit to support local communities. As a representative of this government I'm proud to have been a part of that commitment.

I would like to turn now to my constituency of Regina North-West and report on the progress over the past year.

On November 18, the CN Lewvan subdivision from Highway No. 1 south to the CNR yard, which marks the south boundary of my constituency, was officially closed due to the completion of project 4 of the Lewvan subdivision. This subdivision now takes rail traffic to and from the subdivision around the east side of Regina instead of through the city. The relocation of this line will make it easier to build a north-south arterial — a much-needed transportation link from the northwest part of Regina to downtown. I'm proud to see our NDP government taking part in this worthy project to the extent of sharing 50 per cent of the costs.

Over the past year, I've also worked to encourage our provincial government to become more involved with meeting the recreation needs of the families of northwest Regina. My efforts, together with those of many people in the community, have been successful. I'm pleased to see the provincial government has been able to give a total of \$223,000 to assist in the cost of renovating the Pasqua School into the Pasqua Neighborhood Recreation Centre which was officially opened on October 4 last.

The Government of Saskatchewan believes in supporting communities. When community groups have good ideas, they find the government of Allan Blakeney responds to their needs. I would like to express my appreciation, at this time, to Hon. Ned Shillington, who was then minister of culture and youth, who authorized the grant for the centre.

Another significant development in recreation in northwest Regina was announced just recently, Mr. Speaker. On October 22, it was announced that \$2.3 million plus land will be given by this government to the city of Regina to build a multipurpose recreation complex in northwest Regina. The complex will be built in Sherwood Estates. This grant, composed of \$2 million from the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation and \$300,000 from the Department of Culture and Youth, will make it possible for the community centre to be built in 1981. This is a much-needed facility for the people of northwest Regina, including the people who live in the neighborhoods of Walsh Acres, Sherwood Estates, McCarthy Park, Normanview, Normanview West, Argyle Park, and Prairieview West.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to have been involved with getting this development on the road. I'd like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation on behalf of the

residents of Regina North-West to the provincial government for once again helping to fulfil the needs of our family-oriented community of northwest Regina.

I was also pleased to assist in providing a \$250,000 provincial government capital facilities grant which has gone toward the construction of a new library for northwest Regina on Rochdale Boulevard. This library will be open shortly.

In 1978, the government of Allan Blakeney was once again elected by the people of Saskatchewan. I was pleased at that time, to play a small part in the victory. In that campaign, the New Democratic government had a slogan. The slogan was: A Record of Success — Great Promise for the Future.

Mr. Speaker, when I view the record of this government, a record which I have briefly alluded to during my remarks, it's obvious that the slogan was not empty rhetoric. It was a slogan rooted in the reality of what this government has done. It's a good record and one to be proud of. As this throne speech shows, there is great promise for the future.

Most important, this throne speech clearly lays out the ground rules for Saskatchewan's participation in confederation. Unlike Conservative governments which choose to ride with the tide of separatism, this government chooses to press for needed changes in our new constitutional relationship. At the same time, this government intends to fight the absolutist position of the federal Liberal stand on the constitution. This government, Mr. Speaker, chooses to make its decisions with its head, not its feet. Unlike Conservative forces of reaction we will not break ranks, as the opposite members do, at the first sign of difficulty. This is a strong government, a stable government, not a Conservative government.

Nor will the government of Allan Blakeney back down from the federal Liberal government, a government which takes away our ability to benefit from our resources through a national energy policy which discriminates against producing provinces with the one hand and cuts on transfer payments to our province with the other, as they did with the federal budget of last October.

This government will continue its work and support on behalf of working people in Saskatchewan. I am pleased to see there will be amendments to The Trade Union Act to clarify procedures to be followed in conducting strike votes. The speech also provides for an increased minimum wage to be raised to \$3.85 on January 1, 1981 and to \$4 on July 1, 1981 to help those earning minimum wage to cope better with inflation.

New and improved delivery of day care services and care of the elderly, a new department of consumer and commercial affairs and many other measures will together ensure there is indeed a great promise for the future in Saskatchewan.

Earlier I spoke about this government being a government with clarity of purpose and strong morale, a government with the will and the ability to build and maintain a working economy in Saskatchewan. And as we near the end of our celebration year I am glad we have been able to reflect on how that purpose has been realized by this government. We do have a proud history and a bright future in Saskatchewan and therefore I'll be supporting this motion, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in the debate to the

Speech from the Throne this afternoon, representing the constituency of Melfort. First of all, I'd like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the member for Yorkton and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, for the capable manner in which they made their presentations.

I would also like to congratulate the three members of the Legislative Assembly who have taken their seats in this House for the first time in this session. The new member for The Battlefords has been well chosen and while he has some big shoes to fill I have no doubt that he will meet the challenge successfully. The people of Estevan constituency are to be congratulated on the selection of their new MLA and I am sure that their new member on this side of the House will confirm the wisdom of their choice by serving his constituency intelligently and effectively in the months and years ahead. Welcome is also extended to the new member opposite who will find, I am sure, that he has a very hard act to follow in terms of service to the Kelsey-Tisdale constituency and to the province. I hope he will find his experience here both interesting and enlightening during his brief stay as a member.

Mr. Speaker, as the MLA for Melfort constituency it is a pleasure to stand in this House and reflect on the achievements of this government and on the developments that have occurred in the constituency as a result of this government's policies and programs. The people of Melfort and area have seen growth and development as a direct result of this government's leadership in developing the economy of our province.

The throne speech is another example of the recent and progressive approach of this government, an approach which has served the province so well in the past and will continue to serve it well in the years ahead. The government has shown ongoing concern for the well-being of the people of the province. This is reflected in the service offered to the people in my constituency over the past number of years.

One of the most important recent developments in the Melfort constituency is the construction of the George Willis Bridge on the Saskatchewan River north of Gronlid. This bridge provides an important access between the northern and southern regions of the province. For the people in the communities immediately to the north of the river, the bridge provides an access to the new city of Melfort and provides a direct substantially shorter route south to Regina. This direct route will also be of great benefit to Southerners who will have much easier access to the excellent recreational areas along the Hanson Lake Road and points north, east and west.

The construction of this bridge will bring economic benefits to the communities along the highway. The George Willis bridge provides a shorter, less expensive route for business and industrial vehicles. With the development of Saskatchewan's North, it is conceivable that this bridge will become a major north-south route for the movement of goods and services, providing a direct route from the American border to the northern parkland.

Therefore, in the broadest sense, this bridge is an important additional link in our provincial transportation system. It will benefit the people of my constituency and the Shellbrook constituency to the north, but it also has the potential to become a route of major importance to the province as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, my constituency has also benefited substantially from the government's housing programs. During the '70s, through the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, public housing projects from Lake Lenore to Star City have created 189 senior citizens



housing units and 14 family units, with a provincial government contribution of approximately \$1,535,000. Between 1972 and 1979, over 200 grants totalling \$150,000 were paid out to assist people building houses in the Melfort constituency. Many people, especially senior citizens, have received assistance under the residential rehabilitation and senior citizens home repair programs. From the fall of 1973 to the spring of 1980, 136 loans totalling \$370,000 were made to assist in home rehabilitation and over half of this amount has been forgiven. Nearly 800 senior citizens in the Melfort area qualified for grants of approximately \$330,000 to repair their homes. In addition, government programs to provide rural housing, non-profit housing and to assist with land assembly have been used in my constituency to the benefit of all local people.

Obviously this government is taking action on an ongoing basis to improve the quality of life for our citizens. People of my constituency and of the province as a whole have benefited from these wide-ranging housing programs.

In the area of social services, improvements are also being made in the Melfort constituency. The provincially funded home care service is getting established, with Melfort district, no. 32, being officially recognized on July 1 of this year. The local home care board has received grants of over \$21,000 for administration and public education. I understand the board is presently preparing a development plan for that region. This program will contribute to the self-sufficiency of individuals and families who might otherwise be dependent upon government for their daily care. It will enable more of the elderly, the disabled, the handicapped and the chronically ill to live with dignity and independence in their own homes.

