

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 24, 1983**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of my colleague, the member for Cumberland, I would like to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly, a group of adult education students from the North East Community College in Sandy Bay. They are accompanied by their teacher, Ellie Anderson, and they're in Regina visiting the Gabriel Dumont Institute, the Wascana Centre, and officials of the continuing education branch. On behalf of my colleagues, I want to wish them well while they're in Regina. I sincerely hope it's an educational trip and on behalf of all the members here, we want to wish you all a very safe trip home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you, grade 4 and 5 students from the Torquay Public School from Torquay, Saskatchewan. They number approximately 35 and accompanied by three adults, and they're in the west gallery. I believe Mr. Doug Stallard is with them. They've travelled a fair ways to visit and watch the proceedings of the legislature, and I'll be meeting with them afterwards, after question period, for some refreshments and some pictures, and I'd like to welcome them here.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — As well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome approximately 35 grade 12 students that are in the Speaker's gallery. They're from Lampman High School at Lampman, Saskatchewan, and they're accompanied by Miss Agyeman. And they are going to be visiting with us for a few hours and I will be meeting them, as well, after question period. I would like to have everybody welcome them to this session.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**SGI Rates**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Speaker, I have today 13 pounds of bad news for Saskatchewan drivers. This, Mr. Speaker, is the SGI application for an increase in licence insurance. And let me remind the minister in charge of SGI that nothing you have told this Assembly has been accurate. You said there was going to be no increase to deductible; there was. You said the increase was going to be 6.7 per cent; it wasn't. You told us it was going to be 13 per cent; it isn't. Mr. Minister, how do you square what you said in this Assembly with this application for an increase which states that the true increase is 28 per cent, and I refer you to exhibit C, part 4, of your application?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had taken time to read it accurately in the first place, he would have realized . . . (inaudible) . . . announced today that the 28 per cent that he's referring to in the AAIA (Automobile Accident Insurance Act) would be the effective amount that we would require to achieve the needed amount of money for the balance for six months. If you divide that by two, you'll find that that's 14 per cent, which would have been the amount required for 12 months. But because of the delay that we are forced with — to wait till July 1 — then July 1 to December makes it a 28 per cent necessary increase if we are going to go to that. That application I don't believe states . . . That is, the 28 per cent and I haven't read the, the 13 pounds of information the hon. member is . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Speaker, that's an application going to the public utilities review commission. I'm not sure that it, that 28 per cent, is the amount they're asking for. I'm I refer to the amount that we are asking for, which is 6.7 per cent, plus a \$500 increase, not a 28 per cent increase. We would need, in order to achieve, I might add, Mr. Speaker, in order to achieve the results, and we didn't get the 28 . . . the \$500 deductible as we, as we're requesting, then to achieve the same results a 28 per cent increase would be necessary for the same results. So the information the hon. member is presenting is misleading to say the best . . . to say the least.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that you ought to, you ought to recognize misleading information when you see it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Why is the member on his feet? If he's rising to ask a supplementary, I would like to hear that, and if that's the case, then I would like to hear the question.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the opening line of this document says: "The vehicle rate increase required to break even in calendar year 1983 is calculated as follows and is 28 per cent." What you have just told the Assembly, Mr. Minister, is that the, is that the amount you applied for is not sufficient to break even. So will the minister then admit that — that your application is not sufficient to allow SGI to break even?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I will not admit that, and the hon. member obviously doesn't know how to read or calculate. The application, the 28 per cent he's referring to, would be the amount required if we wait till July 1 and increase strictly on the percentage amount. As we have said, and as we've requested, we asked for a 6.7 per cent increase, effective, effective April 1, I believe it was, originally. Then we had also requested a, a \$500 deductible effective march the 15th. That has now been changed. The amount that we are asking for will not change. It is still going to be 6.7 per cent and \$500 deductible. If we wanted to meet the calculation, yes, it would come to 28. But we're not asking for 28 per cent. The hon. member knows that — he knows from reading it, but he doesn't . . . He wants to mislead the Assembly into thinking that we are going to ask for a 28 per cent increase, which is incorrect.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — A supplementary. Given the fact then, Mr. Minister, that your application is not sufficient to allow SGI to break even, what deficit does your company anticipate in 1983 as a result of an adequate application?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, which way the members opposite would like to have it. We've agreed to wait until July. We realize we are going, that it's costing us money to wait until July.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — How much? How much, was the question. Answer the question.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, I didn't bring the computer with me, and I haven't got the exact figures of what it is going to cost. I believe the, the, the calculation was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$500,000 per month, but that's a figure that I'm, I'm picking out of the air at this point in time. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, what that amount is going to be.

Yes, we needed the 6.7, we needed the \$500 deductible, as a result, Mr. Speaker, of the mismanagement of that corporation when they were the government of this province, and when they were managing SGI. And we are faced with the results that we have today. That's why we needed it. Now we've delayed that, and we've admitted that we are going to lose some money as, because of the delay in implementing those increases and the deductible. But we are still asking — not for 28 per cent, we are asking for 6.7 and a 500 deductible.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, then starting from the vantage point of the minister which is the only one, the only one he seems to be able to cope with, let me ask a new question. Given the fact that you need a 28 per cent increase to break even, which is what you have just admitted, will you now admit that the sole reason for increasing the deductible was to try and camouflage a rate increase which would have been utterly unacceptable if you would have asked for 28 per cent? Will you now admit that that was the sole reason you increased the deductible — was to camouflage the rate increase?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well it, it's, it's very difficult to get through to the minds of some people, Mr. Speaker. I have admitted many times in the past, that without the 6.7 per cent . . . Let me rephrase that. Without the \$500 deductible increase, or the \$150 deductible increase we were asking for, we would have needed 14 per cent. Of course, that is correct. Of course without that increase in the deductible we'd need a larger increase in the basic rate. I have repeatedly informed the member opposite, as I have the people of Saskatchewan many times, that the 6.7 per cent increase was the best way to go to give everyone a better break. Those with accidents would pay more money. That's why the \$150 increase. You didn't like that? You don't like the increase? You caused the deficits. You caused the losses. Do you want to pay for it from your coffers, or your pocket? I don't think so. If you do, you can come forward anytime you like.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Minister in charge of SGI, I have here exhibit C and I want to ask you a simple question, on exhibit C of your submission. Calculations of AIAAIA vehicle rate increase required to break even in calendar year, 1983, with no increase in AAIA deductible. On the basis of that submission, in 1983, it indicated it would require, for 1983, a 28.7 per cent increase. I ask the minister: do you agree with the contents of exhibit C submitted by SGI?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would think it would be fair to say that the contents of the application to public utilities review commission would be somewhat accurate. I am convinced that the management or people at SGI have not put in information that is not correct; that they have not included in that submission false information. I am sure that the information as contained . . . I sent a copy of that book to them yesterday. They've had an opportunity to review it . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And weigh it.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — . . . and weigh it, obviously. I don't, I don't have the contents

of the book memorized. In my mind, in my head — like he said, there's 13 pounds of it — the 28 per cent is the figure that . . . Yes, we are saying to the public utilities review commission, that if you don't do this over here for us, if we don't allow this increase in the rates and in the deductible, to offset it, we would have to do that to achieve, to achieve some kind of results at the end, on the bottom line.

Well, the bottom line is obviously not going to be to our satisfaction, simply because we're not going to get the 28 per cent, simply because we are not asking for the 28 per cent. Yes, that's, those are the calculations, but they read it whichever way they like.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, Mr. Minister, starting with what you've said, as distinct from what the corporation has said, because you obviously don't know it until we give it to you, but let's start with what you've said. What you've said is that the company, to break even, needs a rate increase of 28 per cent. And you have admitted, Mr. Minister (this is the key part), you have admitted that part of the revenue is recouped through an increase in the deductible.

