

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**December 7, 1981**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**QUESTIONS**

**Assistance to Cattle Industry**

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, it's been true for many years that Alberta agriculture, specifically the farmers and ranchers, is in a much more advantageous competitive position than is the case in Saskatchewan, due to factors such as climate, 50 per cent less tax, access to irrigation and natural gas; their costs of doing business are much less.

Mr. Minister, last year you introduced into this Assembly a Bill on beef stabilization. You indicated at that time the expenditures on the cattle industry, supposedly to stabilize it, would be in the area of \$5 million. The minister, I'm sure, is aware that last week the Alberta Minister of Agriculture announced a program for the cattle industry in Alberta and the amount of money to be injected into that beef cattle economy was \$136 million. My question to the minister is simply this: would the minister acknowledge that this \$136 million versus \$5 million will further increase the competitive advantage that Alberta cattlemen have over their Saskatchewan counterparts?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am surprised at the question of the hon. member for Thunder Creek, because down through the years I thought his position with respect to the beef industry and government was that the beef industry should be left alone and there should be no government intervention at all.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hon. member's specific question, as it relates to the program in Alberta, I take the position here on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan that our program in Saskatchewan is far superior to the program in Alberta. I say to the hon. member opposite that it's superior because it's not just around for one year; it's for year and year and years ongoing. I note, Mr. Speaker, three times in the statements by the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Alberta, that this is a one-time program as far as the Alberta beef producers are concerned. They are asking, as legitimately they should, what's going to happen next year and the year after. Producers in Saskatchewan have that answer under the Saskatchewan Beef Stabilization Plan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the minister. Had I not known better, and knowing how well you abide by Mr. Speaker's rulings, I might have thought that you were debating at that point.

Mr. Minister, your program does not take into account the cow-calf operator in the province of Saskatchewan. Recently a study was released by an economist at Oklahoma State University, whose name and specifics I can provide, which showed very clearly that the people who have been ravaged the worst (in contrast to the

commonly held belief) are the cow-calf operators. The commonly held belief has been that it has always been the feedlots. In fact, the study clearly shows that they have been ravaged by interest rates probably twice as badly as any other section. Mr. Minister, I suppose it is fair to say that this study would correlate with the Canadian situation reasonably accurately.

In light of the depressed calf prices that we have experienced in Saskatchewan this fall, I would like to ask the minister whether he would consider including (that is assuming they would wish to go in it) the cow-calf operator in the beef stabilization program, instead of forcing this operator to enter into an operation for which he is not set up, which would require a high capital cost and which really is an artificial thing so far as this use of custom feedlots is concerned?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the cow-calf operator, I think the hon. member opposite will agree that you can only stabilize an animal once. We believe that the stabilization should take place where the producer can receive the most. We believe that the stabilization should take place where the total industry and the province can receive the most gain. It seems to us (and I think the producers in Saskatchewan agree) that you gain the most by stabilizing at the slaughter level and not at the calf level. I don't think there is any question that stabilizing at the slaughter level, rather than the calf level, will strengthen the overall beef industry in the province of Saskatchewan. Instead of the calves moving to be fed in other provinces, we will see more and more of them fed here in the province of Saskatchewan. Surely the hon. member would agree that that has some wisdom and is a good objective.

Two interesting things have happened as a result of the announcement and the delivery of this plan, which takes effect January 1. First, we have seen a strengthening of calf prices in the province of Saskatchewan in the last two or three weeks. I do not have the figures with me, but I will be glad to bring them to the legislature and present them to the hon. member. Calf prices are stronger than in Alberta or Manitoba.

The second thing for the hon. member to take notice of is that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool reports that 35 per cent of the calves that normally move into the calf market in the fall are still on the farms. I think those two points, plus the whole issue of where you should stabilize, give a strengthening position to the Saskatchewan beef plan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the minister, and I truly wish Mr. Speaker would let me debate in order to show the ignorance the minister shows concerning the beef cattle industry.

Mr. Minister, the Alberta program is very simple and straightforward. It simply pays \$50 per bred cow or heifer with a 90 per cent inventory, as of September 1. It doesn't matter how big you are; it doesn't matter who you are; it doesn't matter where you are; and it doesn't matter whether you wish to enrol in some specific program or not. The total comes to some \$136 million. Mr. Minister, your program will total about \$5 million, and to enrol in it the producer must tie himself into a web of bureaucracy. Isn't it true that you and your government are merely trying to socialize the cattle industry and are using bureaucratic red tape as a means of accomplishing an end which you have never been able to do before?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to debate with the hon. member

opposite, as he is intent on having me do. I'll just make the point, Mr. Speaker, with the hon. member opposite, that I do not believe — and the producers in Alberta will find out — the Alberta program is meaningful. I suggest to the hon. member that when he sees the impact of the Saskatchewan program on beef producers in the first quarter, he will agree with me that the program in Alberta is not as meaningful as Saskatchewan's will be. I say it is not meaningful, Mr. Speaker, because it bears no relationship to the cost of production. The Saskatchewan program bears a relationship to the cost of production, and if I ever saw a political program — he talks about a political program in Saskatchewan . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I don't want the Minister of Agriculture, through his bad habits, to encourage the member for Thunder Creek to debate issues in question period.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Final supplementary to the minister, and it's a very short one. Mr. Minister, would it be fair to characterize the difference between the two programs as simply this: Alberta talks cash to their cattlemen and you talk a bag of wind to Saskatchewan cattlemen?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I invite the hon. member, when the first quarterly payments arrive, to call this program a bag of wind. He will find that the Alberta program is going to be a bag of wind.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. There is a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding as far as the beef stabilization program is concerned. Would the minister be prepared to table the specific regulations today, as they relate to the program?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, as soon as the regulations and the policies of the board — the regulations as they relate to stabilization, the policies of the board as they relate to marketing — are in hand, I will provide them to the hon. members opposite.

I don't think that ever before in the development of a program for farmers there has been as much involvement as there has been by farmers in this program. I don't think as much information has gone out about a program to farmers before as has gone out with this program. I don't think there have been as many public meetings surrounding a program as there have been surrounding the beef stabilization program.

I say to the hon. member opposite that the farmers are well informed on what is developing with respect to stabilization, and I will be glad to table the regulations for the hon. members opposite as soon as they are available to me. If the hon. member would like to put a question on the order paper, I would be glad to see it and respond to it in that way.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Do you not think it would have been a good idea to have held all of those meetings before you brought the Bill to this House instead of after? My supplementary to you, Mr. Minister is this: with only three weeks left before producers will be eligible for the program, would you inform this Assembly if the beef stabilization contracts are ready, and if they have been returned to those who have applied? Also, if there are up-to-date contracts available would you table one in this House after question period?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — In answer to the first question from the hon. member for Arm River, development of the beef stabilization program began prior to my time as Minister of Agriculture, which is now over two years. It was started under the strong leadership of the former minister of agriculture, the member for Saltcoats.

Representatives of six of the farm organizations gathered together under the chairmanship of Dr. Leo Kristjanson, now president of the University of Saskatchewan. I was involved in meetings of those organizations as well, so there was a series of meetings before involving the farm organizations, a series of meetings (some 16, so far) in which I have been involved, plus meetings involving members of the board.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the contracts, at a meeting at, I think, Shaunavon the chairman of the board of the beef stabilization plan, Harry J. Elder of Fillmore, indicated the contracts would be going out on or about December 10. He made that commitment and I'm sure that he and his board will follow up on that commitment.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Supplementary to the minister. How many producers have signed into your plan to date?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, with respect to a number of producers enrolled, I do not have an update. The number of producers who signed an initial application to enrol . . . If the hon. member doesn't trust the producers, I trust the producers when they sign an initial application. According to the last information I had, there were some 60,000 cows enrolled involving something like 900 producers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Agriculture. You spoke previously about trusting the producers. I can't say that the producers of Saskatchewan trust the Minister of Agriculture regarding this policy. Can you guarantee the cattle producers of Saskatchewan that the levy will stay at 4 per cent for the entire 6-year lock-in period?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I was at some 16 meetings and I found, at those meetings, that the producers of Saskatchewan trusted the Hon. Minister of Agriculture more than they trusted the henchmen that the Tories sent to those meetings to disrupt them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I was at those meetings and I saw the producers of Saskatchewan beat down those henchmen that the Tories sent to disrupt the meetings. With respect to the hon. member's question respecting the levy, I cannot guarantee that the levy will be 4 per cent . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I can't, and if the hon. member has been looking at what the regulations say and at what I've been saying about the levy, he will know that there is a levy adjustment mechanism. When the fund builds up, the levy will come down. When there's a large deficit in the fund, the levy will go up. I think that's built into the hog stabilization plan and is understood, and I think that's built into the beef stabilization plan and it is understood by the producers.

You're going to have a fund, and if you have a plan you've got to have a plan that is

actuarially sound. This plan is built on those kinds of principles. It may well be that the levy will adjust downward; it may well be that the levy will adjust upward. We'll learn from the experience of the implementation of the plan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the reason the producers of Saskatchewan do not trust you ties right in with the grain stabilization program. You're saying there's that built-in factor. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is: how do you expect the cattle producers of Saskatchewan to go to a six-year lock-in factor with a 4 per cent levy that can rise each year when they have already been burnt by the federal grain stabilization program that has gone from \$500 to a proposed \$1,500 in the upcoming year? How do you expect those cattle producers to trust you on that?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question raised by the hon. member for Wilkie, if he looks at the Western Grain Stabilization Plan, and he looks at the Saskatchewan Beef Stabilization Plan, he will see a very fundamental difference. The Western Grain Stabilization Plan is an income assurance plan. The Saskatchewan Beef Stabilization Plan is a return based on cost of production, and that's vastly different from the Western Grain Stabilization Plan. It's vastly different from the programs of the federal government. Surely the hon. member opposite . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Moosomin has some trouble. He has trouble speaking from his feet; he has trouble speaking from his seat.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — The hon. member for Wilkie has raised a legitimate question, and I'm seeking to answer it. So there is a difference, and an important difference, and the hon. members opposite should support this government in our attempt to achieve similar programs in Ottawa.

With respect to the levy, yes, there's a lock-in period. Yes, there's a levy adjustment. As the producers of this province know, if the levy adjustment raises the levy to a maximum of 6 per cent or down to 2 per cent, the whole plan will be reviewed. They know that; they understand that; and I think it's a welcome adjustment to the plan in terms of the changes that have come since we originally announced it.

**MR. GARNER:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you and your government have been standing up in this Chamber bragging about holding all of the meetings. You didn't come into my area, which is a large cattle area, to have a meeting. I had a meeting. These are the concerns which were brought up at this meeting. Firstly, reduce that lock-in factor to three years. You have to learn, Mr. Minister, that you can control costs to the cattlemen, you cannot control the cattlemen. Will you now reduce that six-year lock-in factor to three years? Maybe then your program might get off the ground.

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I apologize for not being into the hon. member's constituency with a meeting. Mr. Speaker, 16 meetings have taken me into every corner of the province. I have not been in every rural constituency in the province of Saskatchewan, nor will I be able to get there. I know that meetings held by the board members have been held in areas other than those I have been in.

The lock-in period is six years. The plan will be reviewed if there is a levy change, as I

indicated in the previous question. A total review of the plan will be made at the end of five years, regardless of what has happened. This review would include the cost of production formula, the levy and the lock-in period. That is well-known to the producers. Mr. Speaker, what I find interesting is that here is an hon. member who six months ago voted against the plan; now he want to run around and improve the plan. I can't understand that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **Projected Decrease in Farm Income**

**MR. THATCHER:** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. If we can continue with our theme of Alberta's cash and the minister's windy rhetoric, I would like to ask the minister if he has noted that at the agricultural outlook conference in Ottawa today, projections were introduced which show that net farm income in 1982 will be down by 15 per cent, almost down to 1980 income levels. I wonder if the minister noted that, also at that same conference, it was suggested (predicted, as a matter of fact) that the cost of running a farm would be up 10 per cent in 1982. My question to the minister is simply this. Under the situation we have today, bankruptcies are up 25 per cent this year. If we have a situation such as I just described coming up in 1982 (generally these conferences are reasonably accurate), what plans do you have for the farm economy for 1982 to face what would appear to be almost depression-like conditions?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, of course the plans of the government with respect to agriculture policies of 1982 will be announced as part of the budget, which the hon. member knows normally comes down around March 1.

