

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 8, 1981

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills

DEPUTY CLERK: — Mr. Skoberg, from the standing committee on private members' bills, presents the first report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Skoberg as its chairman and Mr. Katzman as vice-chairman. Your committee has duly examined the undermentioned petitions for private bills and finds that the provisions of rules 55, 57 and 60 have been fully complied with in each case:

Of Theodore Baran, Edward Werbicki and Gerald Muzyka praying for an act to incorporate the Bishop Andrew Roborecki Foundation;

Of Western Christian College of the city of Weyburn praying for an exemption from taxation of its property situated in the RM of Weyburn;

Of the Briercrest Bible Institute of Caronport praying for an act to change the name of the corporation to Briercrest Bible College.

Your committee has also examined the petition for a private Bill of Nelson Lake Lutheran Bible Camp Association Inc. praying for an exemption from taxation of its property located near Preeceville. Your committee finds that rule 60 has not been fully complied with in this case. However, your committee recommends that rule 60 be waived and that this petition for a private Bill be accepted.

MR. SKOBERG: — I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Maple Creek:

That the first report of the standing committee on private members' bills be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. GROSS: — On behalf of me, Mr. Speaker, and the member for Shaunavon, Dwain Lingenfelter, who is not here today, I would like to introduce to the members of this Assembly 17 grade 12 students from the Kincaid, Meyronne, Hazenmore and Glen Bain areas. They are accompanied here today by their teacher, Mrs. Karen Windsor; parents and bus drivers, Mr. Duane Senecar, Bob Loverin and Otto Wornath. I am sure members on this side of the House as well as that side of the House will want to wish

them an entertaining and educational stay at the legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Closure of Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. Mine

MR. ANDREW: — My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, it has now been several days since the announced closure of the Eldorado mine at Uranium City. I would assume that the officials of your government have been in touch with Eldorado, the federal government and the townspeople of Uranium City. From the news reports it would appear that Eldorado Nuclear will be providing service or compensation to employees who have been or are now without jobs because of the closures. However, there are also a large number of business people in the town of Uranium City who are probably looking at bankruptcies over the next six months if nothing is done.

Can you give any assurance to those business people of Uranium City that your government will be providing some funding in the event of a failure to do so by Eldorado or the federal government, to ensure that they don't see their life savings go down the tube and that they don't face bankruptcies in the next six months?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's supposition is accurate in that we believe that Eldorado Nuclear will make provision for all of its employees. Certainly that was the assurance it gave to us. The assurance was that there would be generous severance pay arrangements, relocation allowances and the like. We recognize that there are other persons who live in Uranium City who are not employees of Eldorado or of the Government of Saskatchewan or of some other agency which would be able to shelter them from the full impact of the likely economic consequences of the closure of the Beaverlodge mine. We have not reached any conclusions as to our responsibilities in that regard and are at this time unable to give business people any assurance that they will not suffer an economic loss. I think it is simply too early to say whether or not action should appropriately be taken by our government and I am not in a position to give assurance.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary question, Mr. Premier. The town of Uranium City is like any other town in the province of Saskatchewan. I think there is an obligation of the part of the provincial government to ensure it will fight to have the federal government provide some assistance, but if that fails you must give the commitment. Will you give the commitment to some of those business people that if the federal government is not going to (in the words of the Attorney General), "pony up with some money," the Government of Saskatchewan will, with its resources, provide some assistance to those businesses facing certain bankruptcy?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question asked by the hon. member. I am simply not able to give the assurances which he asks for. Certainly I think he would not be suggesting that the Government of Saskatchewan should compensate the Hudson's Bay Company, which is the chief business operation in Uranium City for its loss, because the Hudson's Bay Company takes those things into consideration. Clearly it is not as simple as the hon. member suggests and accordingly I am unable to give him the assurance which he suggests.

MR. ANDREW: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could you give them at least this

assurance, Mr. Premier: that they can expect something more from the Government of Saskatchewan than simply the Premier or some other minister going around and blaming everything on the federal government and that they can receive some money from this province instead of just empty words that too often in the past have come out of this government for people facing financial troubles?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the town of Uranium City is peculiarly a town of Eldorado Nuclear. I would think 75 per cent of the residences, and probably 75 or 80 per cent of the business and the total assessment in that town is Eldorado Nuclear's. It is 87 per cent, I am advised — so it is their town in all effective respects. There are certainly other agencies there, as will be known . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The postal code of the House of Commons in Ottawa is certainly in the province of Ontario but if there were problems in the House of Commons I would not expect the Government of Ontario to settle them. I would expect the Government of Canada, which is the government of all Canada, to deal with that matter.

Its operation is at Uranium City. It is the Government of Canada's operation. I am sure it will act appropriately. To the extent that there are steps which ought to be taken by the Government of Saskatchewan, we will certainly be giving them close consideration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Nursing Care at University Hospital

MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. A letter was sent to you on November 27 from the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses, University Hospital. Just to refresh your memory, they say:

We are aware of the large deficit, \$1.4 million, but do not agree that measures that will decrease the standard of care should be implemented. Our patients deserve safe quality nursing care, and budget problems should not cause any compromise to this level of care.

Mr. Premier, my question is simply: what is your government going to do to ensure that the nursing care in the University Hospital in Saskatoon does not diminish?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague, the Minister of Health, would be in a better position to respond to that than I.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's question, I can inform her that about three weeks ago officials of the Department of Health and I met with the administrator of the hospital, the chairman of the board, and two or three other members of the board concerning their anticipated deficit. They indicated to us at that time some of the particular measures that they were taking. We indicated to them that in some regard they had an obligation to live within their budget, but that we would be prepared to look at how we could alleviate some of the hardships that they are incurring at this time. My understanding is that my officials have met and are continuing to meet with the administrator and the chairman of the board and other officials of the University Hospital to see if we can come to some agreement on their deficit.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Supplementary to the minister. You say, "three weeks ago." This letter was dated November 27. Obviously the cost-reduction measures are already

being implemented. How soon will it be before you have a firm answer for the University Hospital Board so that it does not have to cut back on staff or stop replacing nursing staff? When can it expect an answer?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, it is not up to me as the Minister of Health to determine what staff the University Hospital hires in any particular segment of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, until the members on the opposite side are willing to listen, I will wait and then answer the member's question.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the member that it's not up to me to determine in what particular departments the University Hospital hires its staff. It is my understanding that it has a particular problem in one department. It is trying to come to grips with that problem. I want to give full credit to the board and to the administrator of the University Hospital in coming to grips with the particular problem. My officials will continue to work with them to try to resolve the problem. I think there will be a resolution in the near future, but I think we need to take into consideration the funding we have made available to the University Hospital vis-à-vis other hospitals — not only in Saskatchewan, but funding made available to other hospitals of similar size in other provinces.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Supplementary question to the Premier. Your minister ably answered the question with a bunch of words which sound rather hollow. At one time the University Hospital was considered the jewel of the health care system, not only in Saskatchewan but throughout Canada and North America. Be that as it may, we now have a Minister of Health who equates quality of service with the length of waiting lists. We have a Minister of Health who says we have enough doctors and yet we're well below the national average. We rank eighth in health spending in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member is on her feet for the purpose of asking a supplementary. The member is not permitted to give any more information than is necessary to give background to the supplementary. If the member has a supplementary, I'd be quite pleased to hear it.

MRS. DUNCAN: — My question is to the Premier. Is this your commitment to medicare after 35 years, that hospitals (not only the University Hospital but also other hospitals, large and small) in this province have to cut back on staff, on nursing services and care of patients, because your government will not put enough funding into hospitals in this province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — It was not many months ago that I had an opportunity to participate at the official opening of the extension to the University Hospital, which all but doubled its capacity so far as square footage is concerned. It did not increase its bed capacity, but provided additional room for the great deal of extra equipment, the new equipment, the CAT scanners, and the rest, which are now installed in that hospital. I am of the view that that hospital gives a standard of care second to none in Canada and, while members opposite may feel that they wish to run down the quality of

care rendered at that hospital, I will not be among those who do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — A question to the Premier. Are you then saying, Mr. Premier, that the nurses, who are professionals in their field, do not know what they are talking about?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am not here to comment on whether or not the hon. member opposite knows what she's talking about, or other people know what they're talking about. I am here to answer the questions by the hon. member. It is no part of the function of the Government of Saskatchewan to issue opinions on whether members of the public know or don't know what they're talking about.

Health Care in Saskatchewan

MR. BIRKBECK: — I would direct my question to the Premier-Minister of Health tag team, whichever prefers to answer. I would refer the member to a lead story in the Moosomin *World Spectator*, "Steps Taken to Ease Hospital Overcrowding," a result of a news release by that hospital administrator. Mr. Speaker, with your permission and indulgence, I would like to read at least one paragraph into the record for the minister's information, to assist him in answering the question:

The administrator stated that 20 per cent of the hospital's 50 beds are tied up with patients who don't require active care, and we're more or less stuck with them. He said he hopes his announcement will encourage families of patients not requiring active care to seek space in a nursing home. But that in itself poses a problem, Bjornson said, because the Eastern Saskatchewan Pioneer Lodge nursing home, which has 42 beds, is jam-packed, and the only alternative is to place elderly patients in nursing homes away from their families and friends.

Now then, I wonder if the Minister of Health or the Premier would agree that your irresponsibility and negligence and that of your health department has left local governments and local hospital boards and nursing home boards with their only recourse, which is to resolve their own problems?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, whether the information that the member gives is correct or not, I don't know, but the other day we were accused of having long waiting lists in our hospitals. I read from the December 2 issue of the Prince Albert *Herald* which says:

While patients in Ontario may have to wait between two and four years for elective surgery, and it has been claimed that those in Regina have to wait up to 14 months, the delay in Prince Albert is seldom more than one month.

Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan we approve more beds than any other province in Canada . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . approve and fund. In Saskatchewan we have approximately 8,000 hospital beds, and we have approximately an equal number of nursing home beds, amounting to about 16,000 beds. Again, this is the highest per capita, I believe, in Canada.

A few years ago the former minister of health implemented a policy whereby we allowed rural hospitals to pick up level 4 beds in their hospitals. Some did so; others did not.

That was their prerogative. That was in order that we could accommodate the senior citizens in their own communities. We will, in the future, hopefully, extend that policy further to hospitals so they can take care of their citizens in their own communities.

Mr. Speaker, I don't apologize for the number of beds that we have in this province because it is the largest number anywhere in Canada, I believe. But having said that, I do think that in certain areas of the province, as I told the member last year in my estimates, we need to look at increasing the number of beds. My understanding is that the Minister of Social Services has done that for the southeastern part of the province in his recent announcement.

I think we will look at the pockets where we have difficulties and we will try to accommodate the citizens of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just direct one supplementary to the Minister of Health. In fact, Mr. Minister, the argument that was raised by the member for Maple Creek that hospitals in this province are underfunded, and that the whole program of health care is underfunded, is accurate. The proof, Mr. Minister, is in the fact that there are long waiting lists, overcrowding in the hospitals and shortages of nursing home beds. Those are the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the argument that we make in this House (and I wonder if the minister would agree) is that intensive personal or nursing care is inappropriate to an acute-care hospital and should be provided by nursing or special-care homes. Would the minister agree with that, and secondly, would he agree to meet personally, along with the Minister of Social Services, with the in-home care, nursing home and hospital board directors of our area?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, first of all I think I have already indicated to the member by reading into the record the short waiting lists in Prince Albert and the short waiting lists in many other areas of this province. We have one of the shortest waiting lists, I believe, in this country.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, I think those of us who have read the paper recently have learned that the deficits in Ontario hospitals are well over \$100 million this year. The waiting lists in Calgary and Edmonton are much, much longer than they are here.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the member's contention that people who need nursing care should not be accommodated as such in the hospitals. I don't necessarily agree. I don't necessarily agree that they cannot be accommodated in a hospital. I have talked to many professionals who would prefer to have a special home just for nursing care; others say no, you should combine it with an acute care hospital.