How do you now square, how do you now square that admission with our refusal to submit the question of the deductible to the public utilities review commission? Mr. Minister, if you recouping, if you are increasing your revenue and thus increasing the cost to the consumers by raising the deductible, how, given the spirit of the legislation, do you still maintain that the deductible should not be submitted to the public utilities review commission?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I think instead of sending them that book yesterday, I should have dropped it on their heads . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thirteen pounds would have done something for your head.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many times I have to repeat myself in the same question in a different frame, that they frame it differently. The \$500 deductible is certainly in lieu of an increase, a further increase in rates.

All right, to answer your question. I've always maintained, (and I haven't changed my position), that the \$500 deductible is not a decision, or is not a submission we should be making to, to public utilities review commission. I am not suggesting for one minute that I belong on the bench of the Supreme Court of Canada, that I'm prepared to make, or I'm in a position to make that decision. That's why we have the courts, and that's why the, the presentation or submission is sent to them, submitted to them, so that they can decide whether they are right or whether we are right.

The \$500 deductible, I maintain, is not part of a rate. It's a package . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it isn't. You laugh about that. It's not. I can . . . Should I send for the increase in, in public liability, if we increase that to \$1 million. I'm sure you wouldn't ask us to submit it to the public utilities review commission. You'd say, "Oh, great." There's a . . . What's the difference? It's the same thing. You're submitting a package and asking for a rate on that. Public utilities review commission do not agree with us. That's fine, and we have courts to decide as to who's right and who's wrong. I'm prepared to accept that decision.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'd like to question the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the minister

in charge of SGI.

Mr. Minister, I think you will agree that the proposition that you're putting forward is that, in fact, the increase in the deductibility (in other words, the amount of coverage that the individual is going to get) is not subject to PURC, is not subject to the review by PURC. That has been the position you have taken.

The obvious conclusion: is it not correct that in the future it could be conceivable that there will never be increases in the rates of SGI, because, by the very nature of what you have said, that you decrease the amount of the coverage, and obviously next year you could go up to \$1,000 deductible and say they were going to have a decrease in the amount of the rates for the insurance? You could increase it to \$1,500, and then say that you have no increase, that you have cut the cost.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The hon. member is making a speech, and I would ask him if he has a question to get directly to it.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Those are the obviously conclusions. What are your comments?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The same as they were yesterday, the same as they were two weeks ago, the same as they were when they asked the question originally in the House. Of course I could remove it altogether. I could go up. I could go down. It's part of the package. It's the rate. It's all considered within the rate application but I maintain, but I don't know why were' debating it, Mr. Speaker. I don't know why we are debating this today. The submission has been . . . The application has been sent. Public utilities review commission have asked for a court hearing. We've agreed to that. We'll let them decide as to which way it's going to go. What's the point of the debate in this legislature?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Deception.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — "Deception," he says. "Deception," he says. I have never, I've never, one, at any time suggested that there would be no difference in the rate application if we didn't have the increase in deductibility. I've admitted that. I've said it over and over again. It'll go from 6.7 per cent to 14 per cent if you don't have an increase in the deductible. That way, you charge everybody. That's the way you people would like to see it. You would like to see us apply for a 15 per cent increase so that everybody pays whether they're good drivers or whether they're not. That's what you've been saying all this time. Never mind the people who have the accidents. We'll just pat them on the head. They cause the accidents and they cause the price increases but let's charge everybody. That's what you've been saying all this time. Well, which way do you want it?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the minister feels comfortable with the courts. He's obviously uncomfortable with figures. But I'm glad he is because that's where I was going — to the courts.

Mr. Minister, yesterday, by way of background, let me remind you, Mr. Minister, that yesterday you took notice of a question from my colleague from Elphinstone with respect to the increase in the Auto Pak rates. I now have the increase and I'm holding them in my hand. It amounts to a 17 per cent increase since October and a 46 per cent

increase over last year. My initial question is: will you now confirm that these increases in rates came about as a result because you increased the deductible? Will you confirm that?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is talking about the increases that we will be announcing shortly on the general insurance side, the Auto Pak and so on. I will tell him why we are going to be announcing those increases. I will tell him why. It's because of the mismanagement of those members opposite when they were here and causes a \$40 million loss in SGI last year. And that's why we're having an increase. You created; it is your fault; you should be hanging your heads in shame for the kind of losses that we incurred in SGI last year as a result of the stupidity of your government when you were running that place, and that's why we're having it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Will . . . New question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister save the ballyhoo for your own caucus and give us the facts that we asked for? Is this rate increase, is this rate increase because of the increase in the deductible, or are they poor Saskatchewan motorists going to face another increase in July when the deductible goes up?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, there will be no other increase in July.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. So these are the increases which come about to Saskatchewan motorists because of the increase in the deductible. I'm asking . . . And, Mr. Minister, do I take it then, that if the deductible isn't increased, these increases in Auto Pak rates are not necessary? Do I take it that you wouldn't have increased these if you hadn't increased the deductible?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, he still doesn't understand that when you have a \$40 million loss in one year, something has to happen. He still doesn't understand that the \$32 million of that loss (and they have the report over there) was caused by their stupidity. Even the Premier of Manitoba suggested that it was, it was their stupidity and had been badly managed when they were in government — their leader of their party.

The reason we are having that increase is very simply as I said, you have to take care of a \$38 million loss. Now, do you want to pay for that one as well? Do you want to take it out of your pocket? Maybe you can go and raise it through your friends, I don't know, but we have to do something to resolve the problem that you caused when you were the government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. The minister tells us that this increase comes about because of the losses of the company and is not related to the increased deductible. It is therefore a fair assumption that sometime the motorists of Saskatchewan are going to have to face another rate increase to cover the increase in a deductible. Is that an accurate, logical assumption?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — It would be much easier for me, Mr. Speaker, to have a tape recorder and keep repeating the same answer every time because they come back with the same question time and time and time again. Any increase, and I don't care whether it's on the AAIA side, the SGI side, the losses have been incurred as a result of what you

people did — both ways. You caused it. You caused it. If it hadn't been for the mismanagement of that corporation when you had it, and of those horrendous losses . . .

You talk about increases. You went 56, 60 per cent in a three-year period, but you didn't take the same sanctimonious attitude at the time when you were increasing them, and you still didn't solve your problem with that. You still created an extra \$40 million in losses. Now, how do you justify that? It all ties in, of course. We could turn around and say, "We'll make it a \$100 deductible." We can make a \$50 deductible. I can remove the deductible altogether, if you're prepared to pay enough price, enough in the premiums in the rates, or I can lower those rates by raising the deductible, of course. It's a matter of calculation. If you haven't figured that one out, you never will. But try to understand, try to understand . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You'll have another chance to ask another question. Try to understand that it took, it took you 10 years of mismanagement of horrendous losses. And you are asking us to correct it in 10 months. We'll correct it, but in less than two years. It took you 11 years to make the mistakes.