This program is an important demonstration of the ongoing concern and the innovative response of our government to the needs of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, this year has been one of celebration and renewal for our province and its people. The occasion of our 75th anniversary as a province was marked by many happy events in the province and the Melfort constituency. During the summer months I attended over 20 celebrations in as many communities — reunions, talent nights, art shows, parades — all developed by local people, each reliving its special memories and expressing its unique hope for the future. These were celebrations which reflected the special community spirit that is rural Saskatchewan's strength. I would like to commend all volunteers in my constituency who gave so generously of their time to make these local celebrations a success. I would also like to extend my congratulations to the minister responsible for Celebrate Saskatchewan, and to the staff of the corporation for the important part they played in working with local organizations in planning this year's celebrations.

Mr. Speaker, my community of Melfort marked this year in a unique way by becoming the twelfth city of the province. I am pleased that milestone in my community's development coincided with the milestone in the province's history. I am sure that both the community and the province can look forward to further growth and development in the years ahead. Let me congratulate the people of Melfort and their council and with them well in the decades ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to suggest that there are no challenges that face us in the present or in the future. On the contrary, our province and our nation are facing major issues, and I am pleased that this throne speech addresses those issues. The debate on the constitutional proposal presently before the House of Commons is a major

concern, and I am proud of the clear thinking and the consistent and constructive approach which our government has taken in addressing this issue.

The constitutional debate is becoming a divisive factor in our nation, and this is both unfortunate and unnecessary. The constitutional issue is divisive because of the hard-line positions which have been assumed by both the federal and various provincial governments in the discussion process. These opposing groups have become entrenched and have assumed a stance of confrontation in a situation where I believe, Mr. Speaker, negotiation and compromise would be a more productive approach. This government has always taken the position that the Canadian tradition of making decisions by consensus must be followed in all this important constitutional debate.

This government stands firm on those issues such as control of resources which are vital to Saskatchewan's well-being. However, we continue to strive for more changes in those parts of the constitutional package which are unacceptable to consultation and negotiation rather than confrontation. In this regard I feel that our government is behaving in a responsible manner and is striving to provide for the best interests of our province and our nation.

We have made progress, and yes, there is still potential for persuading the federal government to make important concessions in the constitutional package. And I would like at this time to congratulate both the Premier of the province and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs for the intelligent leadership that they have shown. They have earned the respect of all Canadians.

Western Canada and our province of Saskatchewan are playing an increasingly important role in national affairs, largely because of the quality of leadership provided by the Government of Saskatchewan.

In my capacity as the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see a growing recognition of Saskatchewan's industrial potential. We are finding that there are tremendous opportunities available in the province for the establishing of manufacturing and service industries — a spinoff to the development in the primary resource sector. These secondary industries will bring diversification and increasing stability to our provincial economy in the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite have frequently expressed skepticism regarding these facts. This government's approach to economic development is working and working well. The current situation is the result of good management. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is one of the few areas in North America to record economic growth in the 1980s. Our unemployment continues to be the lowest, or the second lowest in Canada. People move to Saskatchewan to find jobs. Our population is at an all-time high. Since 1972, 85,000 jobs have been created. Personal income is up 10 per cent this year, and private and public investment continues to grow.

Questions have been raised in this House, Mr. Speaker, about the number of business failures in the province. The opposition has quoted isolated statistics to attempt to demonstrate that business is in serious difficulty because of this government's policies. I will not argue, Mr. Speaker, with the statement that these are difficult times for business. However, the problem is caused by the policies of the federal, and not the provincial, government. The current policy of maintaining impossibly high interest rates is a prime cause of business failure. It is the policy which is supported, not only by

the current Liberal government in Ottawa, but was supported by the previous Progressive Conservative government under Mr. Clark.

The members opposite have quoted federal government studies which indicate that the number of bankruptcies in Saskatchewan has increased over the last year. However, the members followed their usual Progressive Conservative practice of presenting only half the facts. In this case, the members neglected to mention other findings of that same study, which indicated that the principal reason for this increase in business failure was undercapitalization of businesses — undercapitalization, Mr. Speaker, which occurs because of the high cost of money. Undercapitalization is a major cause of business failure. It is a direct result of the monetary and fiscal policies imposed on that province and the whole nation by the federal government run by the old-line parties.

Mr. Speaker, as minister responsible for business in the province, I am pleased to report that both Sedco and the Department of Industry and Commerce are offering assistance to business communities to deal with current problems.

Sedco is taking a responsible position with regard to interest rates, and is able to offer interest rates somewhat lower than the excessive levels charged by some agencies in the financial market. Sedco also places a high priority on manufacturing and secondary industries, thus helping Saskatchewan to develop a diverse industrial base. Sedco is filling this role well and is making a substantial contribution to the industrial development in our province. For example, in the first 11 months of this year, Sedco has approved loans and guarantees in the amount of \$16.1 million to the manufacturing sector. As a result of these 32 manufacturing projects, approximately 300 Saskatchewan jobs will be created or maintained. This is a clear demonstration of the commitment of this government and its agencies to industrial diversification and reliable long-term growth.

The Department of Industry and Commerce continues to offer a range of services to businesses and has programs which help businesses deal with current different economic situations. As a result, our province has a health business climate and bright prospects for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech we had the honor to hear a few days ago represents another step in the steady progress of our province towards prosperity and stability of the economy and the total well-being of all Saskatchewan people. I'm proud to speak in support of the Speech from the Throne and of the policies it represents. I will be honored to vote for the Speech from the Throne.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — Mr. Speaker, it has been quite a number of years since I've participated in the throne speech debate, but certain events occurring of late prompted me to take part. The Melville constituency has been well treated by this Blakeney government, but I will refrain from commenting on this, Mr. Speaker, because of the time pressure. However, I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder for the positive and factual critiques of the throne speech and to the general performance of the Blakeney government since coming into office. I also want to congratulate the retiring members of this legislature in the past year. They were outstanding MLAs all of their long years of tenure in this legislature.

I want to congratulate, as well, the winners in the three by-elections. Many comments have been made in the post-mortem of these results. I will not go into those results except to make one comment on the win of Mr. Chapman over the Conservative leader, Grant Devine, in a seat which the Conservatives of Saskatchewan deemed solidly safe for an outside candidate. I believe that one of the factors having a good deal to do with the loss for the Conservative leader was that the farm people in Estevan and community did not forget the statement made by Mr. Devine a few short years ago in his review of Saskatchewan's agricultural future. In the interests of efficiency and good management, he said that three out of every four farmers must get off the land.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Estevan farmers were not fooled by the election prattle of Mr. Devine claiming that the Progressive Conservatives, if elected to power in Saskatchewan, were going to be saviors of the family farm — a statement, Mr. Speaker, totally contradictory to the fact. If anything, the Devine statements revealed that the Conservative policies on Saskatchewan agriculture in this regard were totally politically oriented with no real commitment as to performance to help solve the squeeze-out of the family farm. If anything, these policies would tend to greatly escalate growth of corporate farms and large-sized land holdings with little or not consideration of the social and economic destruction suffered by the rural village and small town communities. I want to congratulate the people of Estevan for remembering.

I will say no more as every one of the government members participating in the debate has done a remarkable job of analysis of the throne speech and the Blakeney government's thrust in the future, a future faced with confidence and determination and with the approval of the majority of the people of Saskatchewan, I may add.

I said at the outset that certain events occurring in the present and immediate past prompted me to participate in this debate. I refer to the constitutional crisis and debate which is raging across the country, a crisis brought on by the almost total inaction of Conservative and Liberal federal governments over the past 100 years in dealing with not just the patriation of the Canadian constitution, but with many other divisions, its dominant control by central Canada (culturally and above all economically), and numerous other outstanding concerns and problems of provincial and regional conflict which have been forever ignored until the constitutional lid blew right off, Mr. Speaker. All of a sudden the federal government introduced hurried and ill-defined measures to deal with these horrendous problems in many areas not acceptable to western Canadians nor to Canadians in other parts of the country.

I want to deal with only one aspect of this debate — the question of multiculturalism as it affects ethnic minority groups in Canada and in Saskatchewan. You may want to ask, Mr. Speaker, why is it that the Melville member want to bring into discussion the question which some would rather see left out? Over many years, but particularly in the recent years, in spite of a more open and acceptable tolerance of the minorities, there still is, to a degree, strong objection from some members of the majority groups toward active participation and involvement by minority groups. These objectors would have it that the minority in ethnic factors should disappear rather than be part of the Canadian scene. This negative attack is open, sometimes subtle and obscure, but nevertheless cynical, critical and downgrading and through the news media, radio and television, it adds fuel to the conflict, Mr. Speaker.