One of the best hospitals I have visited is Baycrest in Toronto, where they have levels 1, 2, and 3. It is run by a Jewish organization. The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that you can have separate care for a nursing home and separate acute care, or you can combine them. We have taken care of separate facilities and combined facilities. I think you can handle them either way.

So, yes, to your last question, I would certainly be willing to meet with any officials from your area. I can't speak for the Minister of Social Services, but I am sure he would

accommodate us and meet with them at a time which may be convenient to them and to us.

MR. TAYLOR: — A question to the Minister of Health. The other day, Mr. Minister, you indicated that a priority of your department would be preventive health. Well, Mr. Minister, marvellous as that concept may be, would you not agree that adequate funding of active programs so as to avoid your mark of an efficient operation (waiting lists) should be the priority before we embark on this venture of preventive health?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, the member who just spoke has often told me, in this House and outside the House, that he fully endorsed my concept of preventive health and that he would not be critical of any ventures in that particular direction. Mr. Speaker, he was not in the House the other day when I spoke to the throne speech. I indicated very, very clearly that if we were to move into the area of preventive health, I could not be at the cost of treatment of curative health. Monies have to be put up front so that we can continue to give the best medical care in Canada. We have done that, and we will continue to do that.

I agree with the Premier when he says that the University Hospital is still the jewel. We have many other hospitals in this province which far exceed, as far as quality care is concerned, many of the other hospitals in some of the other provinces. So I make no apologies for the way we run our hospitals and for the way we fund them, because it far exceeds what is given to some of the other provinces in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Just one question before he starts patting himself on the back too much. I would like to discuss psychiatric services, Mr. Minister, which I believe have been in disarray in this province for the past 10 years. I will quote Dr. Jack McLurg, a psychiatrist in the province of Saskatchewan for 33 years, who retired from the Regina Mental Health Association. With your indulgence, I would like to bring this into the question, Mr. Speaker. This is what Dr. McLurg says concerning the plan to treat patients in their own communities:

However, lack of money, psychiatrists and mental health personnel in general stunted the plan's growth. He said that there has been a digression in psychiatric services offered in the province since the Saskatchewan plan started in 1960.

Now, that's a practitioner in the field with 33 years experience, Mr. Minister. I say to you: when are you going to accept your responsibilities and institute adequate psychiatric services for the people of this province?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, certainly Saskatchewan led the other provinces in dealing with deinstitutionalization of those people who are experiencing a mental problem. Saskatchewan led the way and, at many of the meetings that I have had with other provincial ministers, they have asked me about how we accomplished deinstitutionalization.

Mr. Speaker, certainly deinstitutionalizing brings with it an additional responsibility to

provide the services in the community. We have attempted to do that. It is not very easy, Mr. Speaker, to try to get professional people into smaller towns and cities in Saskatchewan. We would have sufficient psychiatrists if we were to centralize again like the other provinces are doing. We would have sufficient psychiatrists to deal with all of our problems if they were mainly in Saskatoon and Regina. I would oppose that, Mr. Speaker, because I think we are going in the right direction in regionalizing our services, in bringing these services and the people out into rural Saskatchewan. That is what we have attempted to do.

I will admit we have had some difficulties in getting these psychiatrists to move into those smaller areas and in recruiting them. I think my record has improved as far as the number of vacancies is concerned. There is still room for improvement. We're working on that. Hopefully, in the next budget, we can make further assistance available in this regard. But again, I don't apologize for having decentralized and for bringing that services out to the community. I realize, however, that we will have some difficulty in recruiting professional personnel.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, you know full well, from talking to the professionals in the field, that this program is in a shambles and has been through its time. The Premier and you like to compare us with other provinces. In psychiatric services, you say we're a leader; I say that we rank ninth. That's what Dr. McLurg said — ninth in Canada, followed only by Newfoundland. Are you aware of that?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, it's not uncommon for the members opposite to run down either the professional people in this province or the province itself. You constantly hear that from the members opposite. I want to tell the member that, while I don't have the figures here, we compare very, very favourably on a per capita basis in the number of professional psychiatrists and psychologists which we have working in this province. I don't have the figures here but I know we rank very well with Alberta — in fact, we have many more professional people.

Mr. Speaker, I know that any time you try to decentralize you are going to have some problems. I don't apologize for this government's having implemented that policy many years ago. I think we should continue along those lines, realizing that we have to recruit more staff. We have to look to the future to see how we can entice people to come into this province and work in rural Saskatchewan.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I heard you say that perhaps it isn't wise to talk to the professionals in the field; that's what I got from what you were saying. I believe those are the people who know what is happening in psychiatric services — not the minister opposite. When will you come to grips with this problem and institute a meaningful program to put Saskatchewan first in the field of psychiatric services during these times of severe stress and drug abuse in our society?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, we are first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROLFES: — It's simply a question of how we can improve even more those services which we are presently offering. Mr. Speaker, I think that in the next budget or in the very near future, we will have an answer for the members opposite.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 27 — An Act respecting the Protection of Residences in Saskatchewan

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that a Bill respecting the protection of residences in Saskatchewan be now introduced and read a first time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

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

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. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, First I want to add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion, the member for Estevan and the member for The Battlefords. The hon. member for Estevan and the hon. member for The Battlefords have both made many contributions to this Assembly in the short time they have been here. I am sure they will continue to do so for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a special tribute to my colleague from northern Saskatchewan, the member for Cumberland constituency, Norman MacAuley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — Since he has announced his retirement when his term in this legislature is completed, I want to take this opportunity during the throne speech debate to express my pride and pleasure in having served as a member of this legislature with him. During the years he has served the people of northern Saskatchewan, and served them well, many good changes have been made in conditions that affect the lives of people in northern Saskatchewan. Norman MacAuley has certainly done his part to make this happen.

On behalf of all members of this legislature, I would like to wish you and Mrs. MacAuley many years of happiness in your retirement.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say a few words about the

constituency that I have the pleasure of serving. It is a very large constituency, being 416 miles in length and from 160 miles to over 200 miles in width. The Athabasca constituency runs from the 54th parallel to the 60th parallel, up the Alberta border, up the 3rd meridian to the 59th parallel, then goes east to the 105th meridian to the 60th parallel. It is a large constituency, Mr. Speaker, with thousands of fresh water lakes and rivers. They include the beautiful Clear Water River and the Clear Water Valley. It also has the Athabasca sand dunes. It is a great constituency with great people. I am very proud to be their representative in Regina.

Mr. Speaker, since the NDP government came to power in 1971, we have witnessed many changes in the North. I will mention some of them and their importance. In 1971 housing conditions in northern Saskatchewan were at an all-time low. Some homes had as many as 27 individuals living under one roof. In some cases there were three families to one house. As soon as spring came they would move out and live in tents.

Mr. Speaker, this has now changed dramatically. Now it doesn't matter what town you go into in northern Saskatchewan, you will find new homes, well kept, and very proud people living in them. There are still more homes to be built in northern Saskatchewan, public homes and homes for senior citizens. But the real serious housing problems have been tackled and fairly well completed.

Mr. Speaker, we now have some of the most modern and up-to-date schools you will find any place in this province. While there is still some expansion and a few new schools to be built, the biggest portion has been completed.

Recreation facilities are now being built all over northern Saskatchewan to fill a large vacancy which has existed for recreation. These new facilities have not only provided much needed recreation, but have also provided skill-training jobs in their construction.

Mr. Speaker, sewer and water systems were non-existent in 1971. Now, full sewer and water systems are in place at La Loche, Buffalo Narrows, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Beauval, and Green Lake. The newest town to receive sewer and water services this summer was Pinehouse. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan is now looking at sewer and water systems in such smaller towns as Turnor Lake, Jans Bay, Cole Bay, Michel village, St. George's Hill, Patuanak, and Stony Rapids. Hopefully, in the not too distant future, these towns will enjoy the services of running water.

Mr. Speaker, northern towns are now getting new fire halls, fire trucks, health centres, dust-free highways, bridges, and airports. Roads to such towns as Pinehouse, and Patuanak have been completed. The road to Dillon is just about completed. This road now de-isolates the communities of Dillon, St. George's Hill and Michel village. This is a great asset to these towns. This now eliminates expensive air travel and treacherous road trips across little Peter Pond Lake and big Peter Pond Lake, as well as bad ice conditions in the fall and spring. Northern residents appreciate what they now have thanks to an open-minded NDP government which went ahead when opposition members said, "Stop."

We now have just about all the services in the North that any community in the rest of the province has and has had for many years. Now the big task facing Northerners and the Government of Saskatchewan is to provide economic security for all Northerners. At the present time, if all the services I have just mentioned are completed, we have

what I consider a temporary recession on our hands. I feel that we as a government will have to direct funds to industries which will create northern jobs. Let me make this very clear, Mr. Speaker, mining will not solve our problems, it will only be a part of the solution. We have to invest in wood operations. We have many opportunities in northern Saskatchewan with the types of forests that we have in the Grizzly Bear Hills and Clearwater Valley. I sincerely think that we, as a government, are going to have to work closely with these communities to develop these resources.

I think that we must have better utilization of our fish industry. Take a look at the thousands of lakes that we have in northern Saskatchewan. Take a look at the 7 million pound whitefish limit that we have on Lake Athabasca that is never touched — 7 million pounds of whitefish. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this resource has to be utilized. That is going to take some money invested in fish processing plants so that we can process this type of fish. It's a fish that has to be filleted, but once it's filleted it can be put on the market the same as any other type of fish.

We now have a wild rice industry that is starting to boom in northern Saskatchewan. We have many trappers and fishermen who are getting involved in the industry of raising wild rice. It is becoming profitable. I think that the trapper or fisherman who can diversify and get into a small tourist operation and into wild rice, trapping and fishing, has a very bright future. These are the types of industries that we, as a government, are going to have to push for and help Northerners to expand on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Speaker, education, both academic and vocational, is something we most certainly have to develop. We have to make sure that our young northern students have the best possible education at their disposal. We have to make sure that we expand our vocational training and the community college concept through which we can provide courses for young men and women who left school at an early age and want to go back to finish their schooling and get into trades such as plumbing, pipe fitting, and heavy duty mechanics. These, Mr. Speaker, we most certainly have to zero in on. We have to move on and the faster the better, as far as Northerners are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to the problems at Uranium City with the December 3 announcement by Eldorado Nuclear that it was going to close down operations at the Beaverlodge mine on June 30, 1982, and what the announcement means to Uranium City and the communities of Camsell Portage, Fond-du-Lac, Stony Rapids and Black Lake. Let me explain what it means when you shut down a community of 3,000 such as Uranium City along with all the services it provides.

It provides many services, not only to the citizens of Uranium City, but also to the citizens of Camsell Portage, Black Lake, Fond-du-Lac and Stony Rapids. One such service is hospital service. This is where the people of those communities go for their medical and dental services. This is where they go to purchase vehicles and to buy their supplies for their communities. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation. We have all the schools, hospitals and supply services right in the community of Uranium City, and now we are faced with a closure. It was all done without consultation with the people or with this government, just 22 days before Christmas. There was no indication that this would happen. People in Uranium City were doing what most people do in anticipation of Christmas — buying gifts and making plans for the New Year, and working, Mr. Speaker. They were working hard at levels of up to 5,000 feet below the ground, mining

uranium. Those who came off the shift just prior to Eldorado's announcement no doubt were filled with the confidence and hope that comes with hard work which is well done.

Mr. Speaker, what greeted them was the announcement that they wouldn't have jobs any longer. What greeted them was a crass decision made without care or feeling. What greeted them was the power of the federal Liberal government, without direction, policies or programs, and bankrupt, which was cutting its losses at the expense of people — the people of Uranium City.

But while the people of Uranium City are afraid of the future, they are also calm. They are not panicking, Mr. Speaker. They know that their provincial government is reasonable. They know that the Blakeney government will take time to talk to them and evaluate the situation. They know that this government will not make an arbitrary, ill-thought-out decision, because this government cares about people — people in Uranium City, people in Saskatchewan.