### **Rate of Commission Paid to SGI Agents**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'd like to address another question to the minister in charge of SGI. Could the minister indicate whether, in fact, he had decreased, or is contemplating decreasing, the rate of commission paid to SGI agents as in the past?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, that was announced at the convention last week. The agents are fully aware of what the rates are. And again, again he wants us to leave the impression that we're being difficult on everybody, but what he doesn't say in his question: what kind of a package have you offered the agents? And with the reduced rate of commission that we'd be paying, I can assure the hon. member that he agents will benefit from it, by in fact, making more money based on the bonuses, and based on the whole package as once it's all put together.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Just in order that I have it on the record, would the minister indicate what decrease in the rate that he announced and is proposed for the SGI agents Could you indicate for the record, and advise this House, what rate increases, decreases you are putting into effect?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that that's, that's a question for this Assembly — the commission that we pay the agents. Well, the agent . . . I don't think the agents would like to me to announce to the people of Saskatchewan how much money they make, and I don't think that's a fair question, for me to announce publicly what those commission rates are, what the agent in fact makes as a commission, and I don't think they really expect me to do that, as well.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — To put it . . . Mr. Speaker, a new question. To put it mildly, Mr. Minister, what we have heard in this question period is startlingly, startling bad news for Saskatchewan motorists. You tell us that a 17 per cent increase is not, is not intended to cover the increase to the deductible. Can you tell us, Mr. Minister, what increase in new Auto Pak rates will be needed to cover the increase in the deductible? How much more bad news awaits the poor Saskatchewan motorist?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, you have a short memory. You asked that question 10 minutes ago, and I answered it. I said there would be no other fee increase this year,

and, Mr. Speaker, I, I . . . To my knowledge, I will qualify my answer, to my knowledge, to my knowledge there will be no other increase this year, and barring catastrophes or barring other unforeseen circumstances if something should happen on the road, that as a result of what he's talking about, I'm afraid the increases are there.

## **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

### **Bill No. 1 — An Act to amend The Education Act**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Education Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill order to be read a second time at the next sitting.

### **Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act.

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

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **SPECIAL ORDER**

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **Address in Reply**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved Mr. Dutchak and the amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney.

**MR. YOUNG:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with pleasure that I rise again in this House to speak as the member on representing Saskatoon Eastview. I'd like to say first off, Mr. Speaker, that I'm very pleased with the action my government has taken to date, and the throne speech indicates that we're still proceeding in that very refreshing direction. Under that direction, for the benefit of the members opposite, I'd like to point out a few of the improvements that this province is enjoying. We have the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada, the only province with an increase in jobs; housing starts are up 14 per cent, while the Canadian rate fell 29 per cent; the highest minimum wage in Canada, possible North America, and possibly the world; a real reduction in tax since taking office in April, such that we alone after the election enjoyed a cost of living freeze; a mortgage interest reduction program that has been the model for other jurisdictions; consistently the lowest inflation in Canada; and public opinion polls, Mr. Speaker, indicate that the majority of people quite rightly acknowledge that we have kept our campaign promises.

Not bad, Mr. Speaker, considering the past performance of the NDP who implemented their promises in the final year of their term, if they implemented them at all. We put real families, Mr. Speaker, ahead of the NDP's pet family of crown corporations. This is compared to, Mr. Speaker, their clandestine takeover of the potash industry just a few weeks after they took, after their election victory of 975, when during the campaign they never breathed a word of their intentions to the public.



I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, rubbing their noses in the dirt for their past betrayals of this province. However, I think that what I have said so far vividly demonstrates the new direction that we are on, and vividly demonstrates the dogmatic socialism mentality that the NDP have followed for 11 years in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Elphinstone, known to members of the media — I believe it was Dale Eisler who called him “Snow White, the leader of the seven dwarfs.” The leader of the party who, as I understand it, at the last NDP convention, voted to boycott McDonald’s hamburgers. Now that’s the kind of stuff, apparently, that that party is doing at their conventions. I’d like to quote from *Hansard* what “Snow White” said, and I read from Monday, March 21, from *Hansard*:

McDonalds, who stick their thumb in the eye of the Saskatchewan farmers by buying their buns made from non-Canadian wheat; McDonald’s who stick their thumb in the eye of Saskatchewan workers . . .

Mr. Speaker, in chastising McDonald’s, the Leader of the Opposition is saying much more than meets the eye, so to speak. He is suggesting that McDonald’s is a poor corporate citizen. He doesn’t like the way that they do business in this province.

As the member for Saskatoon Eastview, I represent people; I don’t represent corporations. However, certainly many of the people who live in Saskatoon Eastview work at McDonald’s restaurants. It’s a locally owned and operated in business and I feel that these outrageous statements made by the member from Elphinstone deserve a little time in order that the record can be set straight.

The member from Elphinstone obviously does not belong to any service clubs. If he did, he would know full well the contributions that this particular locally owned and operated business makes to the community. If he belonged to the Kinsmen or if he watched Telemiracle, he would know of their charity in that regard. If he belonged to Nutana Kiwanis Club or Regina Lions Club, he would know the contribution that this big, bad organization makes towards charitable causes in this province.

I’ve, Mr. Speaker, belonged to the Nutana Kiwanis Club in Saskatoon since 1976. Each year our Kiwanis club puts on a snowmobile day for the mentally handicapped children at the Floral School, just out of Saskatoon. Ed Redekop and the other members of the Saskatoon Snowmobile Club supply us with snowmobiles and drivers, the Haight family from Saskatoon district provides us with a tractor for hayride purposes, and our Kiwanis club cooks hamburgers and hotdogs and the like, and the kids come there and drink McDonald’s donated beverages. Big, bad McDonald’s.

Now last year, Mr. Speaker, on McHappy Days, as it was called by the restaurant chain, in Saskatoon, all the proceeds from those days’ sales went to the cripple children. Last year the Saskatoon stores raised enough money to buy a specially equipped car for Alvin Law (and he’s the fellow that you may have seen on Telemiracle; he has no arms). Alvin is an education director for the council for crippled children, and uses this car to go from school to school, where he speaks to the children of this province on the aspects of being handicapped. He certainly shows them that it is nothing to be ashamed of.

They are against that, Mr. Speaker. McDonald’s donates to Telemiracle. It has — as probably some people are aware — as well, it’s in the process of setting up Ronald

McDonald House on College Avenue across from the University Hospital.

Now certainly if “Snow White,” the Leader of the Opposition, suffered the tragedy in his family of having sick children which required the special facilities of the University Hospital, which a lot of other hospitals in this province don’t provide, he certainly may be in the fortunate position to have wealthy friends with rambling houses, or be financially capable of setting himself up in a nice hotel suite. However, I would suggest that there are other folk in this province, and people, Mr. Speaker, who he suggests that he represents, who are not so well fixed if they had to come to Saskatoon in a tragic circumstance such as that.

Those people, thanks to the locally owned and operated McDonald stores, have the pleasure, in those trouble times, of staying at the Ronald McDonald House.

Now I could go on and on and name other charities and worthwhile projects that this business donated to. However, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my point clear. I think it is plan to anyone listening, Mr. Speaker, that the reasons that the hair raises on the back of “Snow White’s” back when he drives by the golden arches isn’t because he is having a Mac Attack. It’s because McDonald’s restaurants are the epitome, Mr. Speaker, of everything he doesn’t believe in — him and his party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. YOUNG:** — Now, McDonald’s is just a very good example of the type of free enterprise that “Snow White” loathes. And the reason he loathes it, Mr. Speaker, is because it’s efficient. He loathes it because it doesn’t get government grants and Sedco loans, or other hand-outs from the government. His theory is, his NDP socialist mentality is that these things shouldn’t work. However, it works and it works well. And the truth hurts, the truth hurts, and he just can’t drive by that place and come to grips from the way he thinks with respect to socialism and the way he thinks with respect to free enterprise. Certainly I can understand the anguish he must have when he drives by one of those efficient operations. He’d have the people believe that it isn’t Saskatchewan owned and operated. He’d have the people believe that it’s not charitable. He would have believe all sorts of nasty things about the restaurant chain.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, he uses to hang, uses a nail to hang his argument on, the fact that they have got into difficult position when they are buying buns out of province. Certainly, I can assure “Snow White” that it is everything to do with their quality control and nothing to do with being unpatriotic to Saskatchewan business.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that in his little heart of hearts he knows full well that if this whole country operated to a fraction of the efficiency of McDonald’s hamburgers we’d be exporting cars and motorcycles to Japan. He knows that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. YOUNG:** — He can see that. He knows it. But he has been following his dogmatic socialism for so long that it would literally ruin his career if he ever admitted the truth in that regard. Accordingly, he has to keep his head in the sand and keep condemning things that work.