I could quote numerous examples of this type of minority ethnic downgrading sort of

“putting those upstarts in their place.” Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the whole question of Canadian unity is of such vital importance, evidence of this so-called minority bashing continues.

I have here in my hand Mr. Speaker, two recent articles written on the editorial page of a local newspaper — one under the headline, O Canada — Multiculturalism. It is an article which says in effect to the ethnic community, “We have provided you with a sanctuary, we have given you a new set of rules and obligations; this new world is the ideal, forget your barbaric and backward culture, etc., you are a born-again Canadian.”

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for a person of an ethnic minority not to be offended, nay, Mr. Speaker, to be insulted. I would like to have read some excerpts of that particular article of November 19 in the *Melville Advance* as it was written, supposedly to strengthen and add tissue and substance to Canadian unity but time will not permit me. I will refer to these parts of the article as I replied in the letter to the editor. I will not say the first part except . . . the first quotation:

Over the last century we have welcomed people from many lands and cultures. They have learned new ways and have become full Canadians.

Actually, they are admitting that the foreigners do have culture. Whatever a full Canadian is, I don't understand, and I'm sure nobody else does. May I ask the writer who wrote this, who is we — the Canadian Indian? The English? The French? And pray tell me, what is a full Canadian?

The writer emphasizes the fact that they have learned new ways — meaning the immigrants. There is nothing at all said about the fact that these people from foreign lands have provided a strength and a sinew in the great expansion of the prairie West.

The building and upkeep of the railroads, the expansion of the northern frontiers — nothing is said of their contribution to the Canadian culture. However, the writer openly says that somehow these Canadian immigrants, by denying their identities, by denying their cultural heritage, by denying their roots and history, would become full land better Canadians.

That, of course, Mr. Editor, as I wrote to him is nonsensical and totally unacceptable. Thank heavens most of the Anglo-Saxons in western Canada are not of that frame of mind. One of the most outstanding and well-know Anglo-Canadians of all, Governor General Lord Tweedsmuir, told a great gathering of Ukrainian people in Winnipeg, in 1939 at the dedication ceremonies of a monument dedicated to Taras Shevchenko (a celebrated and famous bard and poet of the Ukraine) the following words. Paraphrased he said this: the mark of a true Canadian is only possible if you know who you are, where you came from, are proud of your ethnic roots and identity, and are proud of your Ukrainian heritage.

Lord Tweedsmuir noted that you cannot be false to your ethnic roots and identity and be true to your adopted land. That I say is equally comparable with and true of multiculturalism.

Somehow in his mind, the writer of that article to the *Melville Advance* on multiculturalism arrives at the conclusion that there is hope — a new trend on the part of governments to encourage new groups of people to resist learning the new ways of the new world, and to impart their old culture and ways to Canada. What a mealy-

mouthed quote in the former part of the sentence, Mr. Editor.

What government is he talking about, specifically? I'm not aware of any government advocating that scenario he outlines. To imply that any government openly encourages resisting learning new ways is ludicrous to say the least — with possibly some truth as far as the province of Quebec is concerned.

The writer goes on to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, "They want Canada to be a land of many cultures." I suppose by "they" he means multiculturalists and some governments. To that I say amen. Canada is richer by far economically as well as culturally for that. It is much more alive, invigorating and exciting because of its diverse people, because of its mosaic composition, its rich identifiable mosaic patterns. It's much better and much more acceptable than that of the United States which personifies sameness and conformity. Our country deserve better than that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What really petrifies me is the following paragraph in the article:

It is impossible to build a great nation if you deliberately divide it into a hundred different groups each speaking a different language.

He ends up by saying "... living in ghettos." The writer is obviously overstating the case, for effect as well. As we all know that would never happen. But let us never forget that it is a fundamental democratic right, in a country like Canada, to speak whatever language we want to speak, to worship in whatever tongue we want to worship, and so down the line.

What the writer is really saying and implying is that it is dangerous for ethnic groups to have the same rights as the majority group. He is saying that the time has come for those foreigners to toe the line, that we have to begin to look the same, to take the same and most fearful of all, to think the same. You must not be different; you must be a cog that fits the big machine with as little variation as possible but preferably with no variation at all. What an ugly repressive picture. And this comes from a spokesman in a newspaper of a society which prides itself that the first and foremost plank of western democracies is individual freedom. Somewhat of a paradox I would say, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — And what is even more frightening, Mr. Editor, (that's the way I write to him) is that if one applies the reasoning outlined in the quote above to our global home, our global nation, the earth, the people of the world will not be allowed to exist in their own cultural state but will be forced to become Anglophones, Francophones, Soviets or (closer to home) Americans. The writer of this article most pointedly alludes to the fact that we must all be part of a whole. He is saying, as it applies to the global situation, that there is no room for a diversity of culture; there is no room for a diversity of language and I suppose there is no room for a diversity of color either. Somehow the writer finds credence in suppression and repression to be the ideal conducive to making a united country. How bitterly ironical and wrong, Mr. Editor.

I say, Mr. Editor, that if we want a united Canada, rich and proud in its diversity, then we will not stifle and suppress our multicultural heritage or the many races and creeds that have made their home in this land, but with every means possible will provide nourishment and encouragement for their development and growth. The writer of the article on multiculturalism is to be pitied rather than condemned. It is quite obvious that

the writer is most certainly not a member of one of our multicultural groups in Saskatchewan. It is very ironical, Mr. Editor, I write, that what we see happening in Canada today is not volatile dissension and reckless abandon by multicultural groups on the question of Canadian unity. No. Nearly all of these multicultural groups are quietly and rationally watching and assessing the situation. However, as the saying goes, still waters run deep, and the agony and suspicion grows when it becomes daily more evident that some of the majority groups in Canada don't give one tinker's damn about the many different ethnic groups that make up a very substantial portion of our western Canadian population. No, Mr. Editor, it's the majority groups of Canada that are wading into the constitutional battle with reckless abandon, strictly concerned for themselves and with their own egotistical interests, even though it means the breaking up of Canada. And I say this in the end of my letter to the editor.

How terribly sad that such ill-conceived verbiage graces the pages of a community newspaper. What a terrible tragedy that the writer identifies opportunity, progress and technology with his interpretation, with his ideal of a golden opportunity, forgetting that all civilizations, in whatever countries, in whatever space or time, are based on the lessons of the past, on the bricks of innovation and halting but progressive advancement in all aspects of life — in the technologies of the humanities or writing literature, etc., etc. — leading to the kind of civilization we have today.

Mr. Speaker, today was built on the bricks of yesterday. But that isn't the only inopportune message that people have attempted to build on ignorance, discrimination and prejudice. In the November 5 issue of the same paper there was another article entitled O Canada and subtitled English Speaking to be Second Class Citizens — not to be worried about in my opinion. I won't read the article except one section of a paragraph.

The great, new, flexible, innovative, vibrant society will be destroyed by giving official and equal status to the backward French culture.

A most unbelievable statement, Mr. Speaker. Regardless of where we stand on the question of bilingualism, that is unbelievable and stupid, in my opinion. Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe that the French culture is backward, where does that leave the ethnic German culture in Canada? The Ukrainian culture? The Jewish culture? The Indian culture? The answer is clear, Mr. Speaker. It leave them even farther below the status attributed to the French culture. The greatness of this nation will not be built by subtracting from its possible potential. Yes, there must be recognition of the two official languages within reasons of practicality, but if this nation is to survive, it must also include recognition of the multicultural aspect of its composition. Saskatchewan is a good example of the mosaic pattern of diverse people. The Melville constituency is equally a population composite of many different races and creeds, as are most constituencies in Saskatchewan. Premier Allan Blakeney is a stalwart supporter and proponent of the multicultural fact.

The Premier of Saskatchewan and the Attorney General, whether at the first premiers conference, or placing Saskatchewan's position in different regions of Canada and in this legislature, continuously stress most emphatically the multicultural aspect of western Canada, and Saskatchewan in particular.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — Being given the position of where this government is and where its Premier stands on multiculturalism, the position of the opposition is not so evident and clear, even here in the legislature. I see by the amendment submitted by the Leader of the Opposition that they have identified compulsory bilingualism as a basic priority. Good, good. But, there is a total silence on multiculturalism. You don't hear much in that regard from the other western premiers either. You would think that Manitoba and Alberta would be cognizant of the mosaic composition of the prairie populace, but that is not so.