With respect to the point he is seeking to make: he's making an argument for Saskatchewan's hog stabilization plans and Saskatchewan's Beef Stabilization Plan. He's saying that the cost of production is increasing and what we need in place for farmers are stabilization programs related to the cost of production; he, therefore, is supporting the position of the Government of Saskatchewan with the red meat industry and he's opposing the stopgap program of the province of Alberta.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the minister. May I perhaps get the question back on track? My supplementary question to you in light of your answer is simply this: how can you, as a minister of the crown, justify an expenditure of \$100 million for an old, decrepit, broken-down air line that we need like a hole in the head, yet you stand in this Assembly today and say you don't have more than \$5 million worth of help for 67,000 farmers?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. members opposite, looking at economic development strategy for the province of Saskatchewan, look at it from an 18th century point of view. I know they don't want to see modern air service between the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon. I know they don't want to see northern Saskatchewan developed. I know that, because that's what went on in the province of Manitoba and the province of Manitoba told that particular style of government what they thought of economic development arising there.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — The hon. member opposite will support a modern, economic development strategy for the province of Saskatchewan. It's essential, if we're going to provide services to the people of Saskatchewan, part of that is a modern air service. It has nothing to do, as the hon. member suggests, with our policies with respect to agriculture; all the hon. member has to do is look at the budget for agriculture for the last fiscal year and he will see that it increased by 30 per cent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### Rapeseed Quotas

**MR. SWAN:** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. The National Farmers' Union, at its convention in Winnipeg last week, made a statement that went like this, and with your permission I'd like to read just a paragraph. It says:

One delegate asked why the wheat board sets one quota on deliveries of rapeseed to country elevators and another much higher one for deliveries to local crushing plants. She said the crushers are paying farmers less than the price paid by elevator companies and suggested crushers should have to purchase their supplies from grain companies. Then they would not be able to capitalize on the farmer's need for cash, which forces the producers to use available quotas.

As well, in your marketing paper dealing with rapeseed, I would like to read a very similar comment. In point 7 in this particular report it says:

Rapeseed crushers in western Canada have taken advantage of tight quotas on rapeseed deliveries to elevators to obtain lower prices supplied for rapeseed by producers.

Are you, Mr. Minister, in agreement with those two comments, one by a paper put out by your department and the other one from the NFU, that the crushers are indeed taking advantage of the producers by getting rapeseed at a lower price than is normal?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, certainly with respect to the rapeseed producers of the prairies, I don't think there is any question that the hon. member would agree that the rapeseed producers are suffering a loss as a result of the private grain trade and the speculation that is being done by the private traders with respect to rapeseed. I don't think there is any question that the Canadian Wheat Board is struggling with that problem, establishing quotas on rapeseed because of that problem and establishing quotas on rapeseed because of the congestion problems they have with respect to rapeseed, as it relates to the movement of export grain, wheat and barley.

If the hon. member is saying that he doesn't think there should be a quota system for rapeseed, under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, then I simply do not agree with the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose.

**MR. SWAN:** — Supplementary question. You speak as though it were the private grain trade. Are you aware that in Saskatchewan the crusher is CSP Foods, owned by Saskatchewan Wheat Pool? Are you also aware that on November 3 the price difference, between what CSP Foods was paying and what the elevator companies

were paying, was 57 cents per bushel? That's not the private grain trade; that's CSP Foods, owned by Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. So are you indeed saying that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool is dealing unfairly with its producer members? Is that what your paper is saying?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, yes, I'm aware of CSP Foods; yes, I'm aware of Saskatchewan Wheat Pool; yes, I'm aware that Saskatchewan Wheat Pool shares the position of the Government of Saskatchewan that wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax and rapeseed should be marketed under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SWAN:** — Supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. You didn't answer my question. Are you aware of the price difference being offered by CSP Foods, which is 57 cents a bushel on November 3 less than they would have to pay had they gone to the wheat pool elevator to buy the same product? Are you aware of that and are you in agreement with that?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry; I am not aware of the figures. I can't easily respond to the figures. I am aware of the policies. The policies of the wheat pool with respect to this issue and the Government of Saskatchewan are one and the same.

### **SPECIAL ORDER**

### **ADJOURNED DEBATE**

#### **Address in Reply**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Chapman and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Berntson.

**MR. BAKER:** — Mr. Speaker, I am again pleased to take part in the throne speech debate. I acknowledge with appreciation the strong support I have received over the years from my constituency of Regina Victoria. It is a constituency made up of pioneers, middle aged and young people. It is a seat made up of every culture and ethnic origin that we find in Saskatchewan. To my constituents, and to those listening, I extend season's greetings.

I would like to congratulate the mover of the motion, the member for Estevan, and the seconder, the member for The Battlefords. They provide a good example of how the NDP provides good representation across the province. I am sure they will both continue to contribute to this Assembly for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, the economic situation in other parts of Canada is precarious indeed. Unemployment has reached probably close to one million people, or 7.5 per cent of the work force, almost double the Saskatchewan rate. Statistics Canada has reported a sudden buckling of economic activity, as the gross national product fell by 1 per cent in the three months ending in September. But that does not tell the whole story. The real slump in the economy is almost twice as large, concealed by the build-up of unsold goods as consumer demand falls in the face of recession. This unwanted inventory is added to the gross national product, even though it is a drag on the economy. It is the worst down turn in the Canadian economy since 1951.



Other indications that we face a major national recession include a 13.5 per cent decline in residential building, a 1 per cent decline in ordinary Canadian spending, and a 2.4 per cent decline in investment. High energy prices continue to keep inflation above the rise in wages, cutting into the purchasing power of all Canadians. In addition, we face a fall in exports and a rise in interest and dividend payments which have driven the federal government's current account deficit to a record rate of \$12.4 billion this quarter.

On whose doorstep must the blame be laid for this serious economic slump? Allan MacEachen is the Liberal finance minister who brought it in. The Conservative finance minister, John Crosbie, was the man who formulated it. In both the Crosbie and MacEachen budgets we find the same theme — restraint; the same goal — reduced inflation; the same measures — higher taxes. Both are willing to accept higher unemployment and slower growth.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal and Conservative policies on interest rates are also the same. I say we need to control our interest rates, and need a measure of control on our foreign exchange, and on our outgoing wealth. The Liberals first allowed the Bank of Canada to pursue a higher interest rate policy. During the short Conservative term in office, the Tories raised the interest rates four times. The conservatives also blocked the immediate passage of a Bill making it a criminal offence to charge more than 60 per cent annual interest on a loan. They introduced a Bill that gave banks and other financial institutions first crack at bankrupt firm assets, ahead of wage earners. So, Mr. Speaker, both Liberal and Conservative governments have done their part to put Canada's economy in the mess it is.

We look at other governments following right-wing economic policies. We see that they are in similar trouble. In Britain, Margaret Thatcher has given many people the choice between heat and eat. Unemployment demonstrations are reminiscent of the '30s. Social programs have been cut to the bone. In the United States a similar situation exists. Social programs, health, education and training are treated as consumptions, an expense to be cut back instead of what they really are — investments in the future productivity of their society. Such policies drive the poor into hopelessness because they take away any chance they may have to get training, employment, and a decent standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, these sorts of policies will not work in the world anymore. There must be mixed economies with co-ops and private and public capital working together under a planned economy. It is the planned economies that have enjoyed the most success in the western world. Planning has enabled Japan, a country with few natural resources, to consistently rack up balance of payment surpluses. At the same time, Canada with abundant natural resources consistently faces a deficit, not because we do not export more than we import but because the profits from those exports also leave the country. Social Democrat West Germany stands out in the world with its great industrial growth, and what it has done for its people through social programs, chiefly because of a humane and balanced economy.

Thanks to this government, we in Saskatchewan own our resources. The profits and the head office jobs remain here. That is why our province remains relatively sheltered from the economic crisis affecting the rest of the country, particularly Tory Ontario. That is why, too, Saskatchewan has come from the edge of bankruptcy when the CCF took over in 1944, to being able to afford social programs that are the best in North America.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — In Saskatchewan we believe in the fundamental idea that it's the government's responsibility to do as much as possible to remove the larger inequalities in our society. That belief lies behind medicare, the prescription drug plan, the dental plan, the hearing aid plan, free chiropractic services. I could name program after program. That is why Saskatchewan has the highest minimum wage in Canada, easy access to universities, and the best pension legislation in this country. We have provided a good measure of security to our senior citizens and our handicapped, and we have improved our grants to our day care facilities.

We have also given good support to agriculture. Only in Saskatchewan has a provincial government consistently supported orderly marketing, and the retention of the family farm. Only in this province can hog and beef producers, as well as grain farmers, confidently bring their produce to market through a marketing plan which assures them of full return on their investments.

Agriculture is the main industry in Saskatchewan. We must keep it strong. That depends to a large extent on the crowrate. The New Democratic Party government recognizes that and only Saskatchewan has consistently stood up to the federal government and defended the crowrate.

I shall now quote from statements made recently by Justice Emmett Hall:

Former Justice Hall has told prairie farm groups the only position they should take on the statutory freight rates debate is that the crowrate is not bargain able.

In a statement read at a "Keep the Crow" rally here in Regina, November 24, the man who headed a royal commission on grain handling and transportation in '75 and '77 said that if any tampering with the present statutory rate is condoned or it is placed on the bargaining table, it will only be a matter of time until it is lost step by step. "There's no position to take except to adhere through thick and thin that the crowrate is not bargain able." Hall said.

The statement by Hall was clearly aimed at the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool which the day before had passed a transportation policy which said the company wanted to keep the crow but was willing to enter negotiations on how future cost increases in grain hauling could be shared.

Hall said that Pool officials and delegates must recognized the threat this policy represents. He said:

The proposition must be put squarely and plainly to the Saskatchewan Pool and its members that what is being suggested in fact is an introduction to Otto Lang's user-pay policy with all its faults disguised as something else.

He said that neither Manitoba nor Alberta are likely to stand firm on the crow, leaving it up to Saskatchewan. He also said that railways already receive the full cost of moving grain on branch lines covered by branch line subsidies. They also have the use, rent free, of 14,000 hopper cars worth \$700 million and receive federal money to upgrade branch lines.

In Saskatchewan, the New Democratic Party government has shown all Canadians what they can achieve. Manitobans tried something else for the past four years and decided that they had had enough.

I suspect other provinces like British Columbia, and even Tory Ontario, will follow suit in their next elections.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — I remind members that economic conditions in Saskatchewan were much the same just before the CCF came to power as they are now in Canada as a whole. I suspect Canadians across the country will soon be noticing the difference in Saskatchewan and wondering why they can't develop their own resources as we have done here.

I would go further, Mr. Speaker. As long as the western world is dominated by the sum of self-interested acts, the total of calculated greed in the corporate boardrooms and the free market, we will continue to live with injustice and inequality. The Third World, in particular, would be condemned even further to poverty, hunger and disease. The NDP believes that human life and labour have higher uses than as robots used in an inhuman competition for the largest return on invested capital.

I am pleased to see that this year's throne speech, once again, introduces programs to protect the individual and provide health care for segments of our society with special needs.

The Speech from the Throne spelled out one specific and necessary program for the protection of home-owners who have recently purchased homes and are harassed by mortgages and higher interest rates. Just as the old CCF came to the rescue of farmers by giving protection through The Homesteads Act in 1945, this Act for urban homes is a continuation of a similar program. People in the '30s in our cities lost their homes not only through mortgage foreclosures but through back taxes. I look forward to this Bill which will protect the home-owners who because of circumstances beyond their control stand to lose their homes and all they have put into them. No one wants to destroy our lending institutions, as the members opposite suggest. That was what critics said when The Homesteads Act was passed 35 years ago. As everyone can see, Mr. Speaker, the banks have remained in Saskatchewan and have prospered. I am sure that the same result will occur over the next 35 years despite the new home-owner's Act.

I look forward to other announcements contained in the Speech from the Throne. Home-owners will also benefit from the amendments to The Power Corporation Act which will more clearly set out SPC's authority to encourage energy conservation and promote the development of alternate forms of energy.

All Saskatchewan residents will benefit from the strengthened preventive health programs announced which are a fitting reminder that 1982 marks the 20th anniversary of medicare in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — I am pleased, too, that the present Saskatchewan government is attempting to meet the needs of special interest groups, such as the disabled, with

programs like a building code making all public buildings accessible. Such programs ensure that the quality of life which the majority of us take for granted is extended as best we can to all individuals and groups.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan will always stand out as an oasis in this country, showing the way to all other Canadians an example of good, honest government, a government that gave free medicare to people, not only here, but in all parts of this country.

Our Saskatchewan New Democratic Party government's record is one that will stand up world-wide. Although much remains to be done, I am pleased to see that the Speech from the Throne again recognizes the needs of Saskatchewan people and provides positive action to meet them.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BANDA:** — Mr. Speaker, this year's throne speech indicated the direction in which our government is proceeding and several members have outlined that direction very well. I certainly want to congratulate the mover and the seconder who did such a fine job in this Assembly.