The truth hurts, Mr. Speaker. However, when you boil things down, “Snow White” isn’t

exactly married to Saskatchewan either. He came from Nova Scotia, and he now condemns a Saskatchewan-owned-and-operated business, a business that provides a lot of jobs in my constituency.

Now, if you take a look at the member from Elphinstone's statutory declaration with respect to his conflicts of interest, which he is required to file in this House, you see that he has investments out of province. He has investments with Nu-West Developments out of Calgary, investments with Morguard Trust Company out of Toronto, so I think it's a little bit hypocritical of him to be suggesting that McDonald's buying approximately 10 per cent, as I understand it, of their product out of the province is so wrong, when he has his own investments outside of the province.

He is fortunate; he, by his conflicts disclosure, has an undivided percentage interest in all of lot block 5 in Glencairn, Regina. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, that's a multi-unit residential complex, and I'm sure his investment today is worth many times more than he put in to the project. However, no one from this side is condemning him for that, and I think it is very wrong for him to condemn another sort of business because it's successful, as I'm certain he was with his investments.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go on and indicate to this House some of the positive things that our government has done in the way of health care.

We have taken, Mr. Speaker, and injected \$500,000 immediately after our election into the very much under-funded ambulance system. And certainly, if one looks at things — again I'll use the member for Elphinstone again . . . If he had a heart attack in this house, the ambulance service would be the most important aspect of health care to him right away, and when you look at it, it is as much an integral part of our health care service as a CAT scanner might be. It's very important, and certainly with their fetish for crown corporations they were very quick to starve out that very fundamental service to this province. And I think that what has come down recently, the Birkbeck report with respect to ambulance service, is something which is going to take us long ways in improving our position, which was eighth place, in Saskatchewan, per capita spending in Canada on health services. It's going to certainly do a lot to push us towards being number one in health care.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP have always claimed to be the great champions of health care. They have used that from time to time in elections quite successfully — a scare tactic, so to speak, Mr. Speaker. When we took office, we upped health care spending by \$26 million, higher than the previous election budget — the election budget of the NDP.

Now, I'd also like to point out to the members opposite, and to the House, that our increased spending in social services will effectively improved our health care system. And the explanation for this is as follows. Yesterday I telephone Elmer Schwartz, the administrator of the City Hospital in Saskatoon. He tells me that 16 per cent of his beds are now filled with geriatric type of patients — patients who could be in special-care homes if there were facilities for the people. The people get there, unfortunately, through an acute problem — a broken hip or something of that nature. They wind up in the hospital with the acute-care problem. When their, when their acute injury mends, they find that the doors behind them have closed. Possibly relatives that they were living with have moved, or their room gets filled where they were staying. And there's just virtually no place for the hospital to discharge these poor souls to.

Accordingly, the expensive acute-care beds are filled to 16 per cent in the City Hospital with geriatric patients. I telephoned the St. Paul's Hospital and spoke to Mr. Paterson. He tells me that 17 per cent of his beds (he's administrator in St. Paul's) are filled with patients who could be in special-care homes.

Now the significance, Mr. Speaker, of these figures is that our pouring money, as we have been doing, into special-care homes will effectively (when they're completed) increase the effective size of hospitals. In other words, the 16 per cent in, in St. Paul's, and the 17 per cent in City — or the figures are the other way around, Mr. Speaker — could be discharged to these special-care homes when they get underway. In that way, Mr. Speaker, our spending, our increased spending on social services is going to do a lot for our health spending, which again has been increased.

We are also, Mr. Speaker, (and I'd like to point this out for the benefit of the members opposite) participating in financing the plans for a possible new city hospital in Saskatoon. And I ask: how many hospitals in Saskatoon were built in the 11-year term of the NDP? None. During the last five years, the NDP, Mr. Speaker, in my submission, have totally ignored the long-term care needs of the people of Saskatchewan, while trumpeting themselves to be the great champions of health care.

And to demonstrate that, I have to go to some of the figures, Mr. Speaker, and I would really appreciate the remaining two members opposite getting out their pencils and making note of the figures that I'm going to provide them with. In 1979-80, the NDP budgeted \$1.1 million for construction grants to special-care homes. In the end they only spend \$231,000. 1980-81 they budgeted 1.1 again and spent \$832,000, '81-82 they budgeted 1.7 million and actually spent 792,000, 792 . . . hundred thousand. Now comes election year, comes last year, in there March election gimmick budget, what do you think they budget? Is it 1.1, 1.1, 1.7? No sir. Election year, election comes along and they budget 4.7 million. Now they lose the election. They're no longer the government. We're in our first term and we could fall into the trap of choking the system out for three years and then hitting it big in the final election year. But their election budget was 4.7 million. After having promised 1.1, 1.1, 1.7 for three years and delivering less than that, we come out in our first year, Mr. Speaker, in our first year we budget more, \$1.5 million more than their 4.7 gimmick election budget. And I have assurances that it's going to be spent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. YOUNG:** — A very perfect example, Mr. Speaker, of starving the needs of the people during their midterm and then cranking up, quadrupling their budget during their election year. Now, besides spending over a million dollars more than their budgeted election gimmick, we also have pumped further moneys into this very worthwhile project. We have as well, Mr. Speaker, as well as increasing from their election gimmick amount, we have put an additional \$800,000 to bring forward projects under the job creation in the construction and the renovation of long-term care facilities so you can effectively increase our 6.4 figure over 800 to over 7 million. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a very, very long time before the NDP can suggest that we're not light-years ahead of them on health and social services spending.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. YOUNG:** — Now the great, the great champions of the working women. What

happens when we come along? We increase our allowance to day care by 36 per cent over the NDP's election budget. First year. Now what in the dickens are we going to do in our election year if we're doing this in our first year of office? Our grants and allowances for the handicapped increased over their last budget by 20 per cent. Our grants for community services were 40 per cent higher than their grants. We had grants to the care homes in my constituency for operating costs which include Elmwood, Extendicare, Frank Eliason, Stensrud and St. Ann's to the tune of \$6,822,000. Now, certainly the issue of health spending and social services, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, there's absolutely no doubt where that sits on our priority list. We've approved funding for major hospital construction, Mr. Speaker, in Lloydminster, in Nipawin, in Melfort, Yorkton, Cut Knife, to the tune of another \$42 million. Further, we've donated just recently \$2.7 million towards the construction of the Children's Rehabilitation Centre in Saskatoon, which will be built in partnership with the Kinsmen Club. If anyone here is familiar with the present facility in the airport area, you'll certainly appreciate what a blessing this is doing to be to the people who run the present rehabilitation centre.

Now, you take, Mr. Speaker, and you wonder how we can do this. I would suggest to the, to the members opposite that it is nothing more than a change in priorities. Our priorities are away from the crown corporations and towards people, and that was how we achieved, Mr. Speaker, the difference.