Canada today and particularly western Canada is at the crossroads of a monumental decision. In the final analysis, the minority groups of the prairies have, for three-quarters of a century been the most loyal and dedicated adherents to their Queen and country. But I say, that time is running out. The minority groups of the western regions as I have said before, have been quietly and rationally assessing and re-assessing the controversial constitutional situation. Such outright attacks on multiculturalism, as I have laid out before you, can very easily become a key factor as to where the West will go. It can easily turn the tide one way or another.

In the next few months, the direction of ethnic minority alienation could become a real fact. No group, or groups of people in all of Canada, Mr. Deputy Speaker, want so much to be a part of the future Canadian scene as do Canada's minority groups. But that could easily turn; they could easily say "a plague on both your houses." It could well become the straw that broke the crucial debate of western separation. Let's hope that the right will be done and that the West will be won for Canada.

Because this is the last time I will be speaking in the legislature before Christmas, I want to wish you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the rest of the House, a very merry Christmas. To all the people who are going to be celebrating Ukrainian Christmas, I want to say *Chrystos che rozdaye*, *Slaveti Yaho*.

I will be supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I consider it a great honor, every time I rise in this Assembly, to address not only the members of this Assembly, but the people of the Wilkie constituency and all the people of Saskatchewan. I believe in the dignity and individual rights of everyone, whether they be rich or poor.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — I have sat in this Chamber throughout much of this throne debate, and I have heard the Premier and members opposite talk about the new decade — the decade of the '80s — and the great future that lies ahead for Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will turn to that in a moment, but first of all I would like to recognize some of the events that have happened this past year.

I think Celebrate Saskatchewan was the number one event, and it bother me very much when I hear members opposite on the government side, trying to take credit for the great success of Celebrate Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, they say that without them, it wouldn't have happened. Well, I think we have to put the credit where it should go — on the people of Saskatchewan!



**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — These are the people who made Celebrate Saskatchewan happen, these are the people who made Celebrate Saskatchewan a success, and to them I say, thank you very much.

I would now like to review some of this present NDP government's record since 1971. I think two of the things that should be brought to bear right away are two Crown corporations — Sask Tel and Sask Power. I believe that these are both very good, very worthwhile Crown corporations. But what I do question is the financial picture.

Since the Blakeney administration came to power in 1971, and we'll take Sask Tel for an example first of all profits were a little over \$12 million. Last year, in 1979, the profit picture turned to \$25 million. Now is this government trying to tell me and the people of Saskatchewan that when the Sask Tel rates go up that the phone is going to ring louder? It won't. They are turning this good Crown corporation into nothing but an NDP multinational corporation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — Now, I would like to turn to Sask Power. When the Blakeney government came to power in 1971, it had a profit of \$22 million. Last year, in 1979, the profit picture was \$40 million. Now the same thing happens here. Are they trying to tell the people of Saskatchewan that when the Sask Power rates go up and each and every citizen of Saskatchewan has to pay more for power, that the lights are going to be brighter in Saskatchewan? They won't be.

These are just two examples of how the Blakeney administration is managing the business and the taxes of the people of Saskatchewan and trying to balance the budget on the backs of the hard-working taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

I would now like to turn to a statement by the Premier of Saskatchewan where the Premier considers what he is doing. I'll just read one little line to you, Mr. Speaker. It comes on December 2, 1980, by the Hon. Allan Blakeney.

In the past our attention as a government has, as I indicated, been focussed on the basic needs of our people.

When we came to office the grants from the provincial government to Regina were \$900,000. this year they will not be \$900,000 but \$18 million.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, \$18 million. This is a 2000 per cent increase to the city of Regina.

I want it clearly understood that I am not against the city of Regina receiving money from the province of Saskatchewan, but I would just like to point out to the members opposite and also to the people of Saskatchewan how fairly this government deals with people.

In contacting one of my local R.M.s in 1971 they received \$59,474; in 1979, a little over \$100,000. Now that is an 80 per cent increase in cash paid out to the R.M. That's not even near the 2000 per cent increase that was paid out to the city of Regina.

Another example: a town in my constituency on conditional grants receive \$4,600 in 1971; in 1979 it received \$18,644. The record was a little better here. It was a 400 per cent increase. But a 400 per cent increase is a long, long way from a 2000 per cent increase to the city of Regina.

Does this mean that we have to have the gold windows in SGI buildings — all of the administration buildings that are being built in Regina? Does this government not realize Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is a Saskatchewan outside of Regina. Then this government wonders why we have a decline in rural Saskatchewan, in the small towns in rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the result. In reality, those who see this province as a land near social and political perfection are dwelling in a fool's paradise.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would now like to turn to another issue, how this NDP government, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Social Services, deal with problems of the people of Saskatchewan. It has to do with a little seven-year-old girl. The mother was on social assistance. The little girl needed extra summer classes. She was to attend a summer reading clinic. Her teacher spent two hours a week with her every week assisting her. The special education spent on-half hour per day on her speech problem. It was recommended to her by the special education teacher to take these extra classes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I got in touch personally with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Social Services, and the cost for this program was going to be \$225. The local school unit put in \$100. She needed \$125 more for this class. The Minister of Education informed me that he was concerned. But do you know what is answer was, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the request for \$125? His answer was, 'I'm sorry, no.' I say, shame to the minister, shame to the government, shame to everyone who sits on the opposite side of this Chamber. This is how this government treats the young people of Saskatchewan.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the little girl did receive her education, because I took the money out of my MLA's salary and paid her \$125. She did have her classes this summer. It was still paid by the Government of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, here is just part of her report card after taking this. This is from the principal.

She was functioning well at the beginning — grade 2 level in all areas and should not need extra help at school next year. (That's a positive note.) She has made great strides in her ability to sound out new words. Her phonics show an improvement of one and one-half years.

Great! Now, this little girl needed the education and the government opposite would not help her for the sake of \$125. I have had to sit in this Chamber many times and hear of the wealth, the prosperity of this government opposite. That was all I asked for, for a little girl with her mother on social aid, no other funding. If it was my little girl, I had the money for it. But how did they deal with this case? With a big answer of no. I say shame. I will be dealing with this further as the session progresses.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would now like to turn to another area that has to do with government members opposite calling the Progressive Conservatives “separatists,” “western Canadians” and everything else. I just want to inform every member in this Assembly . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What are you?

**MR. GARNER:** — I hear someone ask what I am. I’ll tell you what I am. I lost a grandfather and an uncle in World War I. I had an uncle who was buried over three during World War II. He fought to keep this Canada free. I will not stand here and take it from anyone opposite that I am not a Canadian. I will not sell my farm, because any farmer who sells the topsoil has nothing left. I want us to have a good Saskatchewan, a strong Saskatchewan, a united western Canada, and last of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one Canada. And you know who said that — the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker. If he were here . . . Right now, he would be turning over in his grave if he could hear the members opposite condemning the Progressive Conservatives, when he was the man who put Canada together, who brought in the rights for the individual.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like now to turn to a topic which is not too nice for me in this Assembly. The government members opposite call it land bank. I call it state farming. I think I might as well (since the new member is in here who was the grandfather of land bank) point out to the members opposite just how can a young farmer ever buy land from land bank? If five years ago he couldn’t afford to pay \$50,000 for a section of land, can you tell me how he can afford to spend and pay \$250,000 for it today? It’s impossible, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is why we have lost 8,000 farmers in Saskatchewan since this government came into power.

Another fact which maybe should be pointed out is when a young man, on a land bank lease, goes to the bank to borrow money, his banker asks him, “What do you have for assets?” The young man replies, “Well, I have a land bank lease.” There isn’t one banker in Canada who will use that for collateral to help that young man finance to expand and to get through a tough year.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — How about the credit union?

**MR. GARNER:** — Well, I don’t think even a credit union would do it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You don’t know that.