Today I want to focus my remarks on two main areas: the economic trickery the opposition is attempting to sell the people of Saskatchewan, and the model of development we have fostered in this province, Mr. Speaker. First, let me deal with the opposition's economic trickery. In recent months, members opposite and their leader, the puppeteer in the public gallery, have made many promises. I have examined those promises and analyzed their cost. Mr. Speaker, what the opposition proposes to do would cost \$1.4 billion. Even more astounding, Mr. Speaker, it would require the province to put about \$2 billion up front in order to carry them out. Now those are incredible sums of money, and it is the height of irresponsibility for the Conservatives to suggest they could even begin to carry out such promises.

Let's take a look at their \$1.5 billion program. Perhaps the cruellest hoax of all is the promise that they would make a province-wide natural gas distribution system. Now in 1979, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation (SPC) examined the feasibility of that type of a system. To build such a system would cost, in 1981 terms, over \$1 billion. SPC's research examined two possibilities — a system that would include all farms, towns, villages and hamlets, and a system that would include just the farms. The capital, the financing and the service costs were included. The complete system would involve over 12,000 hook-ups in the towns, villages and hamlets, and over 48,000 farm hook-ups. The average cost per hookup would be over \$19,000. The system involving just farms would cost an average of nearly \$21,000 a farm to build. And this is before the cost of gas to be consumed is even considered, Mr. Speaker. Even before this year's Alberta-Ottawa energy agreement, it was known that the Alberta border price for gas will more than double in 1986.

This rural gasification scheme is simple Tory deception and economic trickery. They never say who will pay and they never say how it can be done. Well, Mr. Speaker, everyone could pay. But income taxes would have to double for the next five years. Yet Conservatives want a tax cut. All the gas customers, new and existing, could pay. Yet the Conservatives want gas prices frozen.

There are other pie-in-the-sky promises. They propose a \$350,000 low-interest loan for young farmers as an alternative to the land bank and FarmStart. Well, Mr. Speaker, for this new notion to be even half as effective as the land bank and FarmStart, 3,500 farmers would have to receive that loan. Where would the Conservatives find the \$1.2 billion that would be required to lend 3,500 farmers the \$350,000? And if the low interest amounts to even 5 per cent, how would they raise the \$62 million in interest subsidy that it would cost? I would like to know where the Conservative money tree is, and where they're getting these billions from. Why don't they say who would pay? I say it's a deception, Mr. Speaker — just a plain deception. I find it very hard to believe that even the Conservatives believe some of these ridiculous promises, and although there are not many across there listening, I say that they are guilty of the grossest form of irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, let's tally up the promises we heard the other day when the Leader of the Opposition gave his speech. Rural gasification, \$1 billion; low-interest loans to farmers, \$62 million in interest, \$1 billion in money to lend out. What about the rest of them? A 10 per cent income tax cut, \$46 million; ending the sales tax, \$300 million; reducing oil royalties, \$50 million; bringing in a reduction program for farm costs, \$16 million; the mortgage subsidy plan, \$5 million; an interest subsidy and \$100 million to give out to home-owners, and for freezing the utility rates another \$5 million.

Mr. Speaker, when one outlines the additional costs, either in new expenditures or reduced revenues, the Tory programs cost \$1.5 billion, and an additional \$1.2 billion in up-front money they propose to lend out or give away. I would like to know where this \$2.7 billion is going to come from. This year the total budgetary cash inflow of this government was \$2.2 billion — \$618 million of that was spend on health and \$551 million on education. That's \$1.1 billion on health and education, Mr. Speaker. Unless the opposition wants to do away with those two programs totally, they might not be able to even get near their projections.

Suppose the Conservatives cut all the spending of this government by 10 per cent. They could do that and they would still have to raise the provincial budget to over \$3 billion. Mr. Speaker, that budget would represent about a 36 per cent increase over last year's budget, even with a 10 per cent cut in all existing spending. Their new promises alone would make up that 10 per cent and the additional 36 per cent, yet they want to cut taxes. What deceit; what irresponsibility! Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives would do better to pool their resources and start up a taxi cab company. They certainly seem determined to take the people of Saskatchewan for a ride.

We in Saskatchewan have a strong and growing economy. I might point out that the Conference Board of Canada says economic growth in Saskatchewan this year will be greater than in any other province. In Saskatchewan, private investment was \$700 million greater than it was under the Conservatives in Manitoba. Saskatchewan has traditionally had the second lowest unemployment in Canada. I say that the strength of Saskatchewan's economy didn't just happen; it happened because this government has a rational, orderly approach to economic development in which public participation plays a major role.

The vehicle for public sector involvement in Saskatchewan is our crown corporations. We have publicly owned utilities, resource, service and financial companies which have stabilized our economy. This is because investment decisions by public sector companies are based on the needs and priorities of Saskatchewan. That is not surprising, Mr. Speaker. There is no reason to expect a non-resident corporation to set

aside its own priorities where those priorities differ from Saskatchewan's. This is the first benefit of our crown corporations — investment in Saskatchewan, by Saskatchewan, for Saskatchewan.

Another reason for direct public sector involvement in economic development is the public equity in the economy that results. I think it's clear that Canada today is suffering the effects of having a foreign-owned branch-plant economy. When an economy slows down and companies are forced to retrench, it is the foreign branches which first suffer the effects. The massive layoffs in Ontario are a good example of this. But in Saskatchewan, through crown corporations, the public has assets worth \$4.3 billion. This has greatly stabilized our economy and lessened the impact of national economic upheavals even now shaking other provinces.

The third major benefit of our crown corporations is the services they provide — services which would not otherwise be available. A good example is the Saskatchewan Transportation Company (STC). Revenue from high traffic areas is used to help provide a service in the less travelled areas. There would be no reason for a private company to operate buses on a non-profitable route. Private transport companies exist solely to make a profit. They do not willingly maintain losing routes simply to provide a service. But because bus service is viewed as socially desirable and necessary, the STC runs on certain routes simply to provide the service. Thus crown corporations may provide the people with a service that the private sector would normally be unwilling or unable to do.

The fourth benefit of our public companies is the jobs which they provide. Today, about 13,000 Saskatchewan residents work for public sector companies. I do not think much needs to be said about these people except that we, on this side of the Assembly, feel that the vast majority of them have done an excellent job. We are proud of them, for they have proven conclusively that public sector companies can operate every bit as efficiently as the private sector companies can.

The fifth benefit of crown corporations is the security they afford. We don't have to worry that tomorrow Saskoil will pack up and move to the United States because Ronald Reagan is giving oil companies there a free lunch. We don't have to worry that tomorrow SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) will decide to move to Latin America because of the cheap labour that is provided there. We don't have to worry that SaskComp will pick up and move to so-called Silicone Valley in California because of the quick profits available to computer companies there. Public companies stay with the public. They don't just up and move because a fast buck can be made somewhere else.

The benefits of our crown corporations are evident — investment based on Saskatchewan priorities, public equity in the economy, services for the people, jobs at home and security for tomorrow.

We believe it is the right of the public to participate in economic development, and our public companies have shown that it is beneficial for them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech before us shows that this government is continuing to give leadership to Saskatchewan. It shows that we intend to continue moving ahead.

I want to speak for a couple of minutes about a provision in the throne speech — The

Saskatchewan Home-owners' Security Act. I thought the Conservatives would have applauded the introduction of a home-owners' protection Act, a move by the government to give relief to home-owners who are threatened with foreclosure. After all, the Conservatives are a party whose leader spends much of the time lauding the merits of the family, yet when the throne speech outlines one way to aid suffering families who have had the threat of losing their homes hanging over their heads, the Conservatives forget about the families and scurry to the side of the big financial institutions.

Why, Mr. Speaker, would they do this? I have asked myself the question continually over the past week, as I listened to a member of the Conservative Party plead the case of those poor financial institutions. So I did a little research. I contacted the office of the chief electoral officer for Saskatchewan in Ottawa, and the results were startling, to say the least.

One of the years I chose was 1978 because it was election year. And here are some of the little people who supported the Conservatives in Saskatchewan. I won't go into all of them — it would take too long — but I'll mention a few: \$500 from the Household Finance Corporation of Canada, \$1,000 from the Mortgage Insurance Company of Canada, \$1,000 from The Permanent, \$2,000 from Canadian Foreign Securities, and about \$11,000 from the banks. Mr. Speaker, those are just a few of the many, many contributions large corporations, banks, and resource companies dumped into the Saskatchewan Conservatives coffers to help them win that '78 election. Mr. Speaker, that is not outlining all the monies given to the federal Conservatives by the banks, which is at the \$50,000 mark, not the \$1,000 mark.

Mr. Speaker, what makes it all so tawdry and disgusting is that these are the same people who like to talk about families, while they gleefully run to the side of the family of fine financial interest. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader says one word sums up the Conservative Party, and that's "trust". Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree — Royal Trust, Norfolk Trust, Pioneer Trust and Northwest Fidelity Trust.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BANDA:** — What really sums up the Conservative Party is blind trust, the same blind trust their former leader for Nipawin tried to sell the people last time around, Mr. Speaker.

Another thought occurred to me, Mr. Speaker: that investment by the banks in the Saskatchewan Conservative Party in 1978 must have been the only investment the banks made that year that didn't pay a profit. That must be the only investment.

Mr. Speaker, I support the promise contained in the Speech from the Throne. It's a continuation of this government's commitment to the people of Saskatchewan, and a beacon for governments everywhere. The throne speech celebrates our interdependence, the things we can do together to build a better life for all. I will certainly be supporting the motion put forward by my colleague, the member for Estevan. I cannot, of course, support the ridiculous amendment offered by the opposition House Leader on December 1 after he finished reading us old speeches by his non-elected leader. I'll be supporting the main motion and voting against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with great honour that I rise to join in this debate on behalf of the people of the constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale today. Our country and our province are in a depressed state of affairs. Although we have the richest resource wealth we have not been able to use this wealth to bring financial relief to the people of our province.

Let me explain why. In the northeast part of the province we have many types of resources that are virtually untouched. We have oil and gas. Although no details have been released it is almost certain that a large quantity of both gas and oil cover much of the Carrot River valley basin from Tisdale all the way to the border. Why, Mr. Speaker, do we, as Saskatchewan residents, have to wait maybe 20 more years before any of these are developed? Why, Mr. Speaker, should not the people of Saskatchewan enjoy the jobs and revenues which these would bring to our province? Mr. Speaker, what about our silica sands? We have lime in large quantities. We could easily establish a key lime plant or cement factory. These are things of the future, Mr. Speaker. We need to develop them now to create jobs.

What about an ethanol plant? We have heard much about this ethanol plant which has been talked about. We have the aspen trees, the feed grains and water in abundance. If you talk about an ethanol plant, I am sure the Minister of Agriculture knows, the Northeast is the most logical and practical place to put one or more of these plants. It is the only place where the aspen grows in abundance, where we have lots of logging equipment, where we have the knowledge to log the trees, and the aspen can be had free from the MacMillan Bloedel plant, as has been already told to the minister. The minister stated that aspen would be 75 per cent of the product used in an ethanol plant in the future. Mr. Speaker, think of the savings in the product alone, especially in such a new venture as this.

Mr. Speaker, this year the Government of Saskatchewan acquired a 70 per cent balance of the pulp mill at Prince Albert. Did this create any new jobs for our people? Did it bring any of the young people back from out of the province? No, Mr. Speaker, it did not. It only forced the taxpayer to pay more, whether it was added on to his power bill, gas bill, or telephone. We keep on buying and someone has to pay. That could only be the taxpayer of this province. Let's just stop and think about what would have happened to our whole provincial economy if the government had taken those millions and millions of dollars which they spent in buying the Prince Albert pulp mill and established 50 to 100 new industries around the province. For each industry (say, 50 jobs) the spin-off (which is about four times) is 200 jobs times 50, a total of 10,000 jobs.

Let me give you some examples. We have 40 per cent of the farmland in Canada. But every time someone goes to the store to buy articles on the shelves, how many of them are manufactured here in Saskatchewan? Sure, there are a few dairy products, or maybe a few bread products. But there are very few, I would think. Then why are we not capable of manufacturing our own food products which we grow here? We ship them out to be processed and then return them and pay freight both ways. This, Mr. Speaker, is what I mean. We grow it and some other area reaps the employment and the revenues which should be ours today.

Mr. Speaker, just think what it could have done for Saskatchewan in these slow times, especially with the economical issues as they are today. We are truly a sleeping giant here in Saskatchewan. Let's wake up and be the number one province in Canada and in North America.