I studied the interim report of Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. They had a loss of only \$1.6 million on revenues of \$17.1 million for 1981, compared with a loss of \$5 million on revenues of \$21.2 million for the same period in 1980. Things are getting better in their overall operation. That's hardly reason for destroying a community of some 3,000 people, Mr. Speaker; it's hardly a reason for destroying these people who worked for them and jeopardized their lives, some of them for over 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very curious here. There is a federal Liberal government that builds the Mirabel airport in Quebec — an airport that is seldom used and cost taxpayers \$366 million to build. Officials say that while the airport is drastically under used, business will pick up by the end of the century — the end of the century! Yet the Trudeau government still pumps money into it. But this same government won't even take the time to look at alternatives for Uranium City. They just shut it down and kick the people out of work with no hope and no way around. This is the federal Liberal government which poured multimillions of dollars into the Come-by-Chance refinery — a gamble which finally ended with a \$600 million bankruptcy. Last year, Petro-Canada bought the refinery for over \$20 million. In other words, the Canadian taxpayers had to pay for the refinery twice.

But the federal Liberals can't support a mine in Uranium City and, if the mine is suffering from market conditions and high production costs, don't even care to look at what else may be done to make the situation a little easier for the people.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same federal Liberal government which invested \$87 million in the Gentilly atomic power plant in Quebec, a power plant built with faulty materials, a plant which costs us \$10 million a year to run and hasn't produced one bit of power in the past four years. The same government spent \$13 million to refit an out-of-date aircraft carrier, the Bonaventure, which after being outfitted was sold to Formosa for \$871,000 — a fraction of the price. It's a list of white elephants, bad investments and just plain bad judgment by this old and tired government in Ottawa. It's just staggering, Mr. Speaker.

As Saskatchewan people know, there are only a few votes in Uranium City; there are many, many thousands in Ontario and Quebec. No consultation, no indication, just close it down. They might as well be mining copper in Chile for all they care about the people who live in Uranium City. What of the town council that has worked so hard to build the community? What of the people who have worked years in the mines? No

matter, close it down.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Saskatchewan was alarmed at the contempt for democratic process displayed by the Trudeau government in this instance. They've seen their rail service cut. They see the crowrate guarantees undermined — decision after decision made in an air-conditioned board room in Ottawa, decisions that affect our lives.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Uranium City and the people of Saskatchewan do not intend to let the federal government off that easy. Mr. Speaker, the Blakeney government does not intend to leave the people of Uranium City without any options. We will talk with them and find solutions.

Mr. Speaker, so the record is clear, I do not want to exclude the Conservative Party from having a hand in this callous act. I laughed the other night when the former Conservative energy minister for Canada, Mr. Hnatyshyn, cried crocodile tears for the people of Uranium City. Here is the same minister who wanted to privatize crown corporations; here is the same person who would have sold Eldorado Nuclear to Denison Mines. Of course, now that he's in opposition, he finds a small place in his small heart for the people of Uranium City. It's the same old story from Grits and Tories — wherever there's a fast buck, or whenever they want to look good so they can grab power, they'll say anything or do anything.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Uranium City want action. They don't want Conservative crocodile tears. And what of the Conservatives in this House? Good heavens, they can't even write their own speeches, far less have a plan for the Saskatchewan economy.

Mr. Speaker, it can be argued that in an economic sense the Beaverlodge operation is not in a competitive position. The uranium market is currently experiencing a period of low prices and oversupply. We know that. We understand these market conditions, yet the outlook for the long term is bright for the industry in general. Steady growth of nuclear power capacity around the world means that by 1990, nuclear capacity will triple. It should be understood, Mr. Speaker, that the problems leading to the announcement of the closing of the Beaverlodge operation are not only related to present marketing conditions, but for the sake of explanation let us consider them.

In the late 1970s, many utilities accumulated large inventories of uranium due to delays in start-up, licensing, regulatory delays and low capacity use. As interest rates rose and inventories became more expensive to hold and the utilities started selling them, this created an oversupply and contributed to the drop in price. Now it appears the price has bottomed out at about \$23.50 per pound since June of this year. This price is below the cost of production for many low-grade mines in the United States and Ontario, and has led to a number of shut-downs in these areas. For example: during 1980 and '81, over 20 United States companies announced shut-downs or cutbacks affecting almost 30 mines. Agnew Lake Mines Ltd. shut down its operations in Ontario in 1980. In Saskatchewan Cenex shut down in 1980, and Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. is also to shut down in 1982. Both, Mr. Speaker, were underground low-grade mines, unlike the rich open-pit mines elsewhere in northern Saskatchewan. These reductions will help bring the market back into balance.

Mr. Speaker, although it is true the market is poor in world nuclear capacity the forecast suggests that if only the reactors currently being built around the world are completed, nuclear capacity will triple by 1990. This increase in capacity will cause the demand for

uranium to more than double. In all, over 30 countries have nuclear reactors or are building them, and projections for the long term show a shortfall of uranium supply beginning in the 1990s and during the next century. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan can weather the current poor markets better than any other producing area. Its high-grade deposits and low cost of production will cushion it against current poor prices, while continuing to provide employment and economic opportunities for northern people.

This brings me back to the Beaverlodge shut-down. Shutting down the Beaverlodge mine and mill at Uranium City in June of '82 will leave some 830 employees without jobs. The 30-year-old operation is the main economic base for the 3,000 residents of Uranium City and accounts for 87 per cent of the local tax base.

But Mr. Speaker, it has been evident that the question was not whether Beaverlodge would shut down, but when. The operation is Canada's oldest uranium mine and one of its deepest underground mines. It has been affected by decreasing ore grades and rising production costs. Ore grades at the mine have historically been about 0.2 per cent or 4 pounds of uranium per ton of ore. This compares to an average grade of 7 per cent or 140 pounds of uranium per ton of ore at Cluff Lake and an average grade of 2.35 per cent or 47 pounds per ton of ore at Key Lake. And the ore grade at Beaverlodge is getting lower. In addition to low-grade ore, Mr. Speaker, the ore is extremely expensive to mine and transport from the underground.

Just to give you some idea of the Beaverlodge operations as compared with Key Lake, Beaverlodge has 830 employees to produce one million pounds of uranium each year. Key Lake will have 500 employees to produce 12 million pounds of uranium per year. In 1980, production costs at Beaverlodge were \$66 per pound, or almost twice as much as the price they received for the uranium. By way of comparison, production costs at Cluff Lake and Key Lake are less than \$10 per pound. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Beaverlodge shut-down is a case of an old operation becoming mined out and uneconomic.

Mr. Speaker, Conservatives say it's wrong to invest in uranium. They're wrong. As in most criticisms they make, they're not familiar with the facts. These were the same people who said it was wrong to invest in potash. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Conservatives should take the lead from this government and expend a little energy in trying to help with the problems facing the people of Uranium City instead of trying to find some way to fault this government. Mr. Speaker, the people of Uranium City know this government has stood by them; they know this government has confidence in them and in their futures. We put our money where our mouths are.

Here are just a few facts about this government's commitments to Uranium City. From 1974 to October 31 of this year, the Blakeney government has provided \$550,000 for medical and dental care in Uranium City. The academic education branch of DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) has provided nearly \$8 million for schools, teachers and other educational needs from 1975 to the present. Over \$800,000 has been spent to provide continuing education opportunities from 1978 to 1981; \$2.5 million has been spent for municipal services such as sewer and water, streets, roads, from 1974 to the present; almost \$3.5 million in capital projects and a few office buildings through the DNS building and municipal engineering branch; nearly \$4 million in roads and transportation from 1975 to the present time.

Mr. Speaker, under the rural and native housing program there have been 32 houses and 8 semidetached senior citizens' units built at a total cost to the province of over \$1

million.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this government does care about Uranium City and has been caring about the development of the North for some time. I think it's terrible that the Conservatives want to use the closing of Beaverlodge mine and mill at Uranium City to degrade the best resource policies in this country.

The opposition suggests we should close down all our operations and stop producing and exploring for uranium and other minerals such as gold, nickel, silver and graphite. Should farmers stop raising beef and hogs because prices change? No. We have an obligation to diversify our province's economy; we have an obligation to deal with the problems created by outside interests. Yes, outside interests, Mr. Speaker.

I listened with amazement to the Leader of the Unionist Party the other day when, in the midst of this crisis for the people of Uranium City, he tried to suggest that Eldorado Nuclear was somehow owned and operated by this government. His former Conservative colleagues laughed; they thought it was really funny. But, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan crown corporations are run with the benefit of people in mind, not profits. Mr. Speaker, I don't think, and the people of Uranium City didn't think, the member for Nipawin's attempts at a cheap political shot were funny. Of course, it's understandable the Conservatives would laugh at such a remark. After all, there's a lot to laugh at on that side of the House.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we are left with a serious situation in Uranium City. Let me tell you what this closure means to the people of Uranium City and area. It means small businesses are already moving out. It means a possible loss of school and hospital services that will affect the communities I mentioned previously. But more than this — the abrupt closure announcement was a betrayal, Mr. Speaker, a betrayal of the trust of the people who live there and a betrayal of the trust of this government. I say a betrayal by the federal Liberal government.

I have already outlined some of the monies expended by this government in Uranium City — monies based on what Eldorado told us it was going to do. We trusted them; the people of Uranium City trusted them. In August 1976, Mr. Speaker, Eldorado announced plans to spend \$34 million on expansion to 1980, doubling its production capacity from one million to two million pounds. Their specific plans included the construction of a hydro station at Charlot River to free the company from dependence on expensive diesel-fired electricity. The station was constructed on schedule for \$25 million. New housing was constructed to attract and hold skilled labour — over \$20 million was spent on the construction of 255 new housing units from '76 to '79, bringing the total Eldorado and Uranium City housing to 580 units.

Also, they continued in 1980 and '81 to build homes and recruit labourers. There were improvement, expansion and mechanization of the mines and mill at a cost of over \$25 million; purchase of a Boeing 737 to eliminate bottlenecks in freight and passenger transportation at a cost of about \$17 million. This is what they announced, Mr. Speaker. So we don't feel too sorry for the market conditions they are suffering. It should be remembered that in 1978 Eldorado had a year of record profits of some \$17 million. We believed they were serious about their commitment to Uranium City, Mr. Speaker, but on December 3 we found out they weren't. They didn't offer any alternative to the people. They didn't consult with this government to see how a gradual phasing out could be accomplished. No, Mr. Speaker, they just made an announcement that the mine and the mill would close down at the end of June next year. Mr. Speaker, this is a crown corporation of the federal government acting like the worst multinational

conglomerate. Contrast this behaviour by a federal agency with the following example. When Caland Ore Company, a private concern in Atikokan, Ontario, a wholly owned subsidiary of Inland Steel, closed down, it offered four years notice initially, which stretched to six years with the actual phase-out period spread over the last 18 months. In consequence, a strong and successful locally directed effort to save the town was able to be mounted. Mr. Speaker, Eldorado, a crown corporation of the federal Liberal government, didn't have time to sit down with the town council of Uranium City and the provincial government to work out a solution.

There is one other little fact, Mr. Speaker, that many people aren't aware of. In March 1981 the Government of Canada transferred to Eldorado a total of 15 million pounds of yellow cake. The Government of Canada had stockpiled this in the slump of the late '60s at a cost of about \$6 per pound. Today's export price is approximately \$24 per pound. So, Mr. Speaker, it means Eldorado got a gift from the Government of Canada with a value of some \$420 million. Even with their losses they will still come out ahead with that kind of gift.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, why not have a gradual phase-down period over three to five years? Why not give the people of Uranium City a break? Where is the commitment to the development of the northern part of our province and our country by the federal Liberal government?

Mr. Speaker, this Blakeney government will not let the people of Uranium City down. We will meet with them, and, as in most other things which have worked for Saskatchewan people, we will do it ourselves. We will work with the people of Uranium City and area to see that a bad federal government decision does not have disastrous consequences for the people of that community. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to participate in this debate on the throne speech. I think I will have to be rather quick, so I want to extend congratulations to the mover, the hon. member for Estevan (and he will continue serving his constituents well for many years in the future, there is no doubt about that), and the hon. member for The Battlefords, the seconder. They both did commendable jobs.