**MR. GARNER:** — I don’t know that. The member for Regina North-West keep saying that I don’t know that. I can’t hear him because he has an acoustic coupler stuck in his mouth. There isn’t a financial lending institution in the country, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which would loan him money, including credit unions or anyone else. There isn’t anyone. Because he doesn’t own it, except maybe Sedco, my hon. colleague for Maple Creek has brought up. I see the minister shaking his head and nodding yes. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not the direction to go. I believe a positive approach to this would be the policy of the Progressive Conservative Party.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What’s the policy?

**MR. GARNER:** — Well, he asks me what the policy is. We’ll call it a Saskatchewan family farm purchase program. This would allow a young farmer to borrow \$350,000 at 8 per

cent interest for the first five years (that looks pretty attractive right off the top), and 12 per cent or prime (whichever is lower) for the remainder of the pay-back period. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a positive program which would get young farmers back on the land and give them the opportunity to own it and not be running a farm just for the Government of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is just a prime example of how naive the Premier of Saskatchewan is when it comes to dealing with land bank or agricultural policies. In his speech of December 2, on page 108 (had better put 1980 because some of the other members opposite might miss that point), he states in there:

There have been 2,700 land bank leases, 4,200 FarmStart loans, (he puts it all together and he has) 7,000 new farmers.

Well, I mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker, now come on. Even the members opposite who do have an agricultural background, surely should be able to see through this, and I know the Minister of Agriculture can see through it, because there is no way that you have 2,700 land bank leases and 4,200 FarmStart loans. They have to have a FarmStart loan in order to get going in land bank. This is the way this government deals with the farmers and the people from rural Saskatchewan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is no wonder that rural Saskatchewan is declining and declining rapidly.

Oh, I hear the minister of feed grains talking again now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would now like to turn to the Department of Social Services. This is another almost horror story by the Government of Saskatchewan. I'll just give you one case as an example (I could give you 100, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but we don't want to be sitting that late tonight), a man paralysed with polio, living in his own home and the Department of Social Services will give him only \$100 a month for food, clothing and miscellaneous. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we know very well that man, unable to work, staying in his own home, not only cannot live high on the hog—he's lucky if he sees any hog at all in a month.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we now go to level 3 care in the province of Saskatchewan. What does this government do with level 3 care? They drain the resources of the pioneers of Saskatchewan down to \$1,500 and after they have drained all of their resources they turn around and say, "Well here's the last shot in the teeth. We're going to put you on social aid." Now isn't that just a great thing to have to do to your senior citizens, to the pioneers who build this country which we are living on the fruits of today? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I personally don't want to do that. I don't like to see a government do that. And this is the government which tells us of the millions of dollars they are making in all the resource revenues. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this government would follow the example of the B.C., Alberta and Manitoba governments, and gear that fee to the old age pension and supplement, maybe some of these people could retain their pride and retain some of their dignity. But this government is not concerned about senior citizens, as I've just proved they are not concerned about the young people in Saskatchewan and the education program.

Now since this is 1981 (or going to be the year 1981), the year of the handicapped, I think all of you members will remember what happened last year in the Assembly with the member for North Battleford. We still have another young Saskatchewanite

wanting to work, wanting an opportunity. And I just wonder if in this upcoming session with a new minister of highways — and yet I see it is very difficult for the Premier to reach for a minister of highways . . . I was thinking it was going to be a long reach but I don't think that any more. He just can't go anywhere for a minister of highways. Maybe he will continue with the present Minister of Highways. If he does, the young man, Mr. Randy Wangler, won't get the chance to take a test. Butt here's just another example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, — a young man who wants to work, wants the opportunity, and this government says no again. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is getting to be known as the “no” government when dealing with people and people's problems.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've introduced a bill into this Chamber, an act to amend The Vehicles Act (I think this must be the third time around). I don't see how many member of this Legislative Assembly can oppose this bill on the order paper. And if they do, or if a member does, I promise that member right now that there will be a mail-out to every one of his constituents. I am not kidding. This is a housekeeping bill that should have been passed years ago. We could have prevented accidents and injury, but it seems that this government will not act unless someone is killed. We have had evidence that they don't even act when that happens. It brings to mind the bus accident down on that south highway when the Progressive Conservatives called to double lane it.

Well, I must be truthful. I didn't think it should be double laned. I thought perhaps money should be spent elsewhere, until I travelled that road this summer with my young son. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have had in the past Kramer's cow path, that's a death path and that's the only way to describe it.

If this government cannot negotiate to get funds from the federal government, well, just maybe some of this resource revenue they tell us about could be put into that. But once again, nothing was done. And now my colleague for Maple Creek tells me there were two more people killed on that stretch of road the other day, too. Small children, senior citizens — people being killed doesn't disturb this government one bit.

One of the reasons I introduced this bill was that I believe our children are the most important resource we have in Saskatchewan. It is my job as a parent first and a politician second, to protect them and their interests. I am concerned about it, as every other member in this legislative Chamber should be. I say now to the Attorney General, you are the one who controls this Chamber; you are the one who calls the shots. How about it if we put politics to the side and bring in this bill? Let's not have it stalled on the order paper. The decision is in your hands and no one else's.

I would now like to turn to strikes in the province of Saskatchewan. You know, at the last two openings, and I think that is one of the greatest days in the year — at least it used to be . . . Now every time I come in from my constituency and bring people in, they say, “Jim, are we going to have to cross a picket line?” And this is just what happens. Last year we had the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association) workers on strike. The government had them walking in the cold. They couldn't sit down to negotiate a deal. We had the dairy workers on strike — thousands of gallons of milk dumped before we finally got them back. That is a waste because the people in this province could have consumed it themselves.

We go to the ambulance workers, another very important service on strike. We turn now to liquor board employees. They're on strike. This just seems to be an annual staged event in the province of Saskatchewan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Which side are you on?

**MR. GARNER:** — Which side am I on, they say. Well, is there any other side to be on but the side of the people? I am going to read just how concerned this government was with the strike, and how the minister in charge of the liquor board answered the question in a joking fashion, the question being:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board. In view of the fact that 53 of the 83 provincial government liquor board stores now are closed in the province and over 100 employees have been locked out, will the minister assure the private vendors and hotel-restaurant industry that they will receive their products so the employees will not nose the jobs? Will this government now stop the confrontation tactics between the liquor board employees and the Government of Saskatchewan? And when will negotiations start taking place in good faith before all the government liquor stores in the province are closed?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, his answer was:

If the member had read the press release yesterday, we indicated that as long as we could, we would continue to serve the special liquor vendors and provide liquor to the hotel and the restaurant industry. We intend to do that to the best of our ability with management personnel. With respect to the tactics used, I have no particular comment there except to say that the liquor board is prepared to negotiate at any time.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, negotiation through the paper, through the media — is that how we settle strikes in Saskatchewan? By advertising in the paper? No, that is not the way. That is the way this present socialist government intends to settle strikes, and the strike are not being settled.

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, could you tell this Assembly how much revenue has been lost by this strike which is this NDP government's annual staged event? And how do you intend to recover this lost revenue?

Now here is the fact right now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by the Hon. Mr. Cowley.

My rough estimate at this point in time, the result of the strike is an increase in revenue of about \$8 million.

Now, strikes making money for the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I can't buy that and I don't think the members opposite can buy that either.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, how many people have to walk before Christmas? Christmas is the time of families. What a way to celebrate Christmas — to be on strike, to be without pay. Is there concern by the government members opposite? No, no, no. Mr. Deputy Speaker, once again we get back to the "no" government of Saskatchewan, to the government that doesn't care about the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Labor recently let go, I think an employee who was pretty good. My colleague said "fired." I wasn't going to use such strong terminology. He fired Mr. Ron Duncan. Why was Mr. Ron Duncan fired? Was it because he couldn't

get along with the new deputy minister or was it because this government intends to bring in a no-strike clause? Is that the real reason why Mr. Ron Duncan was fired — that the Minister of Labor knew that Mr. Duncan would not go along with this theory.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Labor has not been handling the labor problems in Saskatchewan. It seems to me that he is causing the problems in Saskatchewan. No negotiations. Don't sit down at the table.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, anyone can come to an agreement. You sit down at that table long enough and talk. But when a government starts confrontation tactics, of course somebody's going to leave the table. But do they care? No. They get their salary. They'll have a nice Christmas, but how about the employees? How about the employees who have been locked out? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. My colleague says, "Who cares about them?" This government doesn't care about them, that's for sure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to turn to another section of this government, and it has to do with Sask Tel. When we start talking about Sask Tel, we start talking about Bill 13. Mr. Speaker, I blame the minister in charge of Sask Tel for introducing Bill 13 to take over total control of telecommunications in the province.