**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, as critic for the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, I feel a responsibility toward trying to better our hunting regulations and the conservation of wildlife. These are two areas which need a great deal of attention. As most people know, our wildlife cannot stand the continual year-round hunting which has been going on. In my area and many others this is the case and continues to be a terrible burden on the wildlife resource of our province. Last year almost 10,000 caribou were slaughtered in the northern part of the province, and mostly left to waste there. I sincerely hope this year that does not happen again. I sincerely hope, too, that the minister responsible for this will see that this is not carried on. Last year hunting went on with spotlights, and wildlife was hunted at night, all night. It's hunted year round. Even in calving time wildlife is being slaughtered. This has to stop. There must be more stringent controls placed on such acts as this. I believe that the Minister of Tourism realizes this and I sincerely hope that he will do something to stop this. The conservation officer must have the power and the right to stop this type of slaughter by anyone, regardless of what race or religion he is.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we woke up and realized that wildlife is for the future. We have to start now to protect it, not wait until it is extinct. Mr. Speaker, we are destroying many of our wildlife habitats. These are essential to wildlife preservation. Small bush areas are being cleared out; the sloughs are being drained. Some of these must be preserved. That is the responsibility of the people of Saskatchewan. I think it is time that we, through wildlife, through farming, should go out and negotiate and talk to these people and bring this back into reality.

We are also making reservations out of many community pastures and lake resorts. Mr. Speaker, that is not right either. These are also wildlife areas, as we all know. Although treaty Indians have the right to hunt in these lands at any time, it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we, as legislators, and the people of this province sat down and discussed where this all leading us. Surely, for the benefit of the Indian as well as the white, we have to do this. These people are intelligent people, exercising their rights the same as anyone else, but now is the time to realize that to preserve our wildlife for their future and for ours, we must start now and we must work together.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — These are small problems, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure they can be settled to the benefit of everyone.

I heard the member for Regina Victoria talking a few minutes ago about the 20th anniversary of medicare. Let's just speak about the medicare system in Saskatchewan. We used to be number one; now we rate about eighth. Why, Mr. Speaker? Is it because we are more concerned with buying and owning property than we are about our own people? I think this is very obvious. We need hundreds of levels 3 and 4 care nursing homes around this province. We need to enlarge hospital services in many areas; we need new hospitals in many areas.

Why, in a new hospital expansion, does the government cost share only 40 per cent, with the balance covered by the municipalities? In my area, the Hudson Bay area, we need expansion to our new hospital and that is exactly the situation we're sitting in — 40 per cent by the government, 60 per cent by the local municipalities. That is a large load for any local government to bear. Many local governments plainly cannot afford

this share of the project and it is set aside and our health care deteriorates more. Why, Mr. Speaker, with all our vast resource wealth are these facilities not fully funded by the government? Communities do not have the resource wealth that a province has. They do not have a large tax base either.

There was a time when the Government of Saskatchewan put medical attention for the people of Saskatchewan first, above all else. Now, Mr. Speaker, they put the building of their empire first and the medical scene somewhere near the bottom.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's time to get back to people first, government and power second.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, Hudson Bay is called the moose capital of the world. It could easily be called the lumber capital of the province of Saskatchewan. We have Sask Forest Products in Hudson Bay and we have most of the equipment and buildings necessary for an overlay plant. We supply most of the materials for this plant. Why was it located in Yorkton? I hope the minister responsible for Sask Forest Products realizes that the savings alone in the cost of the buildings and the handling of equipment, had it been located in Hudson Bay, would have been substantial. But no, Mr. Speaker, I think that move was to threaten the people of Hudson Bay, to either support the government or face the consequences.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Is this not a democracy, Mr. Speaker? Do the people of Saskatchewan have to bow their heads and beg the government to get what should rightfully be theirs? I hope not, but it appears to be that way in Saskatchewan right now.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to change these rules, to again make people first and government second. I have tried to indicate in this brief time allotted to me some of the areas in which I believe our money, the taxpayers' money of Saskatchewan, could better serve the needs of the people. I cannot agree with the Premier that the spending priorities of the Government of Saskatchewan are correct. I cannot justify in my mind (and I believe many others agree) that it is proper to spend money on massive buildings, such as the latest Sask Tel building or the SGI building. I don't think it should be a priority to buy Norcanair for \$100 million, which would be enough money to put a good water system into the city of Regina.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — I do not think it is right to have, in top crown corporation offices, \$120,000 bathtubs. That would be enough to finance some of the departments which have been cut at the university of Saskatoon. I do not think we should be loaning money to Chartwood Developments, an out-of-province firm, at 9.75 per cent interest when we do not provide the necessary low interest mortgage for our home-owners, or for our farmers or small businesses here in Saskatchewan. I do not see the necessity of developing a super bus that will drive across a good portion of the province and refuse to pick up the people in towns, the senior citizens. Those are people who cannot drive cars. At the same time, we are told that the bus route from Hudson Bay to Canora must be taken off because it is not economical. This is a service for some, but not for all. Why, Mr. Speaker? Are we not part of Saskatchewan too?

Mr. Speaker, I brought forward some of the reasons I think the Blakeney government is out of ideas. They are more worried about buying and owning than they are about the health and welfare of the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, under these conditions I have no choice but to support the amendment by the member for Souris-Cannington, and I will not be supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have watched with growing interest the attack by members opposite on this government's uranium policy. I say, "with growing interest," because those attacks tell us a good deal more about the propensity of members opposite to be fair in their criticism than it tells us about uranium and uranium markets. It tells us more about the attitude of members opposite toward crown corporations and public participation in the market place.

I want to begin by stating, as simply and as kindly as I can, what our resource policy is. I state it now as I stated it 10 years ago when I was a candidate in Moosomin. It has not changed. Our policy is based on the fact that Saskatchewan has very rich resources. Our uranium ore is among the richest in the world. We said that these resources should be developed for the benefit of Saskatchewan people. We say that Saskatchewan people should be the primary beneficiaries of resource development. We say (and experience has taught us) that can best be assured by public sector participation in the market place.

Conservatives take the opposite approach, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They would let multinationals develop our resources all by themselves, all for themselves and all for their benefit. We reject that approach. We choose public participation through the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation as a primary means of ensuring that Saskatchewan people are the primary benefactors of our rich resources.

Mr. Speaker, on the issue of public sector involvement in the development of Saskatchewan's economy and on the issue of crown corporations, members opposite at least are consistent. In the session before last, they consistently attached Sask Tel and a Bill which makes Sask Tel a monopoly over the delivery of telephone equipment. In the last session, their focus of attention was SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). During the summer, they attacked SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation). It seems this session, the focus of their attack is going to be the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, one has to admire their single-minded devotion to the dismantlement of Saskatchewan's family of crown corporations. Every event, from the most mundane to the most dramatic, becomes a basis for their attacks. If Saskatchewan people believe that crown corporations should play an important role in the economy of the province (and I believe that Saskatchewan people do feel that way), the Saskatchewan people had better think twice before submitting crown corporations to the tender mercies of such a right-wing philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to burden members opposite with the facts. I know they operate so much better in a vacuum. Nevertheless, the statistics of uranium mining make for

graphic reading. The nature of uranium mining is changing around the world. Underground mines are closing, not just in Saskatchewan, but in various countries around the world. Uranium City's experience is only part of this worldwide trend. In their places, open-pit mines are opening up. All fair-minded and knowledgeable observers of the uranium industry agree that uranium has a key role to play in the world's energy picture and that the future of the uranium industry belongs to the open-pit mines. It is to this government's credit that all of our investments are in open-pit mines — at Rabbit Lake, Cluff Lake and Key Lake. These mines have a bright future. Indeed, the future belongs to them. We haven't any investments in underground mines.

I remember when the member for Saskatoon West was the minister of mineral resources in the federal government. Mr. Hnatyshyn stated to the public that he wanted to sell the mine at Uranium City. We chose not to buy it and it proved to be a fortuitous decision.

Mr. Speaker, I talked about the propensity of members opposite to be fair in their criticism. I don't think the members opposite have stooped lower than when they suggested that Eldorado was a Saskatchewan crown corporation. Of course it isn't. It is a federal crown corporation and federal crown corporations operate very differently. Who among the Saskatchewan people, except members opposite, would identify Sask Tel and SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) and SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) with the likes of the Canadian National Railway?

I am not here to defend Eldorado; indeed I am not a stout defender of the federal government. I will defend the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation. We didn't invest in Uranium City, although we had the opportunity. We invested in Rabbit Lake, Cluff Lake, and Key Lake. And let's compare those operations.

The operations of Eldorado and the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation are as different as night and day — as different as the compelling logic that went into the development of Sask Mining and Development and the nonsense that passes for criticism from the members opposite.

Let's begin by looking at the economics of the Eldorado mine. It has been recognized in the uranium industry, over the past couple of decades, that uranium ore must have a concentration of 0.2 to 0.3 per cent uranium — two-tenths to three-tenths of one per cent of uranium — to be viable ore. And that's been the recognized world standard. Over the past five years the concentrate at the Beaverlodge mine at Uranium City has dropped from a little under 0.3 per cent to 0.15 per cent. It has dropped by almost 40 per cent and it is expected to get rapidly worse.

Extensive exploration has failed to locate any new significant ore body. In simple terms, Eldorado has run out of ore. It has caused it to run well below its capacity. The rate of capacity of Eldorado's Beaverlodge mine is 1.8 million tonnes annually.

To casually compare Beaverlodge uranium mine with the mines at Rabbit Lake, Cluff Lake and Key Lake is a typical distortion by members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the mine at Uranium City is accessible only by air. Rabbit Lake, Cluff Lake and Key Lake are all accessible by road. That not only makes transportation much cheaper, but it makes the employees a lot more stable as they seek to live in a community which is not so isolated.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the concentrate at Uranium City is 0.15 per cent. Compare that with Rabbit Lake, the oldest mine, where the concentrate is 0.5 per cent — three times as high as at Uranium City. But one might compare it with Key Lake, where the ore is 2.5 per cent, 16 times richer than Uranium City. One might compare it with Cluff Lake at 8 per cent, 53 times richer.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on to extend my heartiest congratulations to the members for Estevan and North Battleford, who moved and seconded the Speech from the Throne. Both gave excellent speeches, of which we on this side of the House are justifiably proud. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the contribution to the work of this Assembly, both have been outstanding members.

I never had the opportunity to campaign in North Battleford during last year's by-elections. I do recall campaigning in Estevan in November of 1980. I recall the enthusiasm with which the people of Estevan approached that election. I recall taking one man to the polls to vote for Jack Chapman. He was 97 years of age. He hadn't been out of the house in five months but he wanted to go out to vote. His enthusiasm was typical of the people of Estevan.

It was a hard-fought and, I think, generally, a cleanly fought campaign. I wonder what the people of Estevan must now think of the Conservative candidate who lost that election. My guess is that he has dropped in their estimation with each successive court appeal against the clearly expressed wishes of the electorate. His court challenges to the by-elections smack not only of poor sportsmanship, but what is much more serious for a party leader, a refusal to accept the will of the people. If he is that insensitive to views of the public while a candidate, the people of Estevan — indeed, the people of Saskatchewan — must wonder if he'd be any humbler or more responsive in office. His constant court challenges must give the people of Estevan and the people of Saskatchewan cause to wonder about his sensitivity, and his constant failure must give the people of Saskatchewan cause to wonder about his competence.

I want to mention for a moment the question of The Saskatchewan Home-owners' Security Act as it was filed in the throne speech. Interest rates, Mr. Speaker, have become a national obsession. It doesn't matter whether you dine in the humblest truck stop or at the Assiniboia Club on Victoria Avenue, sooner or later the conversation gets around to interest rates. Everyone senses and shares a growing sense of outrage over the current interest rates and what they are doing to this country. What those interest rates are doing is robbing many people of one of life's basic rights — the right to affordable shelter. The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation sets 30 per cent of a person's gross income as a maximum to be laid out for shelter. And another outrage, the inflated price of houses, means that many people are close to that maximum. What happens when a home-owner's mortgage payment increases by 60 per cent, as many do? That same home-owner is required not to lay out 30 per cent of his gross income for a mortgage payment, but 50 per cent. What happens when persons have to lay out 50 per cent of their gross income for homes is that many walk away from their homes. A house, Mr. Speaker, represents not only a basic right, it also represents the total life savings of many urban people. Many lose most, if not all, of the equity in their houses in this soft market. Thus they lose not only their shelter but their life savings.