I also want, at this time, to say a few words on the hon. member for Saskatoon Mayfair who has announced (or announced some time ago) that he would not be seeking the nomination for our party and, consequently, wouldn't be running in the next provincial election. That would be Bev Dyck. Bev Dyck has served his constituents well.

While I am at it, I might as well take the opportunity (if I can be so bold as to presume that he will not be running again) to say that the hon. member for Saskatoon Nutana also has served the people of Saskatoon very well in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I think I will get right into the meat of what I want to say. So if you would allow me a few words about the economic and social philosophy of this government and how that philosophy directs its actions, that is what I want to speak about for a little while. I think this explanation is required because the members

opposite clearly do not understand it and have been spreading an unusual amount of misinformation about it in recent months.

I want to contrast the philosophy of this government with the philosophy of the members of the party opposite. Rarely in this province has that contrast been so clear-cut and obvious. The members opposite and their leader in the public gallery use many different labels to describe their political philosophy. With the coming to office of President Reagan in the United States, Tories here like to speak of themselves as neoconservatives or politicians of the new right. As if they were selling soap. Tories seem determined to convince people that their politics is a new, improved variety. I fully understand why the members opposite are so anxious to cut all ties with their past, particularly the past in this province in the 1930s. I can understand their desire to speak of a bold, new vision. But most people in Saskatchewan know full well, Mr. Speaker, that Conservatives always get their best visions from glancing into rear view mirrors. They always talk about what you need tomorrow, by lecturing you on the policies of the past. Now what is clear, Mr. Speaker, is that all this talk of the new right or a new vision is but a slick Hollywood marketing campaign. What is crystal clear is that these are the same old tired Tories. Now what is their bold new vision? What do they offer Saskatchewan in the 1980s? Well, they tell us that what this province needs is reasonable free enterprise. They tell us that the time has come to get the government off the backs of the people. Now, it seems to me that we've heard that kind of talk before. It seems to me that we heard it first from Adam Smith, and some of those members opposite probably got it right from his mouth. We heard it too, from Herbert Hoover, and that great Tory, R. B. Bennett. We heard it recently from Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Premier Sterling Lyon.

It seems to me that Tories in the past are synonymous. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan spoke so clearly in the election of '78. It is also why the people of Manitoba spoke so clearly on November 17, when they decided to throw out a Lyon government. The people know what the Tories mean when they say, "It's time to get government off your back." They mean that you should forget about a dental plan for your children. You see, that's government interference in your lives, and it's time to get the government off your back. They mean that you should forget about a prescription drug plan because it's time to get government off our backs. The Tories would say that you should forget about the Saskatchewan Hearing Aid Plan because that's more government interference, and they've said that time and time again in this House. What about the Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living (SAIL) plan? What about this plan which provides the elderly and disabled with wheelchairs and artificial limbs and respiratory aids, and whatever else they need to be able to leave institutions and live independently in their own communities? "Forget that," the Tories would say. They would say that it's time to get government off your backs.

What about medicare? The Tories say that medicare should follow Otto Lang's user-pay philosophy. That means medicare premiums like in Tory Ontario, where medicare coverage costs a family \$552 a year, or in oil-rich Alberta where medicare premiums for a family are \$228 a year. That's what the Tories mean by getting the government off your back.

Not only in connection with these services, but also when we try to help businessmen with Sedco loans, the cry mounts. "Let them use the banks," they say. "Get the government off your backs." Or when we help farmers through a hog price support program, they shout, "Stop that socialism. Get the government off your backs." These old-fashioned Tories in disguise tell people that the best government is no government.

Mr. Speaker, that philosophy isn't something new. It was widely preached and believed about 1840.

I said a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, rarely has the philosophy of the members opposite stood in such stark contrast to the philosophy of this government. And nowhere is this government's approach to public policy more clearly shown and better served than through the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund. Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund is a public policy vehicle of which this government and most Saskatchewan people are very proud, and rightfully so. Now most people understand the role of the heritage fund, but I want to put it on the record here, for the benefit of the members opposite. They have proven to be very slow learners on this subject. Mr. Speaker, as you know, each year all the money that comes to the provincial government from non-renewable resources such as oil, natural gas, potash, uranium, coal and sodium sulphate is placed in the heritage fund, and each year this legislature decides what should be done with that money. There are no hidden deals, as is claimed is the case in Alberta. It's all there for every member to see and question, and each year the largest single chunk of that money is used to keep down taxes in this province.

Now let me explain. This year the heritage fund will contribute \$550 million to the consolidated revenue fund. The consolidated revenue fund is the provincial day-to-day and week-to-week spending money. It's the operating budget which provides the money to build hospitals, pay the nurses, renovate schools, repair highways and plough the snow. It pays your property improvement grants and provides all of the other services and programs with which most Saskatchewan people are familiar.

This year, \$550 million has gone from the heritage fund to that operating budget for our day-to-day expenses. Now, \$550 million is a pretty significant contribution. It's nearly one-quarter of this year's total budget. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it's more than all personal and corporate income taxes combined. Because that \$550 million was available from the heritage fund, we were not only able to expand services and programs in this year's budget, we were also able to cut income taxes for individuals and businesses.

That's the main way in which the heritage fund helps to keep your costs of living and your taxes down. But it's not the only way. This year the heritage fund will contribute more than \$65 million to provincial development projects. These are projects which will be of benefit to the province as a whole for many years to come. These are longer-term projects which we all know are good, but which will not pay for themselves directly. For example, this year the heritage fund will contribute more than \$1 million for the technical institute in Prince Albert, more than \$2 million toward the expansion of the technical institute in Moose Jaw, more than \$3 million for the construction of forestry development roads in the North, more than \$4 million toward the expansion and renovation of the college of veterinary medicine in Saskatoon, more than \$800,000 toward the expansion of Ipsco (Interprovincial Pipe and Steel Corporation) in Regina, and some \$18 million to help municipalities around the province with their various capital projects.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a fraction of the list. To be blunt, if there were no heritage fund most of these projects would not be going ahead. If there were no heritage fund these important improvements would simply be left undone or income taxes would have to be raised significantly to pay for them.

Money from the heritage fund is also helping this province to attain long-term energy security without having to raise taxes significantly. For example, more than \$63 million will be paid this year to companies to encourage the exploration, development and conservation of our petroleum and natural gas resources. That money will come from the heritage fund. More than \$7 million has been put aside for the construction of a pilot ethanol plant. In total, about 70 cents of every dollar that goes into the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund is used to keep taxes down in this province.

The Tory members opposite laugh. The fund keeps taxes down with a hefty contribution to the government's operating budget. The fund keeps taxes down by paying for badly needed facilities around the province. The fund keeps taxes down by helping in the struggle for long-term energy security. About 70 cents of every dollar goes to help reduce our cost of living. The rest, about 30 cents of every dollar, is set aside for long-term investments such as potash mines, oil wells, hopper cars — investments, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are making, partly for themselves and partly for their children. These are the investments which we are making for the time when the resource money starts to run out.

But the members opposite have made it clear, Mr. Speaker, that they don't like this idea of investing for the future. They have said again and again that we should be using every penny of the heritage fund to pay today's bills.

Allow me to make a few quick observations. Firstly, the Tories seem to have forgotten that under their resource policy, Saskatchewan would never have had a heritage fund in the first place. The people of this province will recall that the members opposite have always accused us of taking too much money from the resource companies. They have always argued that we should have the same royalty structure for oil as they have in Alberta. If we had followed their price over the past seven years, the taxpayers of this province would have lost more than \$1 billion in all royalties.

Mr. Speaker, the total assets of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund today are just over \$1 billion. Purely and simply, if the Tories had been in power over the past seven years, Saskatchewan would have had no money to put into a heritage fund. Now the members opposite have the gall to tell the people of this province how to spend money which their party would have given to the oil companies in the first place. Don't you ever believe that the Tories have changed because by nature Tories cannot change.

This year, when we and Alberta were negotiating with the federal government, when we decided that neither of us could lower our royalties except as part of a deal, the Tory leader went up and down this province saying, "Lower the royalties. Help out my friends, the oil companies." So anxious was he to say that he stood for lower royalties (as Tories always have) that he would have had us desert Alberta in the course of our tough negotiations, thereby breaking the common negotiating front just so everyone would know that Tories stand where they have always stood: for lower royalties, for no heritage fund, for no money for the people of Saskatchewan, and for all the money for the oil companies and their cigar-smoking and bourbon-drinking executives, with whom they communicate quite often I am told.

My second point, Mr. Speaker, is a question of political morality. I want you members opposite, when I'm talking about political morality, to pay attention because it's meant for you. The opposition is saying, "We have bills to pay today. We don't care about tomorrow. We want all this money now. Give me; give me." Mr. Speaker, I think that

most Saskatchewan people feel they don't have a right to it all. They want their children to be able to enjoy some of this resource wealth, too. That's the Saskatchewan way, Mr. Speaker, to live within our means today while planning a better tomorrow for our children. Our parents did that for us, as they took raw prairie and left this generation rich farmland. We are now taking all the easily recovered oil because we and the world need it. Surely we should leave a little something for our children. To do less is to dishonour our pioneers. To do any less verges on political immorality. That's the Tory way, but it's not our way. Mr. Speaker, I say that our way is the Saskatchewan people's way.

Mr. Speaker, I just have a minute or two left. I should like to spend the next few minutes on things pertaining more to Saskatoon and, in particular, the Saskatoon Centre constituency. One thing I should like to mention is the need to continue rent control. I believe that rent control is absolutely necessary when one considers the very low vacancy rate which exists in Saskatoon. I suppose that maybe that rate will not get any lower now that we have a good government in Manitoba. The influx of Manitobans into Saskatchewan will probably stop and probably the influx from Alberta will also stop. You may be interested to know that last year 12,000 Albertans decided to leave the jungle and come back to good old Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, rent control should offer protection to tenants and landlords alike. I believe it's doing that. I don't believe we need a situation in Saskatoon like they have in cities like Calgary and Edmonton, where rental accommodation is scandalously high because that's what the traffic will bear.

Mr. Speaker, rent control has been under attack by Tory MLAs for a long time. They claim that it's not necessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I want that to go on the record: "Hear, hear!" from the members opposite. They are against rent control; they are against renters. I just advise you never to walk through Saskatoon Centre constituency unless it's in the dead of night.

AN HON. MEMBER: — For shame!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Yes, for shame. They claim it's not necessary. I tell you, sir, that I have thousands of constituents in Saskatoon Centre constituency (yes, hon. member for Nipawin, some even go down to Arizona, your constituency) and they will tell you that rent controls are absolutely necessary. Now, Mr. Speaker, thousands of constituents to back you up is a powerful backup, and so I urge this government to continue rent control into the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say a few words on the need for increased funding for the Western Development Museum (WDM). There are a few other things that I wanted to mention, but I think I will leave that now because my time has run out. Mr. Speaker, in case you are wondering, I will definitely be supporting the motion.

MR. MacAULEY: — Mr. Speaker, as my colleague for Athabasca said, I'll be retiring after the session. He is, of course, right. I think I'm very lucky to be here today, with the illness

I've had, and I'm very proud to be able to come back to say a few words to my constituents of Cumberland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to join with other members of the legislature in supporting the throne speech. In the last two years, and especially in the last year, we have been giving our main attention to the constitution of this great country of ours. For the first time in 114 years, we will now have the opportunity to change our constitution without recourse to the Parliament of Great Britain.