When this session started, Mr. Speaker, I questioned the minister (it maybe sounds trivial or won't seem like much to some members of this Assembly) about the new Zenith space phone receiver. I asked the minister if it could be connected in Saskatchewan. I knew it couldn't be purchased. He went into a long speech. Mr. Speaker, I will read a part of a sentence. ". . . it cannot be used and the regulations today are no different than they were in 1928."

Is this a modern government with modern ideas on how to handle modern technology when we are being governed by regulations from 1928? No.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a Telex I received from the head of Zenith sales for North America. It reads:

Dear Mr. Garner:

In response to your request as to the reasons you could not purchase a Zenith space phone television receiver in Saskatchewan, please be advised that while we are able to market our space phone television receivers in all provinces of Canada, we are not permitted to do so in the province of Saskatchewan.

Our attempts to market our space phone television receivers in the province of Saskatchewan was blocked by Saskatchewan Telecommunications. Mr. J.G. McGregor, assistant vice-president, planning and development, Saskatchewan Telecommunications, advised us of the following: "Within Saskatchewan, The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act prohibits the connection of customer provided network and non-network connecting loudspeaking devices to Sask Tel's switching network. The Zenith space phone falls into this category. In addition, the act also prohibits the advertisement and sale of equipment which is not permitted by the regulations . . ."

Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about the regulations of 1928. The only thing which reminds me of 1928, Mr. Speaker, is a car which my father is restoring out in his shop this winter. Now that car he is restoring is a heck of a lot different than the car which I drive to Regina.

I will repeat a portion of the quote:

“In addition, the act also prohibits the advertisement and sale of equipment which is not permitted by the regulations to be attached and whose primary or advertised purpose is to connect to Sask Tel's facilities.

If national advertising of the Zenith space phone is planned, a disclaimer stating that the space phone is not available in Saskatchewan should be inserted to satisfy the requirements of The Telecommunications Act.”

Now Mr. Speaker, that points out that Sask Tel has taken over not only the monopoly of manufacturing, sales, leases, but even advertising. Is this government opposite trying to tell me that every other province in Canada is wrong and only Sask Tel is right? No. Mr. Speaker, they're not. It's just one more step, in fact it's a backward step, Mr. Speaker, showing how this government is running the province of Saskatchewan and not allowing people this new technology in Saskatchewan. They're not allowed to buy it and now allowed to connect it. And this is a government by the people? This is a government dictating to the people, Mr. Speaker. I don't doubt that in the upcoming year or years there will be many more pieces of equipment which someone will want to connect to Sask Tel lines and the answer will be no.

Mr. Speaker, I always like to have an alternative. It's very easy to stand here and criticize the government. If we back up to Sask Tel and Sask Power rates and also to Bill 13, I think it's time that this government implemented a public utilities review board in order to have some independent expertise making this decision — not the minister, not anyone else — so that there's another avenue, Mr. Speaker, whether it be for Zenith or word processors or whatever, if the minister of Sask Tel or Sask Tel employees say they can't connect. It's there in Alberta and in other provinces and it should be here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, now I'd like to turn to the natural gas distribution system which we have in Saskatchewan or, as my colleague says, which we don't have — 10 to 15 per cent in rural Saskatchewan. This government likes to compare us with Alberta, so let us compare with Alberta at 85 per cent. No wonder that province is going ahead. No wonder they're making money on their oil resources. Mr. Speaker, it's time to start switching rural Saskatchewan over to natural gas so that this other energy can be used in farm tractors, in diesel trains. It's a good policy. It's a common-sense policy. But then, Mr. Speaker, I could see that would shoot right over a lot of the members' heads.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Well, this is not a common-sense government.

**MR. GARNER:** — Yes. My colleague says it is not a common-sense government and I have to agree with him. Mr. Speaker, 10 to 15 per cent is not very large in Saskatchewan. Since oil exploration has happened a little in my constituency, there have been many gas wells found on local farmers' lands. We have lots of gas in



Saskatchewan. Why can those farmers not get connected at a reasonable cost? Why can this government not bring forth a positive program to connect them? Well, they say no. We're back to the "no" government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that the government would ever be listening to the opposition, but I must confess, this one time they did. It has to do with the mandatory firearms training program. For two years I called for a mandatory firearms training program, along with the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation. I want to give them most of the credit. Finally, they brought a new minister into the department who seems to be responding to their wishes and to the wishes of the opposition. To the minister and to the government opposite, I say thank you for this program because if only one life is saved it will be well worth the whole program.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources moved through an order in council and really hit the cottage owners in the provincial parks. Last session I asked twice, I believe, what the rate increase was going to be. The minister said, "It will be ready in one week." I asked him one week later, "Oh, give me two weeks." Two weeks later, no answer. So this summer, through their great little democratic circle they call the cabinet, bang, there was a 150 per cent increase, a 200 per cent increase.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Tell the truth!

**MR. GARNER:** — 'Tell the truth,' the minister says. When a man pays land rental which rises from \$90 to \$150 or from \$100 to \$240, that is a little much. Anyone can live with an increase of 10 per cent, maybe even 15 per cent. But when you get hit with a plus 100 per cent, that's not fair. Why, Mr. Speaker, did they bring that order in council in and not do it through the legislative Chamber? Could it be that they think the people of Saskatchewan will not fight back, that they will say, "The heck with it, you can take our cottage; just absorb that in another socialist grab."

Mr. Speaker, an order in council almost eliminates the Legislative Assembly. I would like to dwell on that for a moment. What is the point of having a Legislative Assembly with 61 members? We sit long enough in a year. The government bring in the bills; we scrutinize them, the government records; then in the summer we get an order in council. What response do we get on this? Nothing. Are we going to be wasting the taxpayers' dollars in Saskatchewan for another session because for anything the government wants to do when we are out of session they will pass an order in council? So what do we have? We have the cabinet running the province of Saskatchewan, not just the NDP government and all of its members. I feel sorry for the backbenchers once in a while. I know it must be very depressing to have to sit there day after day, and get two speeches in a year. It must be hard. But you are sitting on the government side at least. But maybe not for long when the people of Saskatchewan get this. Mr. Speaker, every time this government moves, it erodes a little more power and a little more freedom from the people of Saskatchewan. They say the end justifies the means. But some of the means concern me when it comes to passing orders in council. Things happen and as a member of the Saskatchewan legislature, I don't know about them until after the order in council is passed. How can I defend and stand up for the people of Saskatchewan when you have this little socialist circle called the cabinet, which waves its magic wand and bang, it hits the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — The socialist sickle!

**MR. GARNER:** — My colleague says “the socialist sickle.” Well, I have another name for it but I will not use it.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other area I would like to go into that is the air service in the province of Saskatchewan. This has to do with why we don't have business — why business aborts Saskatchewan and goes to Alberta. The money market and the businesses are moving from the East. We have two major cities in the province of Saskatchewan. (I harped about this for two years; I won on the mandatory firearms training program, and I might win on this one.) During the week on this mighty wing we call Norcanair, we get air service between the two cities of three flights a day whether we need it or not. We generally need it. When it comes to the weekend you can fly into Regina, you can fly into Saskatoon, with many other air services. Can you commute back and forth? No. Norcanair doesn't fly on weekends. So that means we shut down the province for Saturday and Sunday. Then they wonder why Saskatchewan isn't going ahead. Progressive businesses will not come to this province when they can't move around. Now in the by-elections the member for The Battlefords promised air service from North Battleford. I'll be waiting for that air service. That's just like reaching for pies in the sky. When we can't get air service between the new major cities . . . I want us to have air service from North Battleford and other cities in the North. But he's kidding himself and flirting with the truth with the people of North Battleford if he thinks he can get them air service.