The federal government, which largely authored the problem by refusing to develop a made-in-Canada interest policy, shrugs and says, "There's nothing we can do." Indeed the federal government promised much leading up to the federal budget, and delivered little. Other governments in Canada — Conservative government, I might add — shrug

and say, "There's nothing we can do. Sure, it's a catastrophe," they say, "but there's nothing we can do."

Alone among Canadian governments the Saskatchewan government has the courage and foresight to do something. We're taking steps to ensure that no one is going to lose his home because of the irresponsibility, the stupidity and the neglect of those who fashion this continent's fiscal and monetary policy.

I recognize there will be many, particularly among Canada's lending institutions, who decry this legislation in the strongest possible terms. We've already seen the opposition, as a stalking-horse for the banks, criticizing this Bill in practically every question period.

The hon. member for Redberry said, in his speech a couple of moments ago, that the one investment the banks hadn't realized a return on was their donations to the Conservative Party before the last election. I say to the hon. member for Redberry: don't be too sure, when you hear members opposite, as a stalking-horse for the banks, on this question of interest rates. Don't be too sure the banks aren't getting their dividends back.

We'll preserve, as we always will. We'll always speak on behalf of the common person. We'll do whatever is necessary to ensure that shelter remains a basic, attainable right for the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — As long as the NDP remains in government in this province the banks will not take peoples' homes away.

Mr. Speaker, there was much more I could have said. My time has run out.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Make us feel better and say farmland, too.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — You know, the hon. member is afraid that the banks are going to take farmland away. I say that a government of this stripe passed The Farm Security Act some years ago to ensure that wouldn't happen. Nearly 30 years have passed since that Bill was first introduced and not a single Conservative government in this country has passed a similar Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am out of time. From what was said it must be clear that I will be voting against the amendment in favour of the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to take part in this throne speech debate. First of all, I congratulate the mover, the member for Estevan, who I guess more than anyone showed the Tories what Saskatchewan people think of parachuted candidates and phantom leaders. I congratulate the seconder of the throne speech, the member for The Battlefords, who is carrying on the tradition of strong, decisive representation from The Battlefords riding.

Mr. Speaker, three weeks ago tomorrow the people of Manitoba delivered a victory for the New Democratic Party, which made a rustle right across this country — 34 seats for

Pawley and the New Democrats, 23 seats for Lyon and the Tories. Pawley's picture is on the cover of Canada's national magazine — it's the lead story in that magazine.

Mr. Speaker, what did the Leader of the PC Party here in Saskatchewan say? Professor Devine said that there was a message in the Manitoba victory of the NDP. That's what he said. I find that difficult to understand. Pawley and the NDP got 34 seats; Lyon and the Tories got 23 seats, and Professor Devine says that there's a message in the Manitoba victory of the NDP for the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, yes, there's a message in the Manitoba victory for the NDP, for the Government of Saskatchewan. Yes, there was a message in Manitoba. Yes, the people of Manitoba delivered a clear message all right, a clear message that they want nothing to do with Tory policy, whether it be Lyon economics, whether it be Thatcher economics, or whether it be Reagan economics. They want nothing to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with a policy which says that you've got to have some pain before you'll have any gain, that you've got to have a lot of suffering before you'll feel good. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the policies of the 18th century economics of the Lyon Tories in Manitoba were really the same policies of Thatcher economics that the Saskatchewan people rejected so overwhelmingly in 1971. Those Lyon policies put Manitoba a decade behind, just as those Thatcher economic policies put Saskatchewan a decade behind in the '60s.

But what did all these policies of pain and gain and suffering to feel good do to Manitoba? Manitoba had the lowest rate of economic growth of any province in Canada, the lowest increase in investment of any province in Canada — private investment, Manitoba 5 per cent, Canada 13 per cent for 1979; public investment, Manitoba 1.8 per cent, Canada 8.2 per cent; housing starts, sharpest decline of any province, Manitoba 42 per cent, Canada 14 per cent; employment, the lowest increase of any province; retail sales, the lowest increase of any province; farm cash receipts, the lowest realized net income per farmer of any of the prairie provinces; population, the only province with a declining population. Pain for gain! No hog plan, no beef plan! Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Lyon government was a tragedy. That government failed miserably; it failed hopelessly. It was a disgrace to the progressive people of Manitoba and Manitoba told it so.

Yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all this pain, four years of pain with Lyon Reaganomics, what did it produce? Did it produce for Manitoba a balanced budget? Mr. Deputy Speaker, the deficit in 1981-82 fiscal year is estimated to be between \$200 million and \$250 million. Now you would have thought that with all this pain and all this suffering, it would have brought about a balanced budget. Why did it not? I say that the events leading up to the election in Manitoba in 1977 were exactly the events that are leading up to the election in Saskatchewan which will likely be called next year or the year after. If you look at the events and how the Tory party in Manitoba operated prior to 1977, you'll see the same kind of attack, you'll see the same kind of hate for government and for the institution of government.

Mr. Speaker, you can see that in this Assembly. You can see the hassle on the rules, the hassle on the procedures. The members opposite hate this institution. The member for Qu'Appelle, the member for Thunder Creek, the Tory member for Nipawin want to have nothing to do with the rules and the traditions and the ways of this legislature. Likewise the Tories in Manitoba prior to 1977.

What happened? There was so much attack and so much hate that when the opportunity came for them to govern, they couldn't govern. They couldn't govern, so the people of Manitoba wisely did what the people of Saskatchewan did when they were faced with those kinds of economics and that kind of hate. They replaced the Lyon Tories with the Pawley New Democrats — a team of experience, a team of new faces, a party with a new leader, a new team and a new policy and a party that has come to office to govern, not to attack!

Pawley New Democrats will be especially good for the farming community in Manitoba. Five of the new cabinet, including the Premier, are from rural ridings. Premier Pawley from Selkirk riding; Sam Uskiw from Lac du Bonnet, Minister of Highways and Transportation; Bill Uruski, Minister of Agriculture, member for Interlake; Pete Adam, the member for Ste. Rose, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Co-operatives; Jay Cowan, Minister of Northern Affairs and Environment, the member for Churchill. They have come to office, Mr. Speaker, not to attack. They have come to office to govern and I say to you that farmers in Manitoba are looking forward to dealing with a team which wants to govern and wants to look at agriculture in a serious minded way.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — You see, Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to farming in Manitoba, just as there are two sides to farming in Saskatchewan. There is a grain production side and there is a livestock production side. In the grain production side there is a new opportunity for Saskatchewan and Manitoba and Alberta farmers and for Canadian farmers that farmers have really not had before in a significant way. There have always been restrictions on markets, but that's gone. The Canadian Wheat Board says — 36 million metric tonnes by 1990. They say in the 1990s — 40 million. World grain trade was predicted to grow to 180 million tonnes by 1985 and surpass 210 million tonnes in 1990. World wheat and barley trade increased 25 per cent from 1960 to 1970, and 100 per cent from 1970 to 1980. The world consumed more grain than it produced in 1980 and 1981, and grain stocks in 1981 were at the lowest in 20 years.

The board says the markets are there. Economists and bond market analysts tell us that the great expanding market of the 1980s is the Third World. Those developing countries don't have the dollars to purchase our grain, but they are more than eager to trade the goods they produce for grain to increase the standard of living for their people. So, we have a market. So, we have an opportunity, not just in the spot market and in long-term agreements with the Soviets and the Chinese, but we have an opportunity in the expanding Third World.

Mr. Speaker, how do we address that situation? It relates to producers and it particularly relates to producers with respect to price. Farmers are today saying, and legitimately so, "What's the use of having all of these markets if we're not going to get a price for the grain?" I say to members of this Assembly that the only way we are going to get a handle on the issue of the price is if we get ourselves behind the Canadian Wheat Board.

It was a long time ago that Canada, because of the efforts of farmers here on the Prairies, introduced single desk selling into the international grain trade. It was a long time ago when single desk selling had to trade with the private grain trade. It had to sell tough Cargill, Continental and Bunge. But today, Mr. Speaker, Canada sells grain to a hundred different countries in the world. Eighty-five of those countries deal directly



with the Canadian Wheat Board; 23 of 25 countries who buy 80 per cent of the world's grain have single desk selling and purchasing agencies. What have we done in Canada? We've introduced a first into the international market place. We've introduced the Canadian Wheat Board and the concept of single desk selling to bring a decent return to the producers. But we have more to do. We have the challenge of the pricing situation in the world today, and I want to quote from the *Leader-Post*, December 3, 1981:

Grain Prices Said Controlled by Washington. The theory that world supply and demand determines wheat prices is pure, unadulterated nonsense, a commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board said Wednesday. In fact, said Larry Kirstjanson, minimum and maximum prices for wheat on the world market are made in Washington. The price in between is set by the jiggery-pokery of the grain markets which reflect all kinds of factors within the United States itself, and not necessarily the supply and the demand situations in the world as a whole. The consumer lobby in Washington gets active and three times since 1970 Washington has imposed export embargoes which have the effect of setting a ceiling on grain prices by limiting exports.

So says the assistant chief commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Canada is the world's largest exporter of barley. Canada is the world's top producer of quality wheat. I say in this Assembly, we are the only agency in the world grain trade with the integrity to tackle the issue of price, to relate price and cost of production. We are the only one with the strength in the international markets, the volume of grain, the integrity and honesty to tackle the way the price of grain is set in world markets. And let me make the policy of this government in Saskatchewan clear with respect to the Canadian Wheat Board. We are an orderly marketing government. I say we will not rest as a government until wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax and rapeseed are under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board so far as marketing is concerned.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, what is the position of the members opposite on the Canadian Wheat Board? I heard the member for Thunder Creek the other day say, "Well, who's opposed to the wheat board? I'm in favour of the Canadian Wheat Board, but I'm in favour also of the private grain trade." What is their position, Mr. Speaker, on the studies which say that \$143 million was lost in three years for producers in the West because of the domestic feed grain policy? What is their position on the open marketing of barley and the losses that the producers have incurred because rapeseed is in the private grain trade and not under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board? Oh, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite say they are in favour of the board. The member for Arm River says in *Hansard*, March 18, 1981, "Everyone on this side of the House is in favour of the Canadian Wheat Board. We are against the bureaucrats who run the board." These are chief commissioner W. E. Jarvis, assistance chief commissioner Larry Kristjanson, Charlie Gibbings and all the other bureaucrats.

The member for Thunder Creek says June 12, 1980:

The overall objective must be to market the grain. That's not happening.

The member for Thunder Creek says on June 12, 1980, that the American system is doing a fine job and that producers should have the right to choose.

And I quote from *Hansard* March 18, 1980:

If we are going to talk about grains (and I think he means more grains) going under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, we on this side of the House have to part company at that stage.

Our position very clearly is that if the rapeseed growers want to go under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board that is their right, and there are appropriate mediums where they can express that right.

Mr. Speaker, their friends in Alberta (and they have friends in Alberta because the question period dealt largely with those friends) say in the *Leader-Post*, October 17, 1981: "Alberta wants fewer grains under wheat board control." In the *Western Producer*, April 30, 1981: "Dual Export System Pushed by Alberta," says the headline and in the *Regina Leader-Post*, April 25, 1981: "Minister says farmers should have choice on how they sell their grain" (referring to Minister of Agriculture, Dallas Schmidt). In the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, February 4, 1981: "Alberta Considers Leaving Wheat Board." In the *Star-Phoenix*, September 25, 1981: "Alberta Cash Grain Exchange to Open." The former minister of agriculture in Manitoba, in the *Manitoba Co-operator*, March 12, 1981, calls for a restructuring. "Downey Asks Wheat Board Review."

Mr. Speaker, who is opposed to the Canadian Wheat Board? "We're not," say the members opposite. "We're in favour of the Canadian Wheat Board. We're in favour of the private grain trade. Producers should have a right to choose," they say. I say in this Assembly, do they attack the private grain trade? No, they attack the Canadian Wheat Board at every opportunity.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — The latest, Mr. Speaker, is that their Tory friends, the delegates at the United Grain Growers' convention in Winnipeg, just a few weeks past, passed a resolution at their annual convention calling for export barley to be on the open market. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Saskatchewan and Manitoba know where the New Democratic Party stands, and I say the farmers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba know where the Tory party stands.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers say, "We have this market and if we get behind the Canadian Wheat Board we can handle the price. But how are we going to get this grain we produce to market?" I say in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, you really can't separate the issue of marketing from the issue of transportation. You can't separate them because without single desk selling you get the situation we have in rapeseed — the terminals may be plugged with rapeseed in Vancouver as well as 256 hopper cars backed up on sidings full of rapeseed.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that about a month ago a ship came into the port of Vancouver (so it is reported to me) to load 22,000 tonnes of rapeseed. But it would only get 9,000 tonnes, less than half the load of rapeseed. Why? Because the owners of rapeseed were playing the stocks, one against the other, for a price and they refused to load the ship.