Mr. Speaker, because of the changes taking place both in the federal and provincial governments, the people of Indian ancestry are very much concerned about what is taking place. Mr. Speaker, treaty Indians are protecting their treaty rights, their land entitlements and their aboriginal rights. The non-status and Metis people of this province are also very much concerned about their aboriginal rights. I support these aboriginal rights, land entitlements and treaty rights.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that in the past the people of Indian ancestry have not been treated very well in this country, especially the treaty people. For many years they were banned from using alcoholic beverages, with the result that many of them purchases out-of-treaty Indian status, with the further result that many of the so-called Metis people of this province are now called Metis, but they are really full-blood Indians. Also, we now have hundreds of full-blood Indian women who have become non-status because of marriage. Mr. Speaker, we can now see why the federal government long ago maintained the suppression of the Indian people, when many of them were not aware that their land entitlements were at stake.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see now that the Fathers of Confederation gave no thought whatsoever to the problems that could occur after they were gone, and were not at all concerned that thousands of blood Indians were going to lose their land entitlements. To make matters worse, succeeding generations of politicians have allowed this situation to continue until we are now faced with having to find a remedy for the past thoughtlessness of the federal politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Premier of this province, the Hon. Allan Blakeney, for his part in making it possible, in the future, for Indian people of this province to obtain their treaty rights, their land entitlements and their aboriginal rights. He had the courage and the guts to stand up for what is right for the Indian people of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — Mr. Speaker, may I say a word or two about the northern half of the province. The Department of Northern Saskatchewan (DNS) has been having consultation during the past year with the people of northern areas regarding the new act concerning municipal affairs. That is another step toward improving local

municipal governments in northern Saskatchewan and gives the opportunity to all northern people, Indian and white, to take part in local government in that area.

Mr. Speaker, in 1982 the government will be providing skill-training programs for Northerners, and I welcome these programs. Every effort must be continued to establish training programs in northern Saskatchewan. A noticeable area of need is the establishing of fish hatcheries and skilled northern people to maintain these projects. There has also been a noticeable reduction in fish population in the last 10 years and many of the Indian people still depend on this food product for their living.

The new mining development in northern Saskatchewan has already made an impact on northern people and, when further training has taken place, there will no doubt be an improvement in the employment situation in the northern areas.

The northern roads are continuing to improve, providing more access to and from the South and other northern areas. The road from La Ronge to Nemeiben River is under construction now and Highway No. 106 from Prince Albert to Creighton and Flin Flon is also under construction and much is being paved. I may say that the road is much appreciated by the people living in those areas.

Mr. Speaker, since I was elected in 1975, I have noticed a great change in northern Saskatchewan. These include better health services, better educational facilities, better transportation, better roads and better housing, electric power in most communities, better telephone service, and legal services right in the North for the northern people. I am sure that if the members of the opposition would only travel to the North, they would see and appreciate the changes which have taken place in the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we should take more notice of what is taking place in Saskatchewan. Large amounts of chemicals are going into the ground in the farming areas. One must realize that these chemicals will eventually turn up in the rivers of our province and also possibly in the drinking water in our villages. People living along the river in communities such as Cumberland House and The Pas will also have to deal with this problem in future years. I wish to urge our government to take serious note of what is taking place in the area of pollution and chemicals.

Another area of importance is the forest fires in our province and all people travelling in northern Saskatchewan during the fire season must be careful. Forest fires have been a big loss to our province every year and game and other wildlife are destroyed. I understand it took close to \$21.4 million to suppress forest fires in 1981. Mr. Speaker, as anyone can see, \$21.4 million could be put to much better use in health or education services, just to name a couple. Regardless of how much we spend on forest protection, it will be of no use if the people of this province and others do not take care. I suggest a good advertising campaign might help to bring this serious problem forcefully to the attention of the public at large. I commend the pilots of the tanker planes and all the staff of the fire protection branch who worked day and night throughout the past summer and early fall to cope with these forest fires. I plead with the public at large for their co-operation when travelling in the North in the summer — remember, you will eventually be the losers if these huge fires continue.

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the economy of this province, I would like to point out that it has been awarded an A-plus rating for its growth. We must redouble our effort to maintain this position. However, if the people in this province continue to demand large

grants, this situation may change. This might be the case if money continues to be taken out of this province by people leaving the country on holidays for long periods of time, especially when this country as a whole is suffering from high unemployment and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, we need Canadian money to be spent in Canada. We need to manufacture goods in this province and all prairie provinces, and to export goods ourselves, rather than purchasing these goods from overseas.

Another point I would like to mention is that we all must work together with determination to overcome one very serious fault which continues to hamper Canada, both economically and socially. This is that we do not seem to be able to value ourselves as a nation undivided. This is that we do not seem to be able to value ourselves as a national undivided, but only as separate ethnic groups. I would like to see one Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two in Cree, because this will be my last speech in this House.

(The next portion of Mr. MacAuley's speech was spoken in Cree.)

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the throne speech on their excellent presentation. Their constituents must be very proud indeed to have such men in their areas. Mr. Speaker, I will not be voting for the amendment but I will be voting for the throne speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, it's a pleasure to take my place in this Assembly to reply to the throne speech. It's a pleasure to represent the Moosomin constituency. I'd like to say on that note that I enjoy representing that constituency and working with the people and assisting them in resolving their problems. I am prepared to represent them for as long as they choose to elect me. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the member for Cumberland who has just taken his place in the Assembly. His presentations are always honourable and sincere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address three areas of concern. They are the economy, the health department and the agricultural department. You see at the outset that on a daily basis this provincial government advertises the performance of Saskatchewan. It advertises, Mr. Speaker, that we are a have province. It advertises that the family of crown corporations will ensure our future wealth. The problem is that the people of Saskatchewan are suffering under a heavy tax burden. Our resource wealth is being sunk into non-renewable resources. Mr. Speaker, if we continue with the economic plan of the NDP, we will have no resources, no heritage fund, no jobs, and we will have high taxation.

In addition to spending resource wealth to control every aspect of the economy, taxes are also increased to pay for social services, health and education. Let me list the areas that the NDP is in, or proposes to get into: pulp mills, a malting plant, potash mining, uranium mining, a packing plant, a noodle factory, land development, shopping

centres, hotels, motels, air lines, expensive executive buses, farming, computers, a steel mill, office equipment, a sodium sulphate mine, oil and gas, industrial pumps, house construction or companies, highway construction companies, grain cars, personal financial investment companies, saw mills and grain futures.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of their involvement in oil, I would like to touch very briefly on the involvement of Saskoil in the province of Saskatchewan, or rather should I say in the province of Manitoba, as it is involved in the oil fields in the Kirkella area. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, would it not be prudent for the government to utilize its own Saskatchewan crown corporation, the people's crown corporation, Saskoil, to do some drilling on this side of the border, in Saskatchewan, so the Saskatchewan people could have access to jobs and opportunities. Mr. Speaker, that is the NDP conglomerate referred to as "the family."

I have just laid out before you that happy family of crown corporations and other conglomerates. Let me take an example or two from that list.

World markets for malt have been identified in excess of 500,000 tonnes per year. At the same time we are selling malting-quality barley for feed to export customers. That is a loss of millions of dollars every year to the farmers of Saskatchewan. That isn't orderly marketing. That is not development in Saskatchewan and that doesn't produce jobs for Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, that is blind stupidity. How long can you continue to sacrifice farm incomes on the altar of philosophy?

Let's take another example from agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture claims that farmers are ripped off by rapeseed crushers. Only one company, Mr. Speaker, crushes rapeseed in Saskatchewan, and that is CSP Foods and that is the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Is the Minister of Agriculture saying the Pool is ripping off farmers? Cargill intended to build a crusher at Melfort. That is another option for producers that would increase quotas to farmers. That is a local market. That is development. But the Premier, Mr. Speaker, who never understood agriculture, calls Cargill down every change he gets.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce sat on the fence when he should have supported his own constituents 100 per cent. Mr. Minister of Agriculture, I would like to ask you this question: what are you doing about the rip-off you say is taking place?

Those are only two examples of this government's bungling. They plan to spend \$400 to \$500 million to buy up existing oil fields. That, Mr. Speaker, ties up heritage funds in depleting resources. That will increase the tax burden on all of us. That will not create jobs. That will not expand the economy. That will not provide opportunity for the young people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

The economic policy of the Government of Saskatchewan will guarantee that Saskatchewan will never fully realize the potential which its people know is there.

Let me turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the area of health, a concern to the people of Saskatchewan. I would like to read into the record a letter that was written to the doctors of this province, signed by Dr. J. S. MacMillan, who is, Mr. Speaker, the president of the SMA (Saskatchewan Medical Association). What does he say in that letter? Let me quote:

The minister made it abundantly clear that in reviewing physicians' fees he is quite happy to examine the gross incomes without looking at the amount of work being carried out by Saskatchewan physicians in the service of their patients to generate that income. He acknowledged that Saskatchewan's physicians might be rendering more services than their neighbours and suggested that physicians might find a way of decreasing the utilization of medicare.

Now, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be fair to ask yourself why the Minister of Health would be asking the doctors to limit the utilization of medicare? Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the worst part:

It was the Minister of Health's position that to this end physicians should: (a) discourage return visits; (b) tell patients who are in the office frequently (say, every two to three weeks) that their problem might not be medical; (c) decide how many hours a week they should reasonably work (and he raised the figure of 60 hours) and refuse to work past that; (d) place more emphasis on preventive health.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that those are very damning comments about our Minister of Health. I would suggest that the people of Saskatchewan have reason to be very gravely concerned about the direction this government is taking in health.

Let's look at another comment the minister has made, not on one but on two occasions. He has stated that he believes in long waiting lists as a sign of an efficient hospital system. Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the logic in the Minister of Health's thinking that a long waiting list is a sign of an efficient health system.

I would like to ask this question: does the Minister of Social Services subscribe to the same thinking as the Minister of Health? Does he believe that a sign of an efficient nursing home system would be a long waiting list? Obviously he must, because there is a long waiting list to get into nursing homes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make sure that the record is clear that this government's position on health is a very shaky position. I would like to again refer to some of the questions that I raised in question period today, questions to the Minister of Health about how he is shifting the responsibility of health care in the province of Saskatchewan to local government.

I referred during question period to a front page story written by a hospital administrator who is desperate to obtain assistance from the government and to have an understanding of the people in the area that hospital serves. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, support the in-home care program, the nursing home institutions that we have, and medicare. It is interesting to note that every time we say that we support medicare or the nursing homes or the in-home care program, the government laughs. I don't know why they would want to do that. Obviously they can't be to political, because in real terms who could possibly be opposed to medicare? Who could be opposed to caring for the health of our citizens? Absolutely no one in the province of Saskatchewan, be he politician, be he a member of the cloth, be he a doctor. It wouldn't matter, Mr. Speaker, what he was. All people support good and reasonable access to health care. Obviously the Minister of Health does not support that concept.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour the Minister of Health with all these criticisms. Certainly they have been well laid out numerous times. I'm sure the Assembly's time is better spent in ways other than going over the many errors and bumbles and acts of irresponsibility that have recently been performed by the Minister of Health. But, Mr. Speaker, I still firmly believe that it was necessary to raise it in the House and make sure that the minister is getting the message. Obviously he must be; I see him taking notes.

I would like to move very briefly into some agricultural concerns that I have. I would like to set it on record that the Minister of Agriculture (and it's too bad that he isn't in the House at this time) took a very serious plunge downward in his popular approach to agriculture. Certainly, yesterday he was making his election speech — at least I would have thought it was an election speech, the way he was carrying on. He was putting on quite a good show for the House. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Minister of Urban Affairs thinks it was a good speech. I don't know whether dramatics in the Assembly — pointing of fingers, clenching of fists and those kinds of things, and making comments in this House that certainly aren't in line with my thinking — are very commendable on the part of the Minister of Agriculture . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Heaven only knows, he is on record as having put himself in the hole far enough and now we see, Mr. Speaker, that he has done it again.

Take a look at the positions that he has taken. I think it's fair to quote his comments out of the *Hansard* from yesterday. I quote from December 7, page 272. He starts out by referring to my desk mate, the member for Wilkie:

The member for Wilkie talked about magpies. Four times the members opposite were all on their feet voting against the Saskatchewan Beef Stabilization Act.