I think that I have brought it to the attention of this government opposite. I have drawn on examples of senior citizens; of a little seven-year old girl (an personally it hurts me very much that she couldn't get her education in the province of Saskatchewan); what the government is doing with the crown corporations — turning them into their own multinational NDP socialist corporation. I like Sask Tel and I like Sask Power. They can be good. They will be good, under a Progressive Conservative government. I have no choice, from what I brought forward describing how this government is handling senior citizens, children in Saskatchewan, business and farmers, but to oppose the motion. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — Mr. Speaker, It's a pleasure for me to take part in the throne speech today. I have a number of comments to make about this announcement. First I would like to welcome to this Assembly the member for Estevan, Jack Chapman, and the member for The Battlefords, David Miner.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacAULEY:** — I also want to welcome the member for Kelsey-Tisdale, Mr. Hardy. I wish them well here, in their service in the House.

We have lost two long-time ministers. Mr. Kramer, who has served in Battleford for 28 years, will be missed in the Assembly as he was a great speaker. Also Mr. Jack Messer for Kelsey-Tisdale, who served in the House for some ten years in a minister's position and also served three years as an MLA, served well in his capacity as a member for this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to hear the throne speech promise a new system of local government in the North. In 1972 when the Department of Northern Saskatchewan

was formed only 60 per cent of the people in the northern administration district had some form of municipal government. Only two schools — one at Uranium City in Mr. Thompson's riding, and the other one in Creighton in my riding — had elected school boards. Then in 1973 a meeting was held in La Ronge to talk about the system that would let Northerners govern themselves where local issues were concerned. The result was that a northern municipal council was set up to the following year. The northern municipal council has served well in the last six years, but not it's time to move to another stage of local government. The NDP believes strongly in bringing local governments closer to the people and to the system of municipal representation in the North, as you will see from the example I have just given.

I want to point out that the people of northern Saskatchewan already have moved a long way since 1972. One hundred per cent of the people in the NAD (northern administration district) now enjoy the right to elect municipal governments and 100 per cent of the schools now are run by elected school boards. They have Mr. Blakeney to thank for these things.

Mr. Speaker, the changes talked about in the last speech would do three things. First, the northern municipal governments will be given formal authority in local and regional concerns of community residents. Secondly, there will be much more northern input into the direction of northern development. This is something which Judge Bayda called for in the Cluff Lake inquiry. Finally, the changes will bring local government closer to the people it represents.

These changes are very welcome in the North, Mr. Speaker, and as in so many other areas, Northerners have come to know that they have a friend in the Blakeney government.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see the throne speech talk about protecting the wilderness areas, keeping our environment clean. People in the Cumberland constituency are very interested in taking care of the northern environment.

Mr. Speaker, much of our valuable timber was destroyed by fire in the past summer. When this happens it sets off a change reaction as follows:

1. Many of the fur-bearing animals are killed or flee to another part of the country, leaving trappers without fur in their areas;
2. We lose the economic benefits we would have derived from the forest timber that is burned;
3. Thousands of dollars have been spent fighting fires, money which could have been spent in other important areas of endeavor;
4. Many of the people are left without employment in the northern area as the fires take their toll as they go through. We had a little bit of this in the dry area of this province and we realize something out of that area. This is exactly what has happened to the northern people in my area.

Whenever this happens, Mr. Speaker, and whichever way people want to look at it many of these fires are caused by carelessness. Some are caused by natural causes, such as when lightning strikes but, however, most of them are set by people travelling

through the northern areas. I want to point out to impress our people holidaying in the North, and indeed those living in the North today, to take extreme care in extinguishing fires in that north country. If this is not done, it will cause a lot of problems, such as unemployment, as I mentioned.

The Blakeney government has spent a considerable amount of money buying equipment and airplanes for the use of protecting our forests, but if the public does not co-operate, no amount of money or equipment will relieve the situation such as occurred last summer.

I would like to say a word or two about the constitution. It appears to us, in this province, that the meetings which have been taking place between the premiers and the Prime Minister of this country, have in many ways caused us to drift further away from the hope of agreement on bringing the constitution to this country.

We hear the people to the west of us talking about separation from the rest of Canada. It is very sad to hear about what is taking place there. Those of us who have fought in the two world wars . . . If those same people had to go through what we did, they would think differently today of separating from the rest of Canada. We were told after we joined the forces, that you work for one Canada and one Canada only, to protect your parents, your children and their children's children. That's what we were told when we put the uniform on. I want the people in this province and in Canada to understand what has taken place in that area. It was something that we contributed and I hope it's being respected. It's too soon to forget about those things. It is very necessary for all of us to remember that we are all Canadians, whatever ethnic backgrounds we come from, and we should all work together in Canada. We must be calm and determined to keep our country together. We have much to lose if this takes place in our country. I think we should follow our Premier in the direction he is going, remain calm and listen to what is taking place in this province and in the rest of Canada. Let us not be foolish and get carried away by what is happening in this area. There may be more than meets the eye to what is taking place in the political life and in other areas in this country.

Many of us realize that we have relatives living in the eastern part of the province, and to the west, and we must not work against them or see them working against each other. We must fight to control, and work to see that this thing is corrected. I think our Premier stands for this and we should all stand with him in correcting this problem.

Mr. Speaker, we may laugh at our neighbors to the South when they put their flags up and sing their national anthem at the top of their voices but I think that's what this country needs today — all Canadian should work together and be proud to be Canadian, not have just half-measures in n what is happening in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are problems in the country, but as you hear the Minister of Agriculture say, "We should work to see that these things are settled not only in this province but in the rest of Canada."

I want to say now that I am very happy I was able to say a few words, and I will be voting with the members on this side of the House and supporting the throne speech.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — It is a pleasure to once again rise in this Assembly to debate the throne speech.

I wish to thank the constituents of Arm River for their continued support. During this past summer, I had the privilege of travelling throughout the constituency attending Celebrate Saskatchewan activities. This gave me the opportunity to meet many constituents and former residents of the communities.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the government for its Celebrate Saskatchewan program. I wish to congratulate the winners of the three by-elections, and welcome each one of them to this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I have three main requests from the constituency of Arm River, and they are under these topics: natural gas, irrigation, and the senior citizens' home.

Natural gas in the constituency of Arm River has become quite a concern to a few people. In 1969, Mr. Speaker, they put natural gas from Saskatoon down as far as Craik on Highway No. 11 and at the same time they brought it down Highway No. 2 to Holdfast, on the Imperial-Simpson line, but since 1969 we have had no more gas brought to our small towns and to the farmers close by. Now this is becoming a great concern because after 11 years we ask, "Why is there no natural gas in these towns?"

In the Outlook to Elbow line, they have petitioned several times, and were told yes. The power corporation said, "Absolutely, you can put natural gas in, but you have to pay the full shot." When they put the gas line in on Highway No. 11, the government paid the full amount to bring it in and the people just had to hook on to the main lines in the towns. Now they tell them, from Outlook to Elbow, that they will have to pay the full amount of the main line coming in, which they can't possibly do. They can't afford this.

We have an area from Aylesbury, Chamberlain, and going into Thunder Creek constituency, Findlater, Bethune. These people want natural gas just as much as they do on my line or the rest of the lines of the North. What is the holdup here? Why don't we have natural gas in this area? Back in the 1940s we could have power brought in by the same government at \$600 per farm. They tell me today that it cost less money to bury a gas line than it does to put a power line in. What's the holdup here? Why can we not have natural gas on our farms? We have power on our farms. I ask this very important question on behalf of the people of Arm River.

There's the Minister of the Environment already saying no way. He doesn't want it. But I'll bet you he has it on his farm . . . or awfully close to it. He'll get it! . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I want that on the record. The Minister of Environment says he has it on his farm.

Well, then, he's a very lucky man. I was in Yorkton on the weekend and I was talking to a farmer who is 186 feet from the main line. He built a new home and wants gas put into that home — \$4,000. The contractor said he could hook it up at cost — \$600.

Did the Minister of Environment pay \$600 or \$4,000? He says he has it on his farm. I just cannot figure out why we don't have it.

If I have all these town in my constituency that don't have natural gas, how many more are there in the province of Saskatchewan? I'll tell the government opposite that since you came into power in 1971, there has been almost nil for natural gas to small towns and farmers in Saskatchewan. You're going backward; you're not going ahead. And

don't tell me to take it easy, because this is serious.

We have petitions going now in my area. I'll tell you what we're going to do in Arm River: we're going to get natural gas. If you are a government like you say you are — that you'll do what the people want — then, when my people come with their petition, they'll get it.