Mr. Speaker, we don't talk about keeping what we have here on this side of the House. We talk about adding to the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board, not only to get a decent price for the farmer but to build a transportation system that will work.

Where do the members opposite stand, Mr. Speaker? The Tory party stands for a choice, a choice which plugs up the transportation system so badly that it simply can't operate. And what about this system? There are two things to the transportation system, Mr. Speaker — there is the capacity and there is the rate. Some say that because of the condition of the physical structure we have to change the rate, if we're going to move all this grain that the wheat board is talking about. Yet, in 1979-80, a record movement year, what happened? And what's the target for '82-83? A new record movement. When the board talks about that record movement and it projects into the 1990s, it's not talking about the crowrate but about moving the grain. I say, in this Assembly, that the issues are separate. There's the capacity and there's the rate.

Let's look at the capacity because we've been looking at the capacity for a while and we've done something in the past with respect to capacity. In the 1970s, we invested, as taxpayers, \$170 million in branch lines. In the 1970s, in the main lines, the railways invested \$300 million. In the 1970s, in rolling stock, we invested \$700 million — a co-operation between Ottawa, the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the producers. That's why the board says that in 1981-82 there can be a target of 26 million metric tons.

But more investment is needed, Mr. Speaker. I was pleased to see in the federal budget of November 12 that the government had set aside \$1.3 billion for rail transportation. It didn't say how the money should be used in that budget. It has been saying things since. I hear the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board say that that money should go right to the railroads, sort of like the Hall commission report. He says, "Well, why can't you guys in Saskatchewan — you Government of Saskatchewan — support that position with me because it's with the Hall commission?"

But the Hall commission said two things. It said, "Keep the crow because it's part of the West's right in confederation," and it said, "Compensate the railways for what they do — for what they move — with respect to grain."

Where were the railways when the Hall commission said, "You should have some money?" I didn't see them out here in Saskatchewan gathering around Hall. I didn't see them out here in Saskatchewan gathering around the four western governments and all the major farm organizations in support of that report. Neither did the members opposite. Why didn't we see them? Why don't we hear them now, when they're faced with the capital investment of the rail's capacity through the mountains to the West Coast saying, "Well, if you had implemented Hall, we'd have had the money to do it?"

The reason they weren't there then, the reason they're not supporting compensation, is because they have only one position and that's to be rid of the crowrate. They want to wipe it from the statutes so they can set the price for the movement of grain, so they can set the price where and when they want to at how much they want to.

Given that background, Mr. Speaker, support the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and give the money to the railway? Mr. Speaker, Bill Stinson, president of CP Rail says that some of the crow money has to go to the shareholders. They have to have a piece of this \$1.3 billion. To build another highest single-standing tower in the world, in Canada? No. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have learned in five years. Some people

say that Allan Blakeney and Roy Romanow did such a great job in resolving the issues facing Canada, with respect to the constitution, and they truly did. History will be written on the job they did.

Some say that this kind of approach by the Government of Saskatchewan should translate itself into solving the issue of grain handling and transportation. I want to tell this Assembly and the members opposite that there are some things which the Government of Saskatchewan will not compromise. The policy of this government that the principle of equal rates for equal distance and the principle of a guaranteed rate for the producer in statute is something that we are not going to compromise.

As the Premier-elect of Manitoba said in a Telex on November 24, "When our government takes office on November 30, there will be two prairie governments supporting the crowrate."

Mr. Speaker, \$1.3 billion in the federal budget — how should it be spent? I think the first priority that should be addressed is the branch-line system. The people of Saskatchewan went out to fight for those branch lines, and many of them have been secured to the year 2000. We thought we had won the fight. We were ready to declare a victory because we had secured 12,000 miles of branch lines in the Prairies to the year 2000. But, Mr. Speaker, the federal Minister of Transport says that the West must face, as he calls it, the process of elimination. He says that there are limitations on the number of lines and miles that should be put into that branch-line system. We have just committed \$115 million to branch-line rehabilitation, indicating that's the last, and the process of elimination must follow its natural course if we are to have a manageable situation. I'm sure that the member for Thunder Creek would welcome that announcement.

We have 12,000 miles and we have rehabilitated about 800 of those 12,000 miles. We have to rehabilitate and upgrade at least one-half of those 12,000 miles in five years because we won't have cars to run on them. Everyone knows that the boxcars are going out of the fleet. The acting grain co-ordinator says that we start this year August 1, 1981, with this number of cars in the system, and by July 31, 1982, at the end of the crop year, we will have the equivalent of more than 1,000 hopper cars less.

Figure that out. The projection is about 1,800 boxcars out of the system each year. We have to upgrade and rehabilitate those lines. They need \$1 billion. We call on the federal government to put \$550 million of the \$1.3 billion into rehabilitating and upgrading those lines.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I call on the federal government to respond to this problem of getting the grain to the West Coast — this double-tracking and these tunnels. We have been able to identify \$3 billion in projects that are initially required by CN and CP. We know that 20 per cent of the total movement to the West Coast is grain. We say provide \$600 million of the \$1.3 billion to the main lines.

Finally (these are not our figures) there is a need for 6,000 grain hopper cars to replace the retiring boxcar fleet, and that new capacity that the board talks about. Of the \$1.3 billion, what have we left? Roughly \$150 million. That would purchase about 2,000 grain hopper cars. Clearly, that's not enough. Our government offers to convene a meeting of the Canadian Wheat Board, the provinces and the federal government in Regina, the capital of grain growing Prairies, to talk about the 6,000 hopper cars needed, and how they can best be put into the system.

Mr. Speaker, our government policy is clear. Let's not just give the money to railways; let's provide it as an investment policy. Take an equity position in those branch lines; take an equity position in those tunnels and those double tracks, just as we have an equity position in the grain hopper cars. Direct investment and taking an equity position are the only guarantees we have of giving the Canadian Wheat Board the tools to market our grain. Direct investment means the public begins to own what the public has financed for 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, what is the position of the members opposite on investment in the transportation system for grain? In the August 1, 1981, *Leader-Post*, the headline reads:

Hopper Car Purchase by NDP Will Be an Unnecessary Burden.

Kindersley Conservative MLA Bob Andrew Tuesday challenged the NDP government's \$50 million offer to purchase 1,000 hopper cars as an unnecessary burden on prairie farmers.

Mr. Speaker, he went on to accuse Saskatchewan Transport Minister Gordon MacMurchy of playing politics by making an offer he knows the province will never have to live up to, in order to make it appear to farmers as if it were doing something.

The member for Kindersley said, "MacMurchy is playing politics with hopper cars."

An investment of \$55 million which will move \$0.25 billion worth of grain this year, and will move it at today's prices, and will move it for 40 years, is playing politics?

Mr. Speaker, Professor Devine, the leader of the Tories opposite, said on June 5, 1980, on CBC:

Farmers would be willing to see the crowrate increased if it meant more grain moved to markets. He said the province of Saskatchewan is along in its position on the crowrate.

It was alone. It is not alone now.

Professor Devine said:

Confrontation must be replaced by co-operation among the western provinces if a satisfactory new arrangement is to be put into place.

Mr. Speaker, how do the Tories opposite plan to provide transportation capacity, if they say that purchasing hopper cars, taking an investment in the rail system, and taking an equity investment in the system is playing politics?

The leader of the members opposite for the third year in a row, the member for Souris-Cannington, asked in this Assembly on November 28, 1980, whether our government would now reconsider its position and support the Western Agricultural Conference position on the crow. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the member for Thunder Creek on the principle of equal rates for equal distance say in this Assembly that not many farmers are going to quibble over whether it is going to be 8 miles, 20 miles or 50 miles, maybe

even 100 miles to move their grain. The former minister of agriculture from Manitoba in a December 10, 1980, *Star-Phoenix* report said:

A transportation commission should be established to distribute the so-called crow benefit to grain farmers.

I say in this Assembly that the Tory policy on transportation is the following: co-operation on the crowrate; support for the western agricultural conference; hopper cars are politics; and farmers don't mind paying more. Mr. Speaker, we can sell it, and we can use our strength in the market place to get our price. With some investment we can transport it.

How are we going to grow it? In terms of export opportunity we are talking about doubling what we have been producing over the last five years, from 25 to 27 bushels to the acre to 45 to 50 bushels to the acre. What we are talking about is a change in our production. How are we going to do it? Our response has been to set aside \$25 million for agricultural research in this year's budget in the FarmLab program. I make it clear that Canada's Department of Agriculture can have its research. I make it clear that agribusiness can have its research. But I make it clear in this Assembly that the \$25 million is not going to go to either one; it's going to go to the University of Saskatchewan, and the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there's expertise at the University of Saskatchewan and there's expertise on our farms. We are going to bring that expertise together. And we are going to find production answers that maintain the health of the soil and those who till that soil. We have 104 research projects going on on farms in Saskatchewan and we only started in the latter part of June. I recommend the members opposite visit some of those research projects and talk to those farmers.

Mr. Speaker, what is the position of the Tories opposite on FarmLab? The hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley said:

The regional FarmLab committees, are these elected or appointed boards? When you start appointing boards by the government in power, sometimes you get different objectives from what are really intended by the legislation. I wonder why we have to have all of these boards?

Like the member for Kindersley, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley is saying that MacMurchy is playing politics. And he goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that instead of the farmers it should be left to good, old private enterprise because it has certainly produced it in the animals, and that was without any special advisory committee or any special grant to research.

Mr. Speaker, what about the policies on land? And what about the policies on capital available to farmers in Saskatchewan? Oh, yes, this government set up the land bank. It now leases a million acres to 2,700 farmers in Saskatchewan. Oh, yes, this government instituted FarmStart, which has loaned \$183 million since 1973 to 4,700 Saskatchewan farmers with an average age of 26. Yes, lands branch leases 8 million acres of land to 11,500 lessees; yes, lands branch has leased this land since the natural resources transfer agreement of 1930, and the lessees have been asking for some progressive policies like land bank, to which we responded in the last session. Farm ownership legislation to keep Saskatchewan farmland in the hands of Saskatchewan residents is well known across this country.

Where do the Tories opposite stand, Mr. Speaker? The member for Souris-Cannington talks about exploiting sharecroppers in the December 1, 1981, *Hansard*. I ask, are the rental policies of land bank and lands branch exploiting farmers? Members of his own party dispute over who gets the land. There were those lands branch lessees on grazing and hay leases who came to this government and said, "Bring the lands branch policies up to date; put them in line with lands branch sharecroppers."

The member for Rosetown-Elrose talks about Poland, Russia, and the Black Sea. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley criticizes the constitutional package because it did not include John Diefenbaker's right to own property.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Saskatchewan know where the Tories stand — leave research in the hands of good old private enterprise. They want to do away with FarmStart, do away with land bank, do away with lands branch, do away with the best farm ownership legislation in this country.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — They say we should do away with progressive programs because they attack government and they attack this institution.

On the other side of the agricultural industry, the livestock side, our government introduced a first in Canada last spring — long-term stabilization for beef. I don't think there has been any proposal put forward by the Government of Saskatchewan since we came into office in 1971 that has generated the interest the Saskatchewan beef plan has. Why? It is the first of its kind. The beef market is a disaster. The livestock producers are under pressure from the grain opportunity. I think the excitement is because of what this plan seeks to do. There are six key principles in the Saskatchewan beef plan. Firstly, the plan is voluntary. Secondly, the plan is based on cost of production. If we are going to ask farmers and government to invest, it is important to consider very carefully what they should invest in. We, as the Government of Saskatchewan, have come to the position that investment in income assurance stabilization is the wrong way to go. Our position is that stabilization must be based on cost of production, because I have seen those federal plans for hogs and beef under their stabilization act.

What did the producers receive last year from their income assurance plan? It was \$8 a hog — when producers in Saskatchewan were returned \$30 a hog in an individual quarter. What has the beef payment been from the Agricultural Stabilization Act of Ottawa? I think the last payment was in 1976. What was it? Was it \$8 a head? Good grief!

Saskatchewan plans for hogs and beef are not those kinds of plans. They are based on assuring the producer a return based on cost of production, not based on a declining income. When you look at the cost of production formula being a per cent of feed costs, bedding costs, veterinary costs, breeding costs, building costs, investment costs, labour costs, and interest on costs, you will realize that we are talking about something meaningful for producers and government to invest in.

Thirdly, the Saskatchewan plan is a producer plan. It is for producers who own cows. After all, the cow herd is the backbone of the livestock industry, and only bona fide cow producers are eligible to join the plan. Those bona fide cow producers can enrol feeders as herd owners.