Going specifically to my constituency, Mr. Speaker, in the area of senior citizens' homes, I have a very high concentration of senior citizens homes, particularly in the area that surrounds Market Mall in McEown Avenue and Louise Street and in those areas. This spring we — or last spring, I guess, if you call it this spring now — we introduced and opened . . . had the grand opening of the Scott-Forget Towers in my constituency across from the Market Mall again. This, Mr. Speaker, is the largest unit of that type in the province. It consists of 254 units, or suites, as I like to call them.

In June I attended, Mr. Speaker, the opening of the Nutana Veterans' complex on Preston Avenue, which consisted of 51 units. This, Mr. Speaker, is the first type, the first time shall I say, a group such as, such as the legion has sponsored a seniors' home, and it went real well, and now as I understand it from speaking with the people in Sask Housing, that similar projects are under way as a result of the actions of the legion in Humboldt, and also with respect to the branches of the legion in Kinistino, Melfort, and Tisdale. The Elim Lodge next to the Elim Church in my constituency, near the Wildwood shopping centre, Mr. Speaker, on October the 3rd, opened the phase one of the 24-unit seniors' home. There's a second phase, Mr. Speaker, consisting of another 24 units that I look forward to supporting in the near future.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of meeting with the board from the Ilarion Residence, who are now on the top of Sask Housing priority list for the funding of an additional 51 units or suites on the Ilarion home in my constituency. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, Rev. Boldt and the good people from the Circle Drive Alliance church just south of town on Preston Avenue are also considering a large complex near their church facility out there, south of Preston Avenue and I certainly look forward to assisting them if they should decide to go ahead with their project.

As well, as I understand it, in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatoon Mennonite care service are also having preliminary discussions with respect to a project consisting of 70 units. Their site is as yet undetermined, however, certainly I would hope that they have a look at Eastview for possible construction site.

More . . . Mr. Speaker, I think I can very fairly say that more has been accomplished in my constituency of Saskatoon-Eastview in our first 10 months of office that I could have ever hoped for, and certainly much more than was completed through the entire term of the other former NDP member who represented that constituency up till April, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I can say that I certainly have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting the motion, and I certainly cannot support the amendment. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House this afternoon with pleasure to join in the throne speech debate. I might first of all congratulate my colleagues who have preceded me, for the fine job they have done in pointing out all the progressive points in the throne . . . in the throne speech which was presented in this House a few days ago. Let me take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, also, to welcome the new member to this legislature. He was not here this fall when we adjourned, and we are very pleased to have him here with us as a result of the election which took place in the constituency of Prince Albert-Duck Lake on February 21.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to carry the members opposite back to April 26 of last year, when they suffered a defeat at the hands of the people of Saskatchewan, and I would like to remind them of the words of their premier at that time who said that the people of Saskatchewan didn't really want to vote for the Progressive Conservatives on April 26. As a matter of fact, I would say that he insulted the people of Saskatchewan in his remarks. He said the people weren't using their heads. That's what the Leader of the Opposition said. He said they were using their hearts, they weren't using their heads, and sure, he said, if they had to do it over again they'd never do that. They'd never vote Progressive Conservative. What they did on April 26 was just an aberration.

Well, on February 25, 1st rather, approximately a year later, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan had an opportunity to answer those remarks, and they did it in a most dramatic way as they returned Mr. Sid Dutchak to be. They made him the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake in a most dramatic fashion, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Sid Dutchak won a landslide on that day.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Mr. Speaker, before I get into the throne speech itself, I would like to make a few brief background comments about it. I think it's reasonable to say that this is a throne speech which is forward-looking, which is filled with hope, and optimism. Those are tributes, Mr. Speaker, which are in sharp contrast to what we have seen by the opposition in the past few days. Members of the opposition have risen day after day, and they have given us the impression, without any shadow of a doubt, that they are the Messiahs of doom and gloom.

Their vision of Saskatchewan is an apocalyptic vision, and there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that what they would like to see more than anything in Saskatchewan is for the people to suffer dearly, so that they could say that, "Yes, we predicted this. We were the 'messenger of 'Apocalypse Now,' and it has happened."

However, Mr. Speaker, that is not what the people of Saskatchewan voted for, and that is not what our government has delivered. Indeed, it's safe to say, it's safe to say that, since April 26, 1982, the level of optimism has increased to such an extent that the

memberships of all the Optimist Clubs in this province have risen dramatically.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — But with this spirit . . . It was with this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that the throne speech was written . . . A spirit of optimism, looking forward to the years to come, a spirit of progress. We know that in the past two to three years, Canada has experienced one of the worst recessions, probably the worst recession since the Great Depression. However, it is also known now throughout Canada, that we here in Saskatchewan have refused to participate in that recession. We have taken measure to make certain that our people do not have to bear the brunt of the bad times which now, which now prevail in Canada.

Some of the things we have done was to create jobs for our people. And I'm very pleased to inform the House that Saskatchewan was the only province in all of Canada which last year recorded a net growth in employment. Saskatchewan was the only province which was able to increase jobs by 1,000 over a year before.

Furthermore, another way, another indication that we refuse to participate in the recession, is our unemployment rate. Saskatchewan's unemployment rate, Mr. Speaker, is the lowest in Canada. And we have done this with programs such as our Build-A-Home program. We have created jobs in the past year and we have allowed, we have allowed the private sector to go to work, to do their thing, and to create jobs for our citizens.

Now, in order to do that, Mr. Speaker, we brought in some very progressive, brought in some very progressive ideas regarding taxation. We should take note of the Progressive Conservative philosophy regarding taxation and the New Democratic Party philosophy regarding taxation, the socialist philosophy. Progressive Conservatives believe that the individual citizen is the wisest spender of his money; the individual citizen knows best how to spend discretionary income. Socialist, however, don't believe that. They believe that citizens are not wise spenders of their own money. They don't believe that citizens have the intelligence to make the proper decisions in that area. Consequently, the socialist philosophy is to tax the citizen to the ultimate and then give little bits back here and there. That's the difference.

The difference was demonstrated in a very dramatic fashion minutes after we became government when we removed the gas tax and, in so doing, brought in the largest single tax cut in the history of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Now the members opposite, I would like to tell the people in Saskatchewan and the people in my riding of Last Mountain-Touchwood, the members opposite almost daily condemn this government for removing the gas tax. I want to tell the members opposite that that is the single most popular thing we have done since becoming government. However, unfortunately, the members opposite are out of step with reality. They do not understand what the people want. Because of this, they lost the previous election on April 26th. They said on April 27th as they analysed the election, they said, "well, yes, we made a mistake; we stopped listening to the people." And they were right. They did stop listening to the people. But the other half is that the people stopped listening to them; the people stopped listening to them because their policies

were out of step with what the people wanted. Even today, as they sit here and decry the removal of the gas tax — still being out of step with what the people wish.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech also mentions briefly our role in intergovernmental affairs. The time has come when the people of Saskatchewan and the people in Canada demand co-operation between the different levels of government. That is exactly what our government has done since being elected. The primary example of this spirit of co-operation which benefits our people is the implementation of the farm purchase program. We used the farm credit corporation to implement that program, to administer, and by so doing we avoid building up another bureaucracy within the province government. By avoiding those administrative costs we save approximately \$6 million, Mr. Speaker, and that \$6 million will be used to allow more young farmers to get into the land, as we promised during the election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Co-operatives, Mr. Speaker, is another area that the throne speech recognizes and mentions. Progressive Conservatives realize the unique role that co-ops have played in the history of Saskatchewan, and the very important role they play in the day-to-day lives of our people now. Co-ops, Mr. Speaker, today provide such things as fuel, food, fertilizer, general farm supplies, etc. And recognizing this, we know that a great, great many people belong to and support co-operative institutions. Therefore, and our government has consulted the co-ops, and will be bringing in a revamped co-operative act — one which will reflect the wishes of the co-operative movement in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Small business, Mr. Speaker, is another area that our government recognizes and feels is extremely important to our province. In my riding, Mr. Speaker, I've had small contractors come to me complaining bitterly about the bonding procedures presently in place which effectively eliminates them from bidding on works which are right next to them a few miles away. We will change the bonding practices in Saskatchewan to reflect this problem, and small contractors will be able to bid on things such as school expansions, nursing homes, etc.