The other very important issue in my constituency is irrigation. Outlook is in my constituency. This is where the government did start this irrigation program. But why didn't they do like Alberta did in the summer? They put another \$340 million into irrigation. What do you fellow do? You don't even take care of what's there! Mr. Minister of Agriculture, you are not even taking care of the ditches that are already there. The alkali is coming up through the ditches.

I have brought this concern up for three years. Here goes the Minister of Environment again. He's always thinking that anything the opposition says is tommyrot. I have many things to say about the environment. He better stick to doing something about PCBs in drinking water. Never mind worrying about natural gas and irrigation.

Why can't we, in this province, have more irrigation when we have nearly a third of our province lying in water? We have it in the states to the north or south of us, we go down on a trip through the farming areas and see they have irrigation. We go to Alberta and see they have irrigation. We come to Saskatchewan and we have a little tiny spot in Outlook where we have irrigation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They have it on my side, but what about over in Rosetown? In the Hon. Mr. Swan's constituency it is just about at a standstill.

Now last summer . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Do you have irrigation on your farm?

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — No, I don't have irrigation on my farm. The only way I'll ever get irrigation on my farm is to put it in at my own cost, because these people are not going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, last summer we had an emergency in this province. It was drought, and we had a shortage of hay. Why did we have to worry about bringing in hay from the States, Alberta and Ontario? Why are we not irrigating here in this province and growing hay to build up a hay bank when years are good, that will serve the farmers in a bad year such as last year? Why did the farmers have to get taken like they did last year?

Our Minister of Agriculture and the federal Minister of Agriculture completely blundered on the cattle and hay subsidy programs. In the month of April, I had a list of people in Ontario from whom we could buy hay for \$60 a ton. Then the two governments became mixed up in it and up went the price. They put a subsidy in from here and from the East. And who was getting that extra dollar? The farmer in Ontario was getting it. The farmers and the truckers were getting it and the farmers here had to pay the same costs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I can't understand, Mr. Speaker, why we cannot get speakers from the other side of the House for one week. Mr. Mostoway, the Government Whip, told me that we just can't get speakers, but when I'm up speaking we seem to suddenly have lots of them. There's two and a half hours left after supper tonight, so they'll have their chance.

Another main concern in Arm River is about a senior citizens' home. I have had requests from the area to the south, which includes the Craik, Holdfast, Aylesbury, Chamberlain, Tugaskie and Dilke areas. The only home the people from these areas have to place their loved ones in is located in Davidson. This home only holds about 20 people and continually has a five- to ten-year waiting list. In the summer of 1980 I went to the minister and asked what I could do to help the people get a senior citizens' home in their area. He said to go home and make formal applications through the municipalities and towns, and a survey would then be taken.

A year will soon have passed and we haven't had any results; we haven't even heard from them. In the meantime our own survey shows that we have enough loved ones from our area in various homes in Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw to immediately fill a home in the Craik-Aylesbury area. Why fool around with surveys? That's just talk. The people have said they want a home and we have people who want to go into a home. Why has the Minister of Social Services been putting me off for almost a year now, saying they are doing a survey when no one has been contacted in this last year?

There is going to be some action now, Mr. Speaker. Just as I said there is going to be some action on natural gas and irrigation, now there is going to be some action on a senior citizens' home in our community because the people say there is going to be one built. You have to do what the people say they want or you are not living up to your responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to turn to *Hansard* now. On page 99 there is a remark by the Premier in his throne speech that is just a little more than I can take. He was speaking about a comment made by our leader, Grant Devine. The Premier says:

He (Mr. Devine) is already on record as saying that four out of five farmers should go.

The Premier sits over there and says that our leader says four out of five farmers should go. It's written right here in *Hansard*.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What page, Gerry?

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Page 99. And he also says we have too many senior citizens. I will tell you (and I want this on the record) that this is an absolute lie from the Premier. It is an absolute falsehood. It is absolutely . . . Who is called order? Nobody is calling order. Who would want to call order? Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I will take the member for Yorkton on a point of order.

**MR. NELSON:** — The member for Arm River said that the Premier had spoken an outright lie. I would request him to withdraw the statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well, I think all members are familiar with the rules of the House with regard to the use of that type of language in this House in that it is unparliamentary. While I didn't hear the comment from the member for Arm River, I will take his word as to whether he said it or not. If he did say it, I would ask him to withdraw it.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. I got carried away on this terrific statement by the Premier. I did say that word. But I withdraw the word. I'll just say that it

is definitely a falsehood.

Mr. Speaker, the statement which the Premier has been talking about (the Attorney General was heckling a while ago here) that our leader, Mr. Devine, say there are 67,000, or thereabout, people on welfare, the same number there are farmers — the Premier takes those words and he twists them all around and he says, “You Tories want to cut them off.” Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, these are not the words of the Premier of a year or two ago. Because, Mr. Speaker, when I read these statements from the Premier last night, then turned back and read his throne speech from a year ago and two years ago, it is not the same man talking.

What has happened to the Premier? Is the Premier running scared that he has to sue these kinds of tactics? I’ve known the Premier since the time he was elected in 1971. I’ve always said, there’s a man who, even though we don’t agree with his philosophy, at least stood up as a man in this House and never belittled anybody. But now you had better clap for him because Mr. Premier has placed himself in trouble. You should have heard coffee row in my constituency. They couldn’t believe that this came over the air, that the Premier of this province would stand up and say something like this, that four out of five farmers have to go. Now every one of you over there knows that Mr. Devine never made that statement. Not one person will agree with that. You know that he didn’t say it. You know that he did not say that the senior citizens must go. That is our conniving Premier putting in words and twisting them, twisting the words . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Never mind, I have a little go for Sedco. I have a go for you in a minute. If I were the minister of Sedco, I would be down so low in my seat that I would never come up with even a word.

I’ll tell you where we stand on welfare in this province, Mr. Speaker. I’ll tell the NDP opposite where we stand on welfare. We don’t want to cut anybody off. Nobody is going to cut anybody off welfare. All right, now we’ve heard. They are all twisters over there. Every one of them is twisting. I’ll tell you what we want to do. For the people who are on welfare and are ill, we want to give them ore. But for the other people who aren’t (who are strong and healthy), we will find them a job. You people won’t do it. Our goal is to provide full employment in the province, so that for everyone willing and able to work, there will be a job available in the market place.

Mr. Speaker, for the Premier to state, as he has in his speeches, that my party would cut off welfare to all citizens is yet another example of NDP scare tactics — statements which have no basis in truth. I’ll tell you why. These people are twisting the truth on welfare because they are only interested in one thing when it comes to welfare, and that’s the vote. That’s all they are interested in. When I call on doors in Arm River I receive lots of requests from people wanting welfare. When I see somebody needing welfare who has no job, whether healthy or not, (and this can be proven, because I’ve done it), I’ll fight to get him/her welfare before I have him/her go hungry. And I’ll fight as much as any one of you people. I’ve done it. Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I’m sure that the member for Moose Jaw, who was just heckling there, if he saw me without a job and I was down and out, I’m sure that he’d be the first one in the officer to get me some welfare. Just to show you that what’s going on in this province, in 1960 some wheat pool statistics came out. I was secretary of the wheat pool committee for 13 years. These statistics came from the wheat pool saying at that time that each person who worked provided for five people. But it also said that by 1970 it would be one providing for 12. By 1978, when I ran in the last election, the statistics were that one person was providing for 17. What’s going wrong? Is that an improvement?



Something's going wrong. No one says that we want to cut anyone off, but you people or somebody has to do something about getting it down.

Mr. Minister, sitting over there yapping away, will you tell me that people on welfare are proud people and wouldn't like to be taken off? The member for Meadow Lake says that he has many people who are proud people, the native people. "Get me a job." Why didn't you take your potash money?

I'll tell you what you've done wrong. Millions and millions of borrowed money went to take over the potash in this province. You never really balanced the books, did you? They didn't balance the books because if you were going to balance them right they would have to take what would have happened the other route. What would have happened if you had borrowed the same amount of money and started up some new enterprise that would employ some more people and give more people jobs? You didn't do anything. The minister responsible for Sedco seems to be very excited about the words I'm saying. I will say that he does do his best to supply people with jobs by giving out loan after loan after loan to NDP hacks. I see that I cannot finish by the allotted time. I have more to say. Can I call it 5 o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.