Fourthly, it stabilizes the animal at slaughter weight. That is the level we believe that the greatest return will profit the producer and the industry in this province as a whole.

Fifthly, the plan is a long-term program in which the producer and the government invest. It is not a one-year ad hoc program. It is not for five years down the road and then it's all over. It is there until there is a meaningful national plan for beef producers.

Finally, for the first time in Canada we are introducing single desk selling and rail grading into the beef industry.

Our policies with respect to livestock are to seek national marketing and stabilization schemes. I don't want to hear from Ottawa about a committee. I don't want to hear from Ottawa about a survey. I don't want to hear from Ottawa about stabilization plans based on income assurance. I want to hear about stabilization based on cost of production. We will be putting this position squarely before the federal government at the agricultural ministers' meeting in Ottawa the day after tomorrow.

What is the position of the Tories opposite on beef stabilization? What did they say and how did they vote in this Assembly last spring? Well, Mr. Speaker, to a man, the Tories opposite opposed the stabilization plan. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley said that we shouldn't be supporting the family farm; we shouldn't have a ceiling on the plan. In the *Hansard* of April 23, 1981, he said:

I don't see the role of the Department of Agriculture as putting people with expertise of raising cattle out of business because of some magic number of 100 or 150. With this kind of restriction, that kind of producer is going to be gone, because you want to stabilize and try to support some magic number of cow herd of 30 and 40.

The average number of cows on the family farm in Saskatchewan is between 30 and 40.

On May 14, the member for Wilkie spent his time in the debate talking about magpies.

The member for Thunder Creek said on May 19, 1981:

I believe that the best thing the industry can do is to allow is producers to react normally to market conditions . . . Beef stabilization we don't need.

I think it is ironic that the beef industry has never asked for any degree of government assistance other than some minor isolated pocket, which makes up less than 1 or 2 per cent of the industry. Basically, the beef industry has asked government to stay out of its affairs.

The member for Thunder Creek says that beef men don't want help. But the member for Arm River says on May 8, 1981:

Just send out a cheque. To each person who raises an animal in this province and sends it to market, you could just give so much per animal.

The member for Wilkie talked about magpies. Four times the members opposite were all on their feet voting against The Saskatchewan Beef Stabilization Act. And at the 16 meetings in June, October and November, the Tories sent out their henchmen with



their speeches and their questions written out on paper. Down in Stoughton, in the southeast part of the province, where the meeting was held for the producers from the constituencies of Souris-Cannington, Moosomin and Indian Head-Wolseley, they went so far as to attack the integrity of the members of the beef stabilization board — people from SFA (Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture), SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Western Canada Cow-Calf Association, SSGA (Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association), NFU (National Farmers' Union) . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I wonder if the members can keep quiet. All members have a right to . . . Order, order!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — . . . lies in here.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'll ask the member for Moosomin to withdraw the statement he just made — right now.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — What statement?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I will give the member for Moosomin an opportunity to withdraw the statement he just made.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, what the statement was.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The member for Moosomin knows exactly what his statement was. I will ask the member for Moosomin once more to withdraw the statement he made about lies in this Chamber.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the statement.

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I apologize for getting the hon. member for Moosomin so upset. I would suggest to the House Leader for the Conservative Party opposite that they do something with the member for Moosomin, because he gets the hon. members opposite in trouble, whether it's from his seat or from his feet.

Mr. Speaker, I was at those meetings, and I saw the pieces of paper from which the producers were reading. I saw them — the speeches and the questions — and I stood firm behind the beef stabilization board, because it is to be commended for the outstanding job it has done in putting this plan together.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — And I will not stand by to see them attacked in any form whatsoever. Hon. members can attack me, and beef producers can attack me, but I'll not stand by and let them attack the members of the Saskatchewan Beef Stabilization Board, who have come from all corners of the province. One of the producers has 25 cows; another one has 750 cows — and all of these producers are putting a beef stabilization program together that will be the model for a national plan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I want to say in this Assembly that the producers at those

meetings beat down that attack. They beat down that attack because they're sincerely interested in the plan.

I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: what are the members opposite saying about the Saskatchewan Beef Stabilization Plan this fall in this Assembly? Well, they're talking about changing it to a long-term program. They're saying that maybe it's too narrow, and maybe we should look at changing from stabilizing slaughter beef to calves, or maybe changing that lock-in period. They're going to go around saying, Mr. Speaker, that they will fix that plan. Mr. Speaker, have you ever seen anything so tragic in your life? Six months ago the members opposite were on their feet four times opposing the plan. Now they want to fix it!

What's the Tory position? Well, Alberta has announced a one-time assistance plan. "One time," they say three times in their press statement. "It's only a one-time program," say the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture. These people who attack government respond under pressure. And when they're pushed into a corner, they have a one-time program — nothing to do with addressing the issue facing farmers, which is getting a return that is based on cost of production.

The Tory government in Ontario has a one-time plan. They have a stopgap program like Alberta; in fact, the Alberta plan is modelled after the Ontario plan. What's happening to producers in Ontario? They're so desperate that the Grey Bruce Survival Association has been formed. And what is the report? Two were thrown out screaming from the Ontario legislature. Beef farmers in the Owen Sound area were so angry that they formed an armed vigilante group to stop banks from confiscating farms where credit had expired. Three farmers, one armed and all masked, were depicted as vigilantes this week in a newspaper photograph taken in a darkened Owen Sound area barn. The farmer in that report says that the banks had come to confiscate this summer, eventually leading to this affair. One of them (did you read the report?) left Owen Sound for where? For Saskatchewan. He has come to the province safe for agriculture, to the province of Blakeney and MacMurchy because, as the *Calgary Herald* reported an Alberta feedlot operator, Gordon Davies, saying, "Saskatchewan has an agriculture-oriented government, which will spend money in the agricultural sector."

Mr. Speaker, this country looks to Saskatchewan for leadership in agriculture, as it does in other areas, not only because of Saskatchewan's land base, not only because of Saskatchewan's farmers, but because of progressive policies of the Government of Saskatchewan. World food demands mean an opportunity to produce more food — an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, a challenge, and a responsibility.

That opportunity is evident in grain. Sure; there are problems. The price is not what it should be. We haven't solved all the transportation problems. We've got to invest. The opportunity is not there now for red meat, but it will come, as part of the world's demand for food. Both will take investment and both will take some sound investment strategies — investment strategies. I say, Mr. Speaker, based on the family farm and based on the rural community. It's going to take government investment and government involvement. It's going to take governing, and this party and this government, like the Manitoba NDP, is here to govern.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Compare these with the policies coming from the no-more-family-farm member for Moosomin and the leader of the party opposite, Professor

Eight-per-Cent-Of-The-Family-Farms-Must-Go Devine. I will be supporting the main motion. I will be voting against the amendment.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to join the debates in the reply to the throne speech.

In the past week, Mr. Speaker, we've heard considerable numbers of speeches from both sides of the House. For some strange reason, I had the distinct impression listening to the government members that the message they were trying to get across to the Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan is that they were practising to be the opposition — from all the speeches I heard last week from the members opposite, and including the one I heard today. I thought when I heard the Minister of Agriculture start out today that he was going to take the high road and be different from his colleagues on that side of the House, and was going to talk about the policies of the government and leave the attack on the opposition to those other members who had done it last week. But he also had to take the same road, Mr. Speaker. He couldn't leave well enough alone and he, as well, started to take the attack and take that low road. He was practising, as the other members were, to be in the opposition, which is where they want to be come the next election, I suspect.

Most of the speeches that we heard last week, Mr. Speaker, contained a lot of drivel, a lot of nonsense. Some of the speeches that I heard from this side of the House were fairly informative. As a matter of fact, the speech that I heard from the member for Kelsey-Tisdale today was probably as informative a speech as I've heard yet, because he went strictly to what he considered proposals put forth by the opposition.

I recall an incident last year when the Minister of Labour, the hon. member for Moose Jaw South, was very incensed at the member for Rosthern because the member for Rosthern had accused him of playing politics. His reply to the member for Rosthern was that the member didn't know what politics is, and he said, "I'll explain the definition of politics. It is a science to govern." If you recall your words, Mr. Minister, that is what you said.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, I looked up the definition of politics and politicians, and what I found was this: politics means crafty, sly and cunning. The definition of politician that I found in the dictionary was this: one who engages in politics for personal or partisan aims rather than for reasons of principle. So the fact of the matter was that the member for Rosthern was right in the accusation he made at the time.

I want to touch on a couple of the speeches that were made by the mover and the seconder. I suppose one has to forgive them for their ignorance of the contents and lack of information and the lack of positive, constructive programs from the government. One that stands out in my mind, and I think will stand out in the minds of a lot of people in Saskatchewan for years to come, is the statement made by the member for The Battlefords, who said, "I don't believe in free enterprise." I suggest to you, Mr. Member, and Mr. Deputy Speaker from your chair, to tell that to the pioneers of this province; tell that to the small businessmen in this province who live by the credo of free enterprise.

The Premier, in his speech in reply, spent a great deal of time patting himself on the back for the part he played in the constitutional debate. Now I do not purport to be an expert on the constitution, Mr. Speaker, but I say to you that there are probably fewer than 100 people in Canada who are experts on the constitution. So I am among the

majority, and I say to you as well that the people of Canada today probably feel as I do about some aspects of the constitution.

The most shocking thing about the constitution, what I find very abrasive and repulsive, is the omission of property rights in the charter of rights. And it was a condition of the NDP support, as I understand, to the constitution accord that the rights of property be removed from the charter of rights. So, if the Canadian people today have no property rights, they have the NDP to thank. I'm not an expert, but I believe that the first step after we lose property rights is that it is opened up for a police state to search your property without a search warrant. That's the first step.

The second step, Mr. Speaker, will of course be expropriation, but they know all about that because they have that legislation in Saskatchewan. I say to you and to this Assembly that the people of Canada will live to regret the charter of rights and its omission of property rights.

I listened to the Minister of Labour. Unfortunately he has now left the Assembly, because I would have liked him to hear this. Hopefully he will read it. He said that I distorted facts in my attack on the Cornwall Centre. His exact words were that I "chose to distort and misrepresent the fact" — page 169 of *Hansard*.

If that's the truth then the government has misinformed the people of Saskatchewan. What I said, and these are facts, was that they did give to a Toronto developer a 35-year locked-in mortgage at 9.75 per cent for the construction.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's wrong.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — That's wrong? Well, if that's wrong, Mr. Minister, then you should correct the statements you made last year because this is your statement.

It is also a fact, as we were informed by the Minister of Urban Affairs, that Chartwood Developments Ltd. only had to put up \$2 million to \$3 million as a down payment on a \$100 million project. It is also a fact that they went to a Toronto developer; they couldn't do business with Saskatchewan people. They thought Saskatchewan people were incompetent, that Saskatchewan developers were not capable. So they went to a Toronto firm and handed them, on a plate, a multimillion dollar profit deal which the developer quickly took.

It's a fact that Regina businessmen are being charged two to three times too much for rent to locate in Cornwall Centre. It's a fact that they've had to expropriate most of the property where the centre stands. As a matter of fact, in one case, which went to court, the judge ruled that they had to return title to the property to the previous owner and start negotiating again, because the government had gone to the small businessman and had said, "This is our offer; take it or leave it. We are not going to negotiate; we're going to expropriate." And, they did — until they were directed by the court of appeal in Saskatchewan to return the title to the owner and to start negotiating again in good faith.

Last year in the Speech from the Throne (and I am referring to 1980), the Premier had much to say about the year of the handicapped. I asked a certain person in this province to tell me if she was satisfied with what the government had done and to give me some examples of dissatisfaction with the government. This relates right back again to the

Cornwall Centre, Mr. Speaker.

This is a government that said they care about the handicapped and since this is the year of the handicapped, they would do something for them. Well, I'll tell you what they've done. They haven't any accessibility standard legislation as yet. As a matter of fact, in this year's throne speech, it was indicated that the Department of Government Services is already using these standards. I'd like to know where, Mr. Speaker, because this will prove otherwise: "Cornwall Centre, Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities: An Overview." Let's start with parking:

I have been informed that there are five designated parking spaces for disabled drivers on the main floor. To date these spaces have the following barriers to persons with disabilities: the entrance height is six feet, six inches (2 metres.). Many wheelchair users drive vans with an overall height of between 7 and 8 feet, and therefore cannot even enter the parkade. It is interesting to note that the majority of van users are more severely disabled, making using a car difficult or even impossible. As a matter of fact, in one of the entrances, even an able person has to get out of his car to get the ticket, because of the sharp turn they made. Parking spaces are too small, and without proper (or any) signs designating handicapped parking. It is without proper (or any) signs designating handicapped parking. It is recommended that parking spaces be at least 3.7 metres wide or, if more than one stall is provided side by side, the overall space can be a minimum of six metres. Without signs indicating the stalls are reserved, the abuse continues and it is beyond our control.