Another very important area that our throne speech looked at, Mr. Speaker, was agriculture. And I'd like to look particularly at two areas: one, the farm purchase program, and secondly, the Crow rate. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, to begin with, that the farm purchase program is a program with a vision. And before I tell you about the vision of the farm purchase program, I would like to say that the former government also had a vision for agriculture, no question. And the vision that the former government had was reflected in their land bank program.

Now let's look at the differences, the two different visions. Let's look at the vision that the former government had for agriculture in Saskatchewan, and then look at the vision that our government has, Mr. Speaker.

The land bank program. What kind of vision does that represent? Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly outline to the members opposite the type of people that settled Saskatchewan. And what was their vision? They also had a vision. And what was the reality of the country they came from? There were two kinds of realities in the countries from which our forefathers came. One reality, Mr. Speaker, was state control.



That was one reality, where the people had absolutely no opportunity to farm their own land, and knew that they never would have that opportunity.

Very briefly, that was one reality. The other reality, Mr. Speaker — and I might say that the other reality was where my forefathers came from — the other reality was a reality where large landowners owned all the land. That's who owned it. And once again the people had no opportunity whatever to farm their own soil.

Those were the realities. Now what was their vision of those people in coming to Saskatchewan? The vision of both those types of people was the same — to come to a land of opportunity where they knew they would have to work hard, but in working hard they also knew that the day would come that they would own their own land, that they would be proud of it. That's the reality that our forefathers found here in Saskatchewan. That's the reality my own parents found here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

But the members opposite forgot about that reality. They forgot about the hopes, the dreams and the vision that the people who came to Saskatchewan had. Consequently, they said, 'We're going to change what those people want. We're going to change what they want because, as good socialists all over the world believe, the people don't know what's good for them. They really don't know what they want. We're going to change what they want, and we're going to show them that state ownership of farms is best, you see, but we won't tell them that. We're going to say we're helping them. That's what we're going to do. We're going to say we're helping them to some day own their own land.

So that's what they did. In 1972 in came the land bank. Then, there, I'll tell you, they went all over the province, singing its praises, orchestrating this Land Bank Act that was brought in, convincing some of the people that this was just wonderful. They said, don't you worry. Five years from now you're going to be able to buy that land, and imagine all the money you're going to save in that five years, because you won't have any payments. You're going to have some low rent to pay. And the people believed — quite a few people believed it.

And five years went by, and lo and behold, they couldn't buy that land. And they started thinking, gee, is there something wrong? Maybe I did something wrong. My fault that I can't buy this land, that I haven't been able to save all this money. So they waited five more years. Along came 1982. They still couldn't buy that land. And meanwhile, what they had originally . . . what the government had originally paid \$60 an acre for, now they were asking \$600 an acre for. That was the reality, Mr. Speaker.

I found it very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that as I travelled around my riding, how many people on land bank land were most unhappy with that plan.

Knowing that, our government brought in, Mr. Speaker, the farm purchase program, which represents the Conservative vision of agriculture. Better that vision — that vision, Mr. Speaker, is for the individual to farm that land. And as I tell you about that vision this afternoon, I can't help but think of Friday night, a ratepayers' meeting in one of the municipalities in Saskatchewan. And what will be role there? My role will be to hand out five Century Farm awards, Mr. Speaker — five Century Farm awards. In other words, people will receive awards for having farmed and owned that original homestead for the past hundred years. That's the Conservative vision.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — And it saddens me, Mr. Speaker, to think of things like the land bank. It saddens me to think of the possibility, even, that perhaps a hundred years from now there would be an award given to somebody because he was sharecropper for a hundred years, from the state.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the farm purchase program . . . the runaway success of the farm purchase program is evident and well known by all the Saskatchewan people. So let me just give you a few quick figures. First of all, there have already been 2,000 potential applicants with mortgages totalling \$259 million that have passed their first and second interviews. Of these 2,000, 758,000 with mortgages totalling \$98 million have paid appraisal fees to the farm credit corporation. To date (and these aren't accurate; it's a little more than I'll quote you hear, for this is a few days old) but up until a few says ago, some 350 of the 2,000 with mortgages totally \$41 million have obtained final approval and they're now actual rebate clients.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — 350.

**MR. TUSA:** — 350 minimum.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Our projections, Mr. Speaker, were for 1,500 rebate clients with mortgages totalling \$150 million in the first three months. The 2,000 potential clients with \$250 million in total mortgages show our projections are being surpassed.

I will no longer belabour that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that clearly shows the success of the farm purchase program and the overwhelming approval that the people of Saskatchewan have given it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — I would like to say, make a few brief comments on the Crown rate. And before I start, Mr. Speaker, let me say that two nights ago (Tuesday night), I had the opportunity to attend a Crow meeting in my riding of Southey, Saskatchewan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I was at one too.

**MR. TUSA:** — My colleague from Saskatoon, who's a lady, tells me she was at a Crow meeting as well. And it, that shows, Mr. Speaker, that the spirit in our party, that a lady MLA from Saskatoon will take the time to go out into the rural area of Saskatchewan to lend support to the saving of the Crow rate . . .

And in Southey, Saskatchewan, two nights ago, Mr. Speaker, there was a large Crow meeting and the hall was full. And this Crow meeting was sponsored by rural municipalities, Mr. Speaker, by towns, by various farm organizations, by the wheat pool, etc. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in other words, there before, me was the true grass roots movement of people.

I couldn't help but remember, Mr. Speaker, that approximately a year before that, approximately a year ago, I also had occasion to attend a Crow meeting in the same

hall. The only difference was, and I might say that the hall was full, the hall was full. The only difference, Mr. Speaker, was that the hall that was full approximately a year ago in the same town was about half full of people nobody knew. We looked around the hall and said, "Who are these people and where did they come from?" And the reason that we didn't know them, Mr. Speaker, was that it was a hall of people that was filled by the orchestration of the NDP government of the times, Mr. Speaker, that's why I was so pleased that on Tuesday night, here was a hall full of people that was not orchestrated by any government but they were there because of the genuine concern they have for the future of the agricultural industry in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, The NDP are fond, the NDP are fond of going around Saskatchewan saying, "Oh, the Conservatives, they're not for the Crow rate." And they like to show themselves as being the only saviours of the Crow rate in this province. But the members opposite have short memories, and I would like to throw out a couple of quotations to remind them of what their own leader, their own leader, the Leader of the Opposition, Allan Blakeney, had to say about changing the Crow rate not very many years ago. Now let me quote. This quotation is taken from the CBC TV interview on May 20, 1977. You can check it if you like. And this is what the premier of the day in 1977 had to say about the Crow rate. He said:

But we think under certain circumstances and at some future time the case might be made for increasing the level of the Crow.

In the same interview, Mr. Speaker, in the same interview, the Leader of the Opposition said:

I am realistic enough to know (he said he's realistic, he said he's realistic enough to know) that as time goes on and costs go on, and I think farmers are realistic enough to say that at some time they would look at increasing Crow.