Yes, we on this side of the House voted against The Beef Stabilization Act. That's number one. Number two, like other legislation that is passed in this House, whether or not we agree with it, it is a program that was launched in the province of Saskatchewan. So if we are to be responsible on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, it's not our responsibility to scuttle that program, as the minister is attempting to lay before this Assembly. It's our responsibility to help the Minister of Agriculture (in this case, the beef stabilization program) draft that program through its regulations in a way which will be workable — workable primarily for the cow-calf operation. That's the backbone of the cattle industry. That's what we are trying to do. So when the minister gets up, he loses even more credibility by saying, "Oh yes, here we have the opposition. They originally voted against it; now they are up talking about how to improve it." Yes, we are! Doesn't he understand the parliamentary system? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he does. I don't think he does.

The fact of the matter is that a lot of the members opposite don't understand the parliamentary system. I say again, yes, we voted against the beef stabilization program. But now that it is a ship afloat, if you like, we are on it and we surely don't want to scuttle it. So we're going to do all we can to help that government opposite, and particularly the Minister of Agriculture, to make it work for the benefit of the cattle producers.

What did he say beyond that, Mr. Speaker? He said:

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 meetings were 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 the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Western Canada Cow-Calf Association, the Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association and the National Farmers' Union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from those comments stated in this House (which are in black and white and easy for you people to understand) by the Minister of Agriculture, what do we draw? I'll tell you what I draw from those comments. They are totally out of line and they are not true.

Mr. Speaker, I want to inform this House why those comments irk me so badly. I want to tell this House now. There was a beef stabilization meeting in Moosomin; there were from 200 to 300 people there. I don't know whether they were Liberals, NDP or Conservatives. I don't know what their politics were because the majority of them were cattlemen. The majority of them had cowboy boots on, and I don't know if you can tell the politics of an individual by the boots he wears, but I don't think so. They were involved in the cattle industry and concerned about the cattle industry, and they were concerned about the beef stabilization program. And, Mr. Speaker, they came out to that meeting seeking information.

I made a telephone call to our agricultural representative before that meeting, and I said to him, "Look, there could be a problem at that meeting. Those people there might get into a debate, into an argument as to whether or not that program should be in existence. I want to tell you that I'll be there to take notes for my information, but I will not speak because I had my say on that legislation here in this Assembly and I voted against it."

I told that agricultural representative what I would do and that would be to assist him (because he was chairing the meeting) to keep that meeting on track, in other words, to assist in not letting it break down into a debate as to whether that program should or should not exist. I offered my assistance in that regard, on behalf of the cattle producers of that area. And for the record, Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything at that particular meeting. Not one word did I say during the formal setting of that meeting. Certainly, I met with the cattle producers after. I met with people who are members, I suspect, of almost every, if not all, of the organizations I quoted to the Minister of Agriculture. I had no differences with them. I had no shame in telling them that I voted against the beef stabilization program. I told them why.

After I acted in sincerity, the Minister of Agriculture came into this House and laid a charge like that. Further to that, Mr. Speaker, when the day comes, the low day, when the farmers and cattle producers of this province need politicians (whether they be Liberal, NDP, or Conservative) to tell them how they should think, then I tell you it will be a black day in the province of Saskatchewan. A black day indeed! And I tell you that it's going to be a black day December 7. We will all remember December 7, for the Minister of Agriculture, as a result of his comments, has cast some terrible aspersions on a lot of cattle producers in this province.

Mr. Speaker, that's not the first time the Minister of Agriculture has made blatant attacks on individuals or groups in the province of Saskatchewan. I suppose it would be

fair to say that's enough time on the Minister of Agriculture, and certainly enough time with reference to the beef stabilization program since it has been mentioned and discussed many times in the House. On that note, and on the heels of those comments that I made respecting the decisions that are made from time to time by cabinet ministers, I think it is important to lay out the recent Gallup polls. What do the recent Gallup polls say about big government, including cabinet ministers who impose their will on the people of Saskatchewan? What will they say? We'll take the Prairies, which takes into consideration Saskatchewan (although that happy little Maritimer, the Premier, came out here and I think he thought it was a ship or something, but anyway, it is part of the Prairies). I want to quote from the *Leader-Post*, Wednesday, December 2. It very simply states that the question asked of the people being polled was this:

Speaking of our future, which do you think will be the biggest threat to Canada in the years to come: big business, big labour, or big government?

And going down the list and taking the Prairies, we see it's 22 per cent for big business, 23 per cent for big labour, and 50 per cent for big government. There is nearly as much concern in the province of Saskatchewan that big government is going to sink this province as with big business and labour combined.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that if the government wants to lose office, then it should keep up with its dictatorial attitudes that are imposed on the people of Saskatchewan, because the Gallup poll indicates that is the number one fear in the Prairies and in particular in Saskatchewan.

I want to touch on something else that was imposed on the people of Saskatchewan and that is the 20 per cent sliding gas tax. Boy, I'll tell you, if that doesn't bother you in the province of Saskatchewan I don't know what does. Let's take a look at what happens when a Saskatchewan consumer fills a 40 litre gas tank; that is \$15.84, based on an average price of 39.6 cents per litre. Saskatchewan, through the 20 per cent ad valorem tax, gets \$3.16, SGI gets 60 cents, for a total of \$3.76; federal excise tax, \$4.96; and the provincial royalty, \$2; total government take, \$10.72. In other words, if we were to take off government tax, if big government wasn't imposing its will on the consumers of this province, then we could buy gas for two-thirds of what we're having to pay for it in this province today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to raise another point which I think is very important to have put on the record, particularly in this year, designated by the United Nations as the International Year of Disabled Persons. Here in the province of Saskatchewan the time has come for a building accessibility law. I recognize that the human rights of the disabled have been advanced by the publication of the accessibility standards by the human rights commission. I contend that that action is not enough. I contend that if the government is really serious about accessibility legislation for the disabled, it should introduce it without delay. I find it unconscionable that it has taken years to develop a building code that has yet to be tabled in the legislature and, furthermore, that there still is no accessibility law.

Mr. Speaker, passing a law about accessibility will not in itself change attitudes. What it will do is bring people into contact. It is this which changes attitudes. Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, call on the government not to make a mockery of the International Year of Disabled Persons by just paying lip-service to their legitimate aspirations. I say the government should take definite action and bring forth accessibility legislation.

Regarding senior citizens, Mr. Speaker, the record of the government in its attitude toward senior citizens is outrageous. For the record, I would like to quote from an editorial which appeared in the *Prairie Messenger* called 'opting Out the Aged':

Saskatchewan, the home of medicare, hospitalization and denticare, the province that prides itself on being the nation's social laboratory, opts out of its social care one whole segment of its people. The elderly who need care in nursing homes and senior citizens' residences have two choices: to enter as paupers so that government has no choice but to treat them as welfare dependents, or to retain their personal independence at the cost of spending their life savings on monthly instalment payments.

The member for Regina Rosemont rightly criticized his own government recently on this issue. He pointed out that the elderly, most of whom prefer not to be living in nursing homes, are being penalized for longevity and ill health. The present policy has other ill effects as well. It encourages a welfare mentality of dependence and hopelessness. Why should the citizens of the province strive to save and progress financially when the government in the end penalizes those who are fortunate in having done well? It awards those to whom the province owes the most — its pioneers, its elderly, those who have worked the longest, paid the most taxes and contributed the most often in services and involvement — the worst final indignity possible, stripping away all independence, self-esteem and pride and impoverishing them in order to give them what the elderly deserve to have under any conditions: a home, care, food and a helping hand. The nation's social laboratory owes its elderly a better deal.

It's rather an interesting editorial. Certainly we on this side of the House can't be the only people who are thinking that the government's whole health package — whether it be care for the elderly people, the disabled or everyday attention to the health needs of the people of Saskatchewan — is deteriorating.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude some of my comments on a matter that it would seem the government has some difficulty in addressing. It's an issue, none the less, because of changing economic times which have required a lot of the women in our society today to go out into the workforce. At the same time, they want to retain that right, ability and desire to have children and to raise a family. They're being forced by what I believe is a regressive economic policy of this government to move out into that workforce. Therefore, it is creating yet another situation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss day care just for a few moments. It is well known that more women are working either by choice or necessity. Fewer women are staying at home until their children reach school age. The extended family has all but disappeared. While single-parent families are more and more common, some families are re-examining the assumption that a child's place is in the home until the age of six. Consequently, the demand for day care has never been greater. The Progressive Conservative commitment to day care is not new. We have long recognized the importance of good, accessible day care, as the past record shows. Mr. Speaker, there are, however, fundamental differences between us and the government of the day. Let's take a look at those differences.

Some would assert that there simply isn't enough low-cost day care to go around.

Financial pressures and today's changing attitudes have caused many people to turn to day care, but the demand for subsidized spaces has outstripped the supply. Waiting lists pose serious problems for single parents who need to work but can't get their children into day care they can afford.

Universal day care, perhaps as an extension of the public school system, has been suggested as a solution by some outside of the government. Mr. Speaker, we profoundly disagree. Responsibility for a young child's care rests with the family, not the government. We feel that is the way it should be. The overwhelming majority of parents are perfectly able to make arrangements for their children's care and, obviously, have the right and the responsibility to do so. Universal day care would undermine the role of the family. It would contradict cherished and time-honoured values.

Mr. Speaker, consider the costs alone. The funding needed to provide universal day care would be staggering. Any government has a responsibility to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan who don't have children or don't need subsidized day care, as well as those who do. I ask: why should universal service be government sponsored when many families can cover the costs themselves and others don't require the service?

The welfare of our children is all-important. Certainly, none would argue that a hand should not be stretched out to help parents who can't afford the care their children need. Families should not be asked to choose between their children's welfare and a desperately needed second salary. The challenge facing Saskatchewan is to help meet the needs of these families while, at the same time, being responsible in the management of tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, a Conservative government would make day care more accessible. More attention would be given to encouraging expansion and use of private-home day care. Mr. Speaker, increasing the range of choice in quality day care for all citizens is an important priority. New concepts in day care should be encouraged by offering start-up costs to promising innovative approaches. The rest should depend on the initiative of private citizens and organizations in our communities. Mr. Speaker, while government can offer financial support and fresh ideas, the success of day care in Saskatchewan is ultimately dependent on the initiative of individuals — those who establish and run day care services, and parents, who must be the final judges of which system works best and has the most to offer their children.

Our children are our future. They have a right to the best care we can give them as parents and to the security of a warm, happy environment. Responsibility for giving a child this security and care, especially in the early years, lies with the family. So day care should not be a universally imposed system proclaimed by government as every child's right; rather it must remain a personal choice by each family in the best interests of their child.

Mr. Speaker, the role of government in day care, as Progressive Conservatives see it, is to make the best use of the resources available to those families who need it, but can't afford it alone, and to help communities and individuals provide a variety of good day care service to all parents choosing to take advantage of them. In following this course, Mr. Speaker, we are placing our faith in the judgment of Saskatchewan families, as opposed to that of the Saskatchewan government.

Mr. Speaker, I have covered a fairly wide range of topics in a reasonably short length of

time, given my past record. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would just like to say that I will be opposing the main motion and supporting the amendment.

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Speaker, I thank you. I want to open my remarks by noting a number of inaccuracies that have just been made by the member opposite. The member for Moosomin brought to the attention of this House, in his closing remarks, two criticisms of the Government of Saskatchewan which I thought were extremely interesting. One was a criticism by the member opposite that this government has not been committed to accessibility for the handicapped. He went on to criticize this government for not supporting a commitment to accessibility legislation and for not supporting accessibility standards. I thought that was a very interesting criticism. The member neglected to note the comments in the throne speech which say:

In this International Year of the Disabled the Government of Saskatchewan is pleased to announce that it will give prompt consideration to the enactment of accessibility standards in public buildings based on the recommendations of an advisory committee which has been established to consider a uniform building code. This committee is reviewing the comprehensive standards proposed by the provincial accessibility committee and already adopted by the Department of Government Services as guideline specifications for all new and renovated provincial government buildings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PREBBLE: — He also neglected, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the legislature the fact that the Government of Saskatchewan has already committed approximately \$1.5 million this year, the International Year of the Disabled, for accessibility to public government buildings.