The closest mall entrance comes down two steps. The path of travel from designated parking stalls to entrance should be the shortest distance. The way a person with a disability must enter the mall is to go out into the parkade traffic, around some pillars, and down to the doors.

There are a number of elevators that can be used providing you can find them. These include a parkade elevator, which conforms to all the requirements outlined in the accessibility standards, including raised numbers to benefit visually impaired persons. Mall elevators: one is located near the Elephant and Castle restaurant. It is behind what appears to be a fire door, with a sign that states "service corridor." (That's where they are going to send the handicapped — down the service corridor.) Once through the door, you go down a long hallway and eventually find an elevator. Note: at first there were raised numbers but these have been pried off. Of course, a visually impaired person would never be able to find the elevators because of the hidden location. The other mall elevator is located down a service corridor by Eaton's; unlike the other elevator, only half of the raised numbers have been removed. Eaton's elevators: the control panels for the floor numbers are higher than recommended by the accessibility standard, and there are low raised numbers.

Washrooms are located on all floors of Eaton's, and I've only found one washroom on the mall. Eaton's provides wheelchair washrooms on the second and mezzanine floors. The men's and women's washrooms are not accessible. Therefore, the only option is to use the wheelchair washroom. The mall washroom provides a well-accessible cubicle but the lock has been removed, thereby negating any privacy. The sinks do not provide room to get under and the taps are not useable by a disabled person.

The majority of phones are too high. My investigation only found one that had been placed at a convenient height for a wheelchair user. It is located on the second floor by a store called Naturalizer Shoes.

Then this same individual, Mr. Speaker, visited the Sask Tel building. It was just opened last week. This is what this person had to say:

I only had time to check out the washrooms on the main floor. There is an accessible cubicle but the lock does not conform to the access standards. The accessible cubicle has its own sink and hand dryer, but, in all honesty, it is not necessary for the cubicle to contain its own sink. It really doesn't matter, for the sink does not have taps. Therefore, you must use a normal washroom sink, which is how it should be.

We heard again today from the member for Regina Victoria, who said they were going to introduce some accessibility standards this year. This is a wonderful time to introduce accessibility standards. You have finished all the major buildings in this province; you have finished your major renovations. You don't even see them around this building. If you want to get into this building, you go through the back door. I have not found a washroom in this building as yet which is accessible to handicapped people. Maybe there is one . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is there one, or more than one? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, you might find one.

About the throne speech that we received 10 days ago, I suppose one could say that the members opposite really had very little choice but to attack the opposition in their replies. If you read the throne speech, you will see that they didn't have much to work with.

For example, we could be asked to consider amendments to The Power Corporation Act. I suppose that is so you can borrow more money. There are amendments to The Highways Act. I have been asking the Minister of Highways to consider some new safety regulations. I have been waiting for a year, and there is nothing about that. The Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act; a Court Order Interest Act; amendments to The Jury Act; The Legal Profession Act; amendments to The Election Act. We just went through that last year, Mr. Speaker. It's back in again. That's really important news for a throne speech. That's the content of our throne speech. Mind you, there were three lines in the throne speech which I think were very, very significant, and they were The Home-owner's Security Act.

We have been waiting for that Act to be read in this House since the day it was discussed. We don't know anything about it. It's on the blues today, but we find out we are not going to get it today. They are waiting to bring it in so they can jam it through. If it doesn't pass, they will say it was the opposition's fault . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know whether I oppose it or support it — I haven't seen it. How can I do either, Mr. Minister of Education? I suppose it wouldn't make any difference to you, because you wouldn't want to give any thought to anything you are going to do anyway. It doesn't matter whether you see it or whether you don't. I would like to see it. I have been waiting to see it. I have been waiting now for 10 days.

There is the evidence and proof, Mr. Speaker, that that thought or comment was put in the night before the throne speech was delivered. They had no idea of what they were doing. Somebody thought about it, and I suspect it was probably the Minister of Urban

Affairs. It sounds like some of his loose thinking. I don't know who it was, but it was a last minute decision to put this into the throne speech. Consequently, we don't have the Bill. They don't know what to put in it. They don't know what to do with it.

Not having seen the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments about what we suspect is going to be in the Bill. If, as has been indicated, they are going to allow the people of Saskatchewan to make decisions as to when they should renew their mortgages, then I say what they are doing is playing the futures market with people's property. Now, the Premier or the government has no right to play the futures market with my property or with the people's property in this province. If I want to play the futures market, if I want to play the stock market, that is my business. They have no right to do it for me. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I suspect will be in that Bill. They might convince or con (and I think perhaps the better word is con) some people into saying, "Well, wait. Interest rates are 17 per cent right now, so wait until next year and they might be 12 per cent." But they might also be 24 per cent. So they're playing the futures market with my property and I object to that. Mind you, that falls right in line with their desire not to have property rights in the constitution or in the charter of rights . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'd like to know who said that, but I didn't hear it. Oh, that sounds like that socialist from Lakeview; yes, it does.

We don't consider, Mr. Speaker, the effect that this Bill will have on the credit unions and on the small trust companies, who carry (and correct me if I'm wrong) better than 50 per cent of the mortgages in this province. There are 600,000 members of the credit union, as the Premier suggested the other day, in 230 credit unions in this province. There are Saskatchewan Trust, a Saskatchewan corporation; Co-operative Trust, owned by members of the co-operative movement; and Pioneer Trust, a Saskatchewan corporation. You're going to tell these companies that they can pay 20 per cent for their money but they can only lend it out at 10 per cent. That's what you are going to do to the credit union members and to the members of these other small trust companies.

The role of the opposition is twofold, that is to criticize and to offer alternatives. Mr. Speaker, we have spent two years offering some very constructive and positive programs . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Oh, they scoff; they scoff and they laugh.

They laugh, for example, at the program that we suggested of putting out \$200 million from the heritage fund at government borrowing rates for home-owners. They scoffed at that. They scoff at the idea that we can put up \$200 million in this province, through whatever means is necessary, to help the construction industry, to help home-owners, to help young people build. They found that ridiculous. It would be at no cost, I might add, to the government. As a matter of fact, they would make a profit if they used the heritage fund money to do this, because what they are doing with the heritage fund today is losing the money in most cases. They can't afford to take \$700 million and loan it out to the crown corporations at no interest. We're suggesting you charge interest. The government is doing it in Alberta. Here's an example of one: 8.75 per cent mortgage for an apartment block so that it will keep the cost of rent down, put out through the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation — the heritage fund money.

Does that surprise you, Mr. Minister? It's there and it's also available for others as well. But no, you have to control things a different way. You have to put the lock and the arm on people — individuals.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's terrible.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes, it is terrible; I agree.

We have suggested, Mr. Speaker, an irrigation program in this province. I'm not a farmer. I'm not going to talk about farm programs to any great extent; however let me say this. I am informed that for the cost of buying Norcanair and losing money on it for the next five years . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Taxair.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Taxair . . . It could bring water in from the South Saskatchewan River system, look after Regina's needs and provide irrigation for all of southeastern Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You think that's a little ridiculous? The other day, I heard one of the members (I believe it was either the member for Estevan or the member for The Battlefords) suggest that it was going to cost a billion dollars to set up rural gasification in this province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, it was you. In Alberta, again, they implemented far more rural gasification than what we're looking at in Saskatchewan, at a cost of \$165 million.

I know how they arrive at a figure of a billion dollars. It's easy. The government goes to Sask Power. It says to the president of Sask Power that it wants an estimate which says it's going to cost a billion dollars to do the gasification. So, he obliges and hands it over. That's it. It's going to cost a billion dollars. Nonsense! They don't want to do rural gasification in this province. That's very clear. They've made it very clear to the people of Saskatchewan that they don't want it.

But we want it and we can do it. As a matter of fact, if you consider \$200 million (I don't know if it's going to be \$165 million or \$200 million with the way prices change — I agree with that) and spread that over four or five years, the length of time it would take to do the job anyway, what are we looking at — \$40 million or \$50 million a year? Less than that. It would be about the cost of building the building for the minister of Sask Tel. It has gold-plated windows. He even has an office up there, as well. Plus there is the throne, and the luxury of the 13th floor with all the fountains and the skylights and the rest. For the cost of building that one building, they could have used that money in one year for expenditures for rural gasification. Where are the priorities?

Mr. Speaker, we would implement rural gasification in Saskatchewan. We're committed to that. Now, they say that we can't take away 10 per cent of the income tax. Do you know what it would cost to reduce income tax in Saskatchewan by 10 per cent? About \$41 million. We just signed the energy agreement with Ottawa that will bring us an extra billion dollars a year in the next five years. But what do they want with that? I can tell you; they want to buy airlines. They want to buy some more gold-plated glass window buildings . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, it's a little difficult. That's right. It sticks in my craw. That's how difficult it is to say.

They want to buy more farmland, but say we can't remove the sales tax. Over a period of five years, what are we looking at? We're looking at about \$60 million a year to remove the sales tax. Forget that we're getting an extra billion dollars a year of revenue. But where do they want to spend it? Then they turn around and say (and this is the Premier who says this), "We're going to have to tax the people more because we lost \$16 million a year through the last budget in Ottawa." That's \$80 million in five years, which is \$16 million a year, they're going to tax us



more. We're saying to you that we will reduce income tax by 10 per cent. We will remove the sales tax.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Then they scoff (and this really gets to me) at the public utilities review commission. Saskatchewan is the only province in North America that doesn't have one. You know why they don't want one? It's because they couldn't possibly get a 409 per cent increase in natural gas since 1975. Do you know why they don't want one, Mr. Speaker? It's because insurance rates have really gone up. (I hope the minister of SGI is listening) because, Mr. Speaker, the 1981 rate for some grain trucks in Saskatchewan is 419 per cent over the 1978 rate, and the lowest one is 199 per cent over 1978. That's why they don't want a public utilities review commission, and because they don't want to have to justify a 230 per cent increase in power rates.

We are committed to these programs. We are committed to do what we have said we are going to do — remove the sales tax, freeze the gas tax, reduce the income tax by 10 per cent, make funds available to home-owners. We've said we will do it and we can do it. And the people of Saskatchewan know that we can keep our promises. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no intentions of supporting the motion, but I will certainly be supporting the amendment.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder, before the hon. member resumes his seat, whether he would permit a question? Can the member tell me whether he personally checked the facilities for handicapped people in the Cornwall Centre? Did he check with Chartwood? Did he check with Eaton's, SGI, Sask Tel, the Royal Bank? Is he personally aware that they meet the national standard code for the handicapped? Or is it hearsay that he is going on and mouthing here?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I would be very happy to answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I think that we're setting a precedent today in the fact that I'm up again and I can give a second speech. In reply, thank you very much, I can start all over again. I will, in fact, if the minister likes, give him the name of the individual who did research the . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Did you personally?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No, I did not. I will say this. I do not question the integrity of the handicapped person sitting in a wheel chair, who spent a full day investigating the facilities of the Cornwall Centre. I do not question her integrity, her honesty. If the minister wants to question it, that's up to him. He can live with that. I will take that person's word for what she informs me she found when she went into the Cornwall Centre and the Sask Tel building.

I visited the Sask Tel building myself during the opening, but I don't know what standards are required and I'm not handicapped. Perhaps the minister if handicapped somewhere up here. But I suggest to you that you visit the Cornwall Centre yourself and you take along a handicapped person with you. Don't take it that you are the knowledgeable person. Go with someone who knows what they want and then perhaps you will change your attitude about accessibility standards in the coming legislation. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 11**

Garner	Birkbeck	Andrew
Rousseau	Pickering	Duncan
McLeod	Hardy	Swan
Muirhead	Ham	

**Nays — 35**

Blakeney	Pepper	Allen
Kaeding	Snyder	Romanow
Smishek	Bowerman	Tchorzewski
Robbins	Baker	Feschuk
Rolfes	MacMurchy	Mostoway
Banda	Hammersmith	Kowalchuk
Dyck	Thompson	Engel
Byers	Long	Cody
Koskie	Matsalla	Shillington
Skoberg	Prebble	Johnson
Lingenfelter	White	Lusney
Solomon	Chapman	

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like an opportunity to speak on the main motion, and I see that it is now past 5 p.m. For that reason, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Department of the Environment Act**

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Department of the Environment Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 26 — an Act to amend The Lloydminster Hospital Act, 1948.**

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Lloydminster Hospital Act, 1948.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:07 p.m.