The only question I have to the hon. members opposite, that since their leader clearly has said that he feels that farmers are ready for an increase in the Crow rate, do they feel that today is the time that farmers are ready? Or is it going to be next year? When do they feel farmers are ready for an increase in the Crow?

Now I have a few more quotations, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that amply shows, shows the forked-tongue policy that the members of the opposition have regarding the Crow rate. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are well aware of the position our government has regarding the Crow rate, but let me just repeat it one more time. And our position has been consistent from the days that we were on that side of the House, and we have always said, and we say today, that the federal government must pay for the shortfall in transportation costs. We have always said that all of Canada benefits from a national transportation system, and from agriculture in western Canada, and therefore the farmer must not be called upon to pay any more. It is the duty and the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, of the federal government.

Just one or two more things, Mr. Speaker, before I close my remarks. I'd like to mention briefly the overwhelming reception that our natural gas program is receiving out in the countryside. This is a program at which the initial phase, Mr. Speaker, will be for 10 years. After the 10 years have expired, we will have serviced 25,000 rural dwellings and 10,000 urban, at a very, very reasonable cost to the consumer. And I want to tell

you that speaking to the people in my riding, in my constituency, they are signing up in droves, and they are looking forward to a cheap, reasonable source of fuel in their farm homes and garages.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to mention very briefly the overwhelming success of our Build-A-Home program. I just have some figures on that, if I could find it . . . Here it is, the Build-A-Home program, and a few figures on that. Up in this, we had originally estimated (and I have to admit we were wrong, because we underestimated) we had originally estimated that perhaps 1,000 people would apply for new homes under the Build-A-Home program. To date, Mr. Speaker, as of March 19, 1983, we have received 1,195 applications, and we're receiving an average of 100 applications per week.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say, and to inform the people of Saskatchewan, that that represents the creation of 2,091 jobs in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — And while I'm speaking about job creation, Mr. Speaker, let me, let me very, very briefly tell you what our government has done to create jobs. We have two programs, Mr. Speaker. We have the Canada-Saskatchewan program. And I would like to inform the House of the status of that program as of March the 18th. The Canada-Saskatchewan program has an allocation of \$15 million. To date, \$11,299,346 has been approved. There remains \$3,700,654 in that program. The jobs created to date, Mr. Speaker, have been 1,663, and we feel confident that, by the time the program is completed, we will have created an additional 2,300 jobs for the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — We also have a provincial jobs creation program. In that program we have allocated \$2.5 million. We have approved 1,909,000, and we have remaining 590,000. That program, Mr. Speaker, to date, has created an additional 166 jobs. Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that our government is serving the people of this province well. We are spending their money wisely. We are spending their money in a way that will benefit the whole province.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TUSA:** — Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker. I would like to remind the members opposite because they forgot . . . (inaudible) . . . the 26th, I would like to remind the members opposite what kind of people we have in Saskatchewan. The kind of people we have in Saskatchewan are first-class and world-class. And they are showing, they are showing the rest of Canada that there is so much more we can do.

Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I would like to conclude, and I must say that without

any question and with confidence in my mind, I will be voting against the amendment and supporting the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HAMPTON:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. First, I would like to commend our government on a truly excellent throne speech, and I'll comment a little more on that in a few moments.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HAMPTON:** — But before I go any further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to express my gratitude to the electorate of the Canora constituency for the honour of representing them here in this, this legislature. I know that in the few months past many of them have come to me with problems of various natures, and I as their MLA have asked for and received just outstanding co-operation from the ministers of this government. And I'm extremely thankful for that and I now that my people are. And as a result, most of the unsurmountable problems that have been brought to my attention have been brought to satisfactory conclusions.

I've just a quick word to the farmers of my constituency. I want . . . believe me, our government, and particularly the Department of Agriculture, is working for you. We're not going to abandon our fight against the Pepin plan. This, Mr. Speaker, is the main reason that I am here — because the people believe me — and I want to continue that even though the hon. member across there says they won't make the same mistake. I've been told, Mr. Speaker, that in years past the accessibility to government did not exist to the same degree as it does today, and so I believe that it's just another way of our government showing the people of the province that we are an open government. We are open for business, and we will be continue to be open to the people of the province as long as we're government. It make me feel good to know that my children, and in the future my grandchildren, will be able to have this type of access to the administration of this great province because, Mr. Speaker, this government is going to remain in power for a long, long time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HAMPTON:** — The people of Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan are telling us that every day. When a person enjoys participating in what's going on, they cannot help but spread their enthusiasm, and that's what's happening out there. Perhaps the best example of that recently, Mr. Speaker, was that Prince Albert-Duck Lake by-election when the people in the constituency expressed their enthusiasm with our government and elected Mr. Dutchak as their representative.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to publicly congratulate our new member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake. I have a great respect for this gentleman, and I know that he is going to contribute a great amount to our government over the many years ahead. And particular, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to congratulate the people of Prince Albert-Duck Lake for their wisdom which was so adequately show in the recent by-election.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my opinion on the throne speech. My

opinion is very brief. I liked it. The speech gave a genuine overview of the intended direction of this government during the upcoming fiscal year and beyond, Mr. Speaker, I personally feel that this is precisely what a throne speech is designed to do.

To the members opposite, I have some comments respecting the recent throne speech and their misguided understanding of this speech. Mr. Speaker, I don't think for a moment that any of us, one either side of this Assembly, lack understanding, and yet over there sits a small group that try to prove they lack that understanding. I am sorry for them. I wish they'd stop clowning around and get down to business.

Surely after the election this April past, the now members of the opposition, a few as . . . excuse me . . . few as they are should have realized that the people of the province expressed their desire for a sincere government. And a sincere government is only effective when the opposition fulfils their role, meaning an effective opposition, which I don't believe that we have here at this time. I wonder how long the people of the province will have to wait before this comes to pass?

I have heard the Leader of the Opposition state on several occasions that he was prepared to give us time to get our act together and become an effective government. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel our act is together, and it was together a way back, beginning when our premier and our cabinet ministers were sworn in.

Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me right, our Premier instantly removed the gasoline tax, immediately following the swearing in ceremony. Mr. Speaker, from that moment until right now this government has kept its act together and it will continue to keep its act together. All one has to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is follow the announcement of the various programs, the projects and the services the statement that have been made by the minister of this administration over the past 10 months to confirm what I'm saying. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I look at the opposition, and what do I hear, and what do I see? I hear a small group of washed-out, worn-out and truly defeated members still dreaming their dreams of socialism and completely out of touch with reality. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it's the purpose, that this is the purpose for which those members were elected. And I can't help but feel that the people of this province are being short-changed. Their effectiveness as an opposition doesn't exist.

Mr. Speaker . . . excuse me . . . Mr. Speaker, I am thankful that our Premier from day one made it possible for all of us to have our say and our input into the decisions that were made concerning the province. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that through this process we have become our own opposition, which I may add is very effective. And therefore, the people of this province are receiving good government, and no credit to the official opposition.

But who am I to judge, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The people of this province are judging and the Prince Albert-Duck Lake was just the first of many decision that the people are making and are going to continue to make.

Perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's not my role to advise the Leader of the Opposition or his colleagues, but if I may, I would like to offer a little advice to them. To the members opposite, I wish you would get sincere. You can start by humbly apologizing to the people of the province for the poor government by yourselves over 10 years. You can then say that you are sorry for your mismanagement, and that you are prepared to accept your share of the blame for the economic woes of this province and of all of Canada.