I think we've just witnessed an example of the kind of misleading statements that are frequently made by members opposite. I wish that members opposite would at least read the throne speech before they criticize the government.

It was also interesting to hear the member opposite talk about the need for day care. I am very pleased that the member opposite who, when I stood up six months ago in this House in May and called for expanded day care programs, was on his feet, followed by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, opposing those programs and opposing my comments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PREBBLE: — I say, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that they are now supporting day care; but I do feel that their reversal of position is a very interesting one six months before we go into a provincial election . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Having been diverted slightly from the remarks I intended to open with, as a result of the comments made by the member for Moosomin, I want to say that it's a pleasure for me to take part in this throne speech debate this afternoon. I am honoured to be representing my constituents in the provincial legislature and I am especially pleased to be representing them on behalf of the New Democratic Party.

There are three prominent issues that residents in my constituency have brought to my attention on numerous occasions over the past year. I want to begin my remarks by comments on those three issues which are: increasing interest rates,

university funding and concerns over VIA Rail cutbacks.

First, I would like to comment on the question of interest rates. One concern, of course, that my constituents have is the rapidly increasing cost of living and particularly the high interest rates on mortgages that many families are facing. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that our government has introduced in the Assembly today legislation that will protect home-owners from foreclosure by the banks in the event that they are unable to meet their mortgage payments. This will offer many home-owners an increased sense of security during times which are very uncertain. We, of course, realize that this legislation is only one of many steps that are required to protect home-owners from high interest rates. The most effective solutions lie at the national level and our government has advised Ottawa that the burden of high interest rates could be substantially eased if the federal government would re-establish the policy of legislated fixed interest rates which it abandoned in 1969. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberal Party argued that doing away with the legislated interest rate of 6 per cent would lead to increased competition between the banks, and that that would drive down the interest rates. They were supported in the position by the federal Conservative Party. Only the New Democratic Party voted against that proposal at the time, and only the NDP is insistent now in its demand that high interest rates be controlled through a lower interest rate, set by legislation in the House of Commons, rather than by the banks at the leading of the Bank of Canada.

Unfortunately, it does not appear that the federal government has any intention of implementing such a plan. I believe, in addition to passing The Home-owner Security Act, our provincial government ought to extend direct financial assistance to all home-owners through an increase in the provincial home mortgage interest tax credit program, so that possible savings are increased to \$750 a year from the present maximum benefit of \$250. Our provincial government was the first and only provincial government in Canada to bring forward such a tax credit program. I now propose, Mr. Speaker, that in these difficult times, our government extend that program and expand its benefits.

I want to comment for a moment now on university funding. A large number of residents in my constituency teach and study at the university. They are naturally concerned about the cutbacks in funding to post-secondary education announced in the federal budget. They are also concerned about what future levels of provincial funding will be. As the throne speech emphasizes, Mr. Speaker, our government will continue to fight against the federal health and post-secondary education cuts, which we estimate will cost Saskatchewan \$33 million this year and \$285 million over the next five years. At the same time, however, our government has made it clear that we are not prepared to allow these cutbacks to have an impact upon our provincial institutions.

I was very pleased with the official announcement by the Premier last week that all the federal cutbacks in post-secondary education announced for 1982 will be made up by our provincial government.

The resource policies of our government are now providing us with the revenues needed to shield the university from what will be more than a \$10 million reduction in post-secondary education funding this coming year. Beyond these positive measure, Mr. Speaker, it must be realized that the University of Saskatchewan has been facing financial difficulties quite apart from the federal cutbacks. The last three years have seen tight budgets for both universities — budgets which have fallen short of the rate of

inflation and which has not taken into account the rapidly increasing student enrolment. In Saskatoon, student enrolment is at least 1,000 over predictions made a short time ago. While university funding should not be tied to enrolment directly, this major enrolment increase has clearly added to the financial needs of the university.

The university is experiencing other financial pressures as well. Energy and teaching equipment costs are rising well above the rate of inflation. The excellent construction program our government has implemented on campus has actually resulted in extra operating expenses for additional buildings, and these must be budgeted for. Faculty salaries, particularly starting salaries, are falling behind those for comparable positions for qualified persons in the private sector, and tuition rates, while having dropped dramatically as a percentage of the university budget, have risen to the point that they are now actually the highest in western Canada.

In Saskatoon these pressures have resulted in reductions in service at the university including the phasing out of two departments and the Institute for Northern Studies. Other departments have experienced reductions of staff or loss of teaching assistant positions, and the library has come under considerable pressure. Mr. Speaker, our universities have and must continue to offer a high quality of education. It is thus most important that the pressures I have expressed be responded to quickly in the upcoming provincial budget. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that they will be. And I urge our New Democratic Party government to continue its tradition of strong support for the universities by ensuring a significant increase over and above inflation to the two universities in the 1982-83 provincial budget.

Mr. Speaker, a third area that is of special concern to my constituents are the cutbacks recently implemented by the federal government in VIA Rail service to our city. The federal Minister of Transport announced the phase-out of direct transcontinental rail passenger service from Winnipeg to Saskatoon and Edmonton this July, and those cutbacks were officially implemented on November 15. This is another one of those federal decisions that is almost incomprehensible, Mr. Speaker. Before the Supercontinental service was discontinued on November 15, passenger service one way from Winnipeg to Saskatoon stood at over 175,000 passengers a year. Ridership had increased by 40 per cent over the past four years. From every policy viewpoint, Mr. Speaker, it made sense to improve rather than phase out that service.

In times when energy conservation is imperative, the train offers the most energy conserving means of travel of any mode of transport. For students, senior citizens, and families of low or moderate incomes, train travel is much more affordable than the plane. For larger trips it is, of course, much more comfortable than the bus. Relative to other forms of transportation, rail passengers service is also the least subsidized form of transportation. Yet in light of all these facts, Mr. Speaker, the federal government chose to phase out service through Saskatoon at a time when Saskatoon and the West is really the only area of Canada whose economy is growing to any significant extent.

It is also incredible that some members on the other side of the House, such as the member for Thunder Creek, made comments stating that they in fact were not opposed to the cutbacks. The member for Thunder Creek indicated that he had no special desire to VIA Rail service continued, that he was not particularly upset about the cutbacks. Mr. Speaker, I think that that is truly an incredible statement for any member of the

Saskatchewan legislature to make about the discontinuance of a major transportation service to Saskatchewan people. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the decision by the federal government is a real blow to Saskatoon, and for many smaller communities like Melville it means the complete loss of any kind of passenger rail service.

I am pleased that our provincial Minister of Transport, the Hon. Gordon MacMurchy, has done much to fight the federal government's decision. Each local region of Saskatchewan affected has also fought the phase-out. In Saskatoon, where I and a number of other concerned citizens organized to fight the cut backs, we found Mr. Pepin, as federal Minister of Transport, simply impossible to deal with. He refused all our requests to meet with him in Saskatoon to discuss the problems the loss of direct service would pose. And when we sent a delegation to Ottawa, he was completely insensitive to its request. It is simply another example of what we have, unfortunately, come to expect from the federal government.

I was pleased that our government joined in initiating court action against the federal government on this issue. While the court today has ruled that Ottawa can legally act unilaterally to phase out rail service without consulting the Canadian Transport Commission or without holding public hearings, I believe that that judgment should be challenged. I'm pleased to see that Transport 2000 will be appealing the decision. Thus I want to urge our provincial government to participate in the court appeal against the federal government on the VIA Rail issue, and not to follow the path recently announced of not participating. It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that our provincial government fight this decision to the very end and not leave a stone unturned in trying to get it reversed.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to comment on some of the other areas of the throne speech that I believe are of special importance and some of the new policy initiatives that I believe are required.

One area that I want to touch on is that of alternative energy sources. Another welcome announcement in the throne speech is the proposed amendment to The Power Corporation Act, which will more clearly set out the authority of SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) to encourage energy conservation and to promote the development of alternative forms of energy.

As members of the House know, I have, since being elected, attempted to encourage our government to invest in alternative forms of energy, particularly wind, solar, and biomass development. The announcement of the pilot ethanol plant in last year's budget was one important example of the initiatives that have been taken in this area. Much more could be done, however, in promoting the use of solar energy and wind power and in making use of sources of biomass, such as garbage, as a potential source of fuel.

Action also needs to be taken to remove some of the institutional impediments to the use of alternative energy sources by ensuring that credit is made available to those who incorporate alternative energy sources into the design of their commercial operations and residences.

Another institutional barrier that must be overcome is zoning regulations which, for

example, generally fail to protect the user of solar energy from losing access to the sun at some point in the future, as a result of neighbouring construction. Our provincial government should therefore introduce amendments to urban planning legislation making provision for municipalities to pass by-laws protecting the right to sunlight.

More demonstration projects in the area of solar and wind energy would also be a very welcome initiative. Our provincial government has implemented a very successful series of residential energy conservation demonstration projects. We should not implement a similar series of projects, demonstrating the agricultural, commercial and residential applications of solar and wind power.

In the area of energy conservation, Mr. Speaker, I can say with pride that our provincial government has the most progressive set of programs in Canada, but much more needs to be done.

One area of great importance is home retrofit, where the Saskatchewan Power Corporation \$1,000 interest-free loan and the federal CHIP (Canadian Home Insulation Program) at present only provide financial incentives for a fairly limited insulation job. I believe that what is needed is a greatly expanded provincial assistance program for home retrofit in which, depending on income, interest-free loans of up to \$6,000 would be available for home retrofit projects in which fuel consumption is reduced by 40 per cent or more. Such a program would reflect the fact that a comprehensive retrofit job on a home can cost \$6,000 to \$10,000 today. The existing retrofit programs, in contract, are simply encouraging projects which only save between 10 and 20 per cent of fuel costs and involve much smaller expenditures. An expanded home retrofit program could substantially reduce natural gas and electricity demands for home heating in Saskatchewan and offer substantial savings to individual consumers. It should thus significantly reduce the amount of natural gas our government needs to buy from Alberta, and should also have a moderate impact in reducing electricity demand for home heating. Financial assistance to help home-owners undertake major energy conservation projects in their homes is especially important during periods when higher interest rates result in savings from conservation being discounted into the future very rapidly thus undervaluing long-term returns.

Given the inflationary pressures home-owners are now facing, it is extremely important that our government, in the next budget, set in place incentives that will make long-term investments, such as energy conservation in existing homes, financially attractive in the shorter term. If a major home retrofit program is to be successfully undertaken, it is important to also have in place a proper support system in terms of retrofit standards, building inspection and trained construction personnel. Initiatives at the provincial level should be taken immediately to put this support system in place.

I want to just comment, Mr. Speaker, in closing on this topic, on what some of those initiatives should include. First of all, a revised provincial building code needs to be introduced, which would include insulation standards well above the national building code. The revised guidelines should reflect the Saskatchewan climate and the building techniques available in the province. Secondly, and more importantly, specific standards for a residential retrofit program must be established in conjunction with the home-owner assistance plan.

Thirdly, a retrofit program will require high-quality workmanship and a much more comprehensive program of building inspection. Additional building inspectors would

need to be hired by the province to inspect retrofit projects. Staff capable of doing energy audits on existing houses before and after retrofit would also need to be hired and trained. Such a program would almost certainly stimulate a major expansion in the energy conservation industry in Saskatchewan.

Commercial opportunities would include things like the expansion of firms specializing in home retrofit and house sealing, the manufacture of air-to-air heat exchangers, research and manufacture of energy-efficient windows, the manufacture of insulated window shutters and curtains and other forms of mobile window insulation, and the manufacture of energy-conservation-testing equipment, such as equipment for measuring air tightness and heat loss.

Not only would the implementation of a home retrofit assistance program stimulate the expansion of such conservation industries, but by taking the lead in energy conservation in Canada, Saskatchewan could put itself in a position to market materials and contract out skilled personnel to conservation projects in other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other areas I would particularly like to comment on, and one of them is the transport of hazardous materials, which I was pleased to see was addressed in the Speech from the Throne.

That section of the Speech from the Throne notes that it is the intention of our provincial government to introduce complementary legislation to the recent federal legislation governing the handling and movement of dangerous goods, and also announces that the existing provincial inspection staff will be trained to serve as dangerous goods inspectors. In addition to the present announcement in the throne speech, which I very much welcome. I believe that other measures should be considered by our provincial government to reduce the risk posed by the transport and storage of hazardous materials.

This matter is of special concern to my constituency, Mr. Speaker. Every month, upwards of 150 different kinds of hazardous substances are shipped through my constituency. These include everything from chlorine, propane and vinyl chloride, to high explosives, tear gas material, ammunition, and liquid sodium cyanide. Saskatoon has at least 62 locations where dangerous materials such as insecticides, sulphuric acid or chlorine are stored. Several preventive measures to reduce the risk of accidents could be taken with the assistance of the provincial environment department and the provincial emergency measures organization (EMO) and such measures could include the following actions.

First, assistance could be provided to help relocate high risk commercial outlets and storage facilities to safer parts of the city, for instance locating them in an industrial area and close to an emergency access route. These facilities are now sometimes found near residential neighbourhoods where they pose a much higher risk.

Second, separation distances should be established for all facilities storing hazardous chemicals or other dangerous materials. There should be an automatic separation distance from other adjacent buildings.

Third, the provincial government should not allow high-rise or apartment construction within a set distance of any major rail or traffic route where dangerous goods are regularly being transported. These are all examples of how better prevention could be

achieved through improved urban planning with the assistance of the province.

Attention should also be given to the storage of hazardous materials within our schools. Many schools have a large number of chemicals on hand, and in some cases they are improperly labelled and improperly stored. Any legislation and regulations which are passed should attempt to include provisions which deal with the labelling and containment of hazardous materials. As the recent accident involving the spill of Golden Malrin at the Regina Bus Depot demonstrated, federal labelling and containment regulations are woefully inadequate.

While the Saskatchewan Transportation Company did, of course, not realize that they were actually shipping a hazardous material, the fact remains that there are no regulations at present which prevent the shipment of toxic chemicals in glass, as was being done when the bus depot accident occurred. Neither are there regulations which require the ingredients of a chemical, or even the toxic ingredients of a chemical, to be listed on the label so that in the event of exposure the proper medical treatment may be given quickly. In the Regina Bus Depot accident, the ingredients of essentially 75 per cent of the chemical involved were unknown and could not be readily obtained for immediate medical treatment.

In general, as I have mentioned on previous occasions in this legislature, there is a need for a greatly expanded provincial emergency measures organization that is well funded and that can act as a central training organization for local groups across the province to respond to accidents involving the transport of hazardous materials.

Mr. Speaker, another area I would like to comment on is an initiative that our provincial government has taken recently, while not specifically mentioned in the throne speech. It is the matter of freedom of information — a matter of some considerable importance to the future operations of our government.

I was very pleased when the Attorney General recently announced that former Chief Justice Culliton was being asked to undertake a study into whether freedom of information legislation ought to be passed at a future sitting of this legislature. I am strongly in favour of the passage of such legislation for I believe the assurance that public access to information will always be provided as a legal right is important to strengthening the workings of democracy in any province.

Justice Culliton is asked to review the recently introduced freedom of information legislation in Nova Scotia and also the proposed federal bill on freedom of information. I want to particularly urge, at this time, that the format of Nova Scotia Bill not be adopted because this has a large number of fundamental weaknesses which greatly reduce the effectiveness of freedom of information legislation.

The Nova Scotia freedom of information act provides a good example, in my view, of what we should seek to avoid in Saskatchewan. The preciseness with which material must be requested before it can be obtained is one serious weakness. Unless very precise requests are made, the information may not be released under the Nova Scotia Bill.

Another weakness is the lack of requirement for the deputy head of a department to actually respond to a request for information when it is made. The Nova Scotia Act states that where the deputy head has not responded to a written request for information within 15 working days of its submission, the deputy is deemed to have

denied the request.

A third weakness is that the final appeal, when information has been denied under the Nova Scotia Act, is made to the legislature itself rather than to the courts, thus making appeal tedious and on occasions, highly political.

The Nova Scotia legislation also provides for quite widely defined exemption sections — wide categories of information that can remain confidential — and makes the error of stating a number of areas where information is specifically to be made public, thus leaving further confusion over what is intended to be made available. The courts may well decide to exclude from their interpretation of what is to be released all classes of information not specifically itemized for public release in the Act.

These criticisms of the Nova Scotia freedom of information legislation highlight what a Bill in Saskatchewan should contain in order to be effective.

Firstly, the exemptions from the rule that all information is to be made public should be precise and should be narrow in scope. Loosely worded or broadly defined exemptions would inevitably mean that much information would not become public.

Secondly, an independent review body must be available to make binding decisions on appeals against denials of request for information. Appeals should not be made to the legislature.

Thirdly, there should be a strictly enforced time period during which the provincial government should either meet or deny the initial request for information.

Finally, under new freedom of information legislation, all final versions of reports and documents and names of files should be indexed by the government department for which they were prepared. These indices should be published and regularly updated. In addition, the Act should make provision for the indexing and release of information on a subject-by-subject basis. Without these provisions, freedom of information legislation would become ineffective, because it would simply not be possible for people to know what information is available.

Mr. Speaker, there is one final area on which I would like to comment, and that emerges from the recent oil-pricing agreement concluded between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada. That is indeed, Mr. Speaker, an agreement of which I believe all citizens in Saskatchewan can be proud.

One can consistently see through that agreement how the Government of Saskatchewan has made a better deal for the people of Saskatchewan than the Government of Alberta was able to negotiate for the people of Alberta. One can consistently see in that agreement how the people of Saskatchewan will be getting a larger share of the revenues from oil in this province than will be the case in the province of Alberta.

One of the other things that agreement does, Mr. Speaker, is to put in place the necessary pricing arrangements that will lead to the establishment of a heavy oil upgrader, and will make such an upgrader feasible in this province. Of course, one of the issues that that raises is the question of the environmental impact of the upgrader, and here, one of the very important concerns is the question of acid rain.

The effects of acid rain have been well established, and it's not my intent today to elaborate on them in this legislature. I think that across Canada the question of acid rain has become recognized as a very serious environmental issue. Some people paint it as the most serious environmental issue that many regions in Canada face.

I think the question of acid rain and the question of the upgrader become important in this context: that the upgrader and the environmental policies put in place for that upgrader will be the real test of what our provincial government's policy on acid rain is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is urgent at this point that our provincial government establish stack standards for nitrous and sulphur dioxide emissions — in other words, acid rain emissions — in the province of Saskatchewan. At the present time one of the shortcomings of our environmental legislation is that stack standards for acid rain emissions are not in place. There are only emission standards for ground level nitrous oxide and sulphur dioxide emissions. There are no standards for those emissions at the stack.

I believe that it is urgent, Mr. Speaker. It is imperative that our government introduce and establish these standards as quickly as possible. And with the construction of any upgrader in the province of Saskatchewan, these standards must be established for that upgrader.

The other important aspect of the acid rain issue is going to be the policy and the position of the Government of Saskatchewan with respect to acid rain emissions by the province of Alberta. The Government of Alberta has, in my view, set highly inadequate acid rain standards for the tar sands plants which have been built in Alberta to date. There is no sign that the Conservative Government of Alberta is going to move quickly in the future to ensure that plants are going to be built in such a way that the most up-to-date scrubber technology will be installed in those new tar sands plants.

A recent federal parliamentary task force report outlined the urgency of the situation with respect to the problem that the Alberta tar sands plant posed the province of Saskatchewan. That task force report, Mr. Speaker, emphasized the urgency of the Government of Alberta's not being allowed to increase acid rain emissions in that province to any greater degree than they already exist. It will be imperative, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Saskatchewan take a strong position with the Government of Alberta on this issue — a much stronger position than has been taken to date.

I would say that before we are in a position as a provincial government to take a strong stand on acid rain with the province of Alberta, we have to have strong, tough standards in our own province. We have to be willing to enforce the same standards that we ask the Government of Alberta to enforce, even though our sources of acid rain are not nearly as substantial as those of the province of Alberta.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I call in this legislature today for the Government of Saskatchewan to set standards for acid rain emissions, to set tough standards in all areas of acid rain with respect to all future plants, to make the heavy oil upgrader and the environmental standards that are set for it an example to all other governments in Canada (particularly to the Government of Alberta) and to insist from the Government of Alberta that it put in place acid rain emission standards. These must ensure that the

northern environment of Saskatchewan, the northern lakes of Saskatchewan, and the northern forests and soils of Saskatchewan are not destroyed by the inept environmental policies of the Conservative Government of Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Speaker, I want to close by simply saying that the throne speech clearly contains many positive announcements for Saskatchewan people. Much remains to be done. I am confident that the New Democratic Party will lead the way in accomplishing many of the new initiatives which I have suggested today. It should be clear that I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some brief comments and call it 5 o'clock and then pick it up again at 7 o'clock. I wish to respond to a couple of questions raised by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland and his concern about the acid rain arising out of the tar sands projects in the province of Alberta. The member did not bring forward the fact that some fairly extensive hearings were conducted in the Cold Lake area and the Fort MacMurray area by the Government of Alberta.

The Government of Saskatchewan was, of course, requested to make submissions to that particular hearing — both by the people making the investigation in the Alberta environment department and by several rural municipalities on the Saskatchewan side. They repeatedly requested assistance and repeatedly requested help; yet no money was forthcoming to assist them in preparing their brief. No brief basically was made by the Department of the Environment of the Government of Saskatchewan. I think the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland is going a little overboard in casting all the blame on the Government of Alberta, when our government stood by and did virtually nothing while those hearings were taking place. I agree with the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland that important acid rain protection mechanisms must be in place for the heavy oil upgrader that will be built in Saskatchewan. As I understand from the representations made by the consortium, this problem is being addressed in a very serious way, primarily by the engineers putting the project together. That is primarily Husky Oil. In fact, the emissions of acid rain from the proposed heavy oil upgrader will be less than some of the emissions coming from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation's coal-fired generators in Saskatchewan, and clearly less than the proposed one that the Government of Saskatchewan seems so bent on forcing onto the people of Gravelbourg.

I think the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland had better address his questions and concerns first to the Government of Saskatchewan, because that's the jurisdiction we deal in, and second, to the province of Alberta because the Government of Saskatchewan is every bit as much at fault in creating acid rain with regard to its regulations as is the Government of Alberta.

I'm also glad to see that the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has now finally joined in the fight for freedom of information legislation in Saskatchewan.

I can give advice to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, however, I would very much be surprised if we ever see freedom of information legislation tabled as long as the members opposite are the Government of Saskatchewan. We will not see freedom of information legislation. I suspect that the report coming will not be such that the

government will push forward with freedom of information legislation. But I congratulate the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland for his support of an issue for which I have fought during my time in this Assembly: freedom of information legislation in this province and in every other province and country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have some more things to say after 7 o'clock. I would now like to call it 5 o'clock.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. BIRKBECK: — I wasn't aware, Mr. Speaker (that's why I rose a little late), that you were going to move to orders of the day at this time.

I would like to, if I may, raise a point of order and refer to Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules*, page 104, paragraph 319, subsection (3). I will, if I may, refer to a few sentences out of that particular paragraph:

In the House of Commons a Member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself as a political institution; or to impute to any Member of Members unworthy motives for their actions . . .

I refer to that particular rule in Beauchesne's as it relates to the Minister of Agriculture's comment yesterday, December 7, beginning on page 272 of *Hansard*, where he said:

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 . . .

It goes on from there, but I won't continue any further. Mr. Speaker, I felt that that certainly qualified under the ruling that I just laid before you, for your information. I respectfully request your ruling and perhaps the hon. member could withdraw the comment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I'll take the earliest opportunity to examine the record as the member indicated in his remarks on the point of order, and report back to the House at the earliest opportunity.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.