After you have done those two things, you could withdraw your amendment and join myself and my colleagues, and support our motion. Then you would be on the road to recovery and the people out there would truly believe that you are earning your salt.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it's no longer necessary for me to lecture them. I know that other members have got other things to pass on to the members of the opposition. I would not think of voting in favour of the amendment, but I sincerely support our motion. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HODGINS:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am an optimist. I am an optimist about Saskatchewan. I have more than the usual amount of optimist about the future of our province because of the dynamic and constructive measures of a Progressive Conservative government under our Premier Grant Devine. This is why I am especially pleased to be able to participate in this debate.

It was only months ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Melfort constituency was honoured by this government when Premier Grant Devine asked me to move an address in reply to the first Speech from the Throne. Since then, many good things have happened to Saskatchewan.

At the outset of my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to commend our new colleague from Prince Albert-Duck Lake on his reply to the Speech from the Throne. His election to this, to this legislature confirms that the people of Saskatchewan share the optimism of the government.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to be somewhat philosophical for a few moments. In preparing myself to participate in this debate, a number of question passed through my mind. Just what does this Speech from the Throne mean to the people of Melfort constituency? What does it mean to the people of Saskatchewan? Given national and provincial conditions, does it address the needs of the people? In a historical context, does it measure up to what is good for Saskatchewan?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to take a few minutes and tell this Assembly what it means to Melfort constituency, and why I believe Saskatchewan is on a rendezvous with destiny. And I certainly do not say that lightly. The Speech from the Throne represents a sacred bond between the government and the people — a trust. It symbolizes the very reasons why the people of Saskatchewan elected a Progressive Conservative government. And, in turn, it symbolizes this government's commitment to honour our pledges.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate I, along with all others in this House, have heard negative, cynical, and purely partisan rhetoric from the gang of eight who sit in opposition. In the traditions of the parliamentary system, the position of the loyal opposition was always considered to be a special part of the give-and-take of parliament. The opposition was supposed to be the watch-dog and defender of the other voters in any democratic jurisdiction. I contend that here in Saskatchewan we have a group that is sadly lacking in the qualities that make for a good quality opposition.

They are led by a person who dwells in the past, a person who is totally void of any new ideas and, quite frankly, is losing at a rapid pace any respect and credibility he may have

had. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not say this out of malice toward that individual. I recognize that he did at one time make some contribution to public life, but surely he must recognize that his days are numbered as a participant in this arena. Why do I say that? I just have to point to an editorial that appeared in the *Melfort Journal* of February 23rd of this year. It is an excellent commentary on the Saskatchewan political scene. It stated, and I will quote:

Once again it appears the NDP are convinced that when they lose, it is because the electorate are fooled.

And the same article went on to say:

Perhaps it is time for the NDP to take a look at themselves.

That is what the *Melfort Journal* said, and that is precisely why the NDP is a present force in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I will concede that there were things that this current Speech from the Throne has not done, and I will admit to this House that there are things this government has not done. And I implore all members of this House to listen carefully.

Mr. Speaker, this government has not created any new crown corporations. It has not created any government bodies of a bureaucratic nature. We did not create them because this is what the people wanted. We did create the public utilities review commission, which protects the consumers of this province. We did create a family farm purchase program because people would rather own their farms than rent them.

Mr. Speaker, this government did not increase any taxes, because the people told us that they had had enough of it for 11 years. Instead we removed the notorious 20 per cent sliding gas tax. Mr. Speaker, this government did not announce any Santa Clause, socialistic, give-away programs, because the people told us, and we believe, that nothing is free. Instead we put the taxpayers' dollars to good use by such positive economic programs as the Build-A-Home Saskatchewan plan, the Saskatchewan Power HELP program, and, as a result of our economic common sense, housing starts and construction are way ahead of the national average. Home ownership is a reality, not a dream, in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the government did not announce any short-term, stopgap fiscal measures that were the order of the day with the previous administrations. Instead the Progressive Conservative government responded to the long-range economic future of Saskatchewan by announcing such things as the following: research and development plans; the development of high technology plans; streamlining government structures; increased investment in education, Mr. Speaker, this is the vision, this is the action of a government with vision.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we did not attempt to score political points at the expense of the less fortunate in society. We did not make political rhetoric about unemployment. No, Mr. Speaker, we offered help and hope, programs such as the \$15 million job creation program. And our unemployment rate is currently the lowest in Canada. We don't talk about the dark side of being out of a job because we believe in the dignity of the individual. People want jobs, not rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, no, we did not do a lot of things and that is because on



April the 26th, 1982, the people totally rejected the philosophy, ideas and attitudes of the very things we did not do since. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the government of Premier Devine has opted to do since. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the government of Premier Devine has opted to do more constructive things, realistic measure for a better Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, Melfort knows the importance of the Crow rate. The Crow rate is the Magna Charta of the western farmer. The Pepin plan of the central government in Ottawa eliminates the guaranteed rate of the farmers and substitutes as guaranteed rate for the railways. We as a group reject that notion.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, I question the sincerity of the opposition in their support for the Crow rate. I remind this House that in the last session prior to the 1982 election, they did not allow a joint Crow rate resolution to be voted on in this Assembly. Why, Mr. Speaker? Now that they have supported the Crow rate resolution of this government I seriously wonder if they have contacted their followers in other provinces to support this. Has the Leader of the Opposition, for example, contacted Mr. Bob Rae, leader of the Ontario NDP, or Mrs. Alexa McDonough, leader of the Nova Scotia NDP, asking them to support Saskatchewan's position? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Not at all. On the one hand, they voted for the motion and outside of this House they represent a different position. Let me warn them: Pierre Trudeau and his ministers in Ottawa will be quick to capitalize on any divisions in our efforts to reject the Pepin plan. I warn the members on the opposite side that if they do not unite with us on this issue, it will be their fault that the Crow rate is lost.

Mr. Speaker, at a time like this, the natural impulse is to list a catalogue of our achievements, and they have been substantial since this government came to office. Rather, I want to say how the Speech from the Throne is a celebration of what is truly great about Saskatchewan. This is a time when we in Saskatchewan can march into the bright sunshine of prosperity. This government proudly proclaims the politics of optimism. It believes in people because it is the people and not the government that makes a province great.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HODGINS:** — I represent the people of Melfort, and as each hon. member represents their own constituency, we collectively, the Progressive Conservative government, through the Speech from the Throne, represents the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the good people of the Melfort constituency, I am pleased to tell this House that I proudly support the motion introduced by the hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake in support of the Speech from the Throne.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would first of all like to join with others to congratulate the mover of the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Dutchak, the newly elected member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake. And I also want to congratulate the seconder, the member from Morse.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the member from P.A. was the first member to stand in this legislature and give a formal speech with the advent of TV to the Chamber. And I want to say that for a fleeting moment he was a TV celebrity, soon but soon to be forgotten once the opposition were given the opportunity to speak.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say to the constituents of Quill Lakes, I want to extend my appreciation for the privilege that they have afforded me in being able to again represent them in this Chamber.

I want to say that no doubt, I want to say that no doubt the particular, the particular function of me as a member has changed from the government benches to the opposition. But certainly I want to say to the constituents of Quill Lakes that though that role may have changed it is my intention to serve the constituents and to serve the people of Saskatchewan in the most positive manner that is possible.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the debate on the throne speech has been rather interesting, particularly the speeches from the members on the government side. Oh, their styles may have varied. Some were bombastic. Some were loud. Others were restrained, and some were timid. But I want to say that the theme that all echoed was the same theme: there is so much more we can be.

But you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they had finished that line, when they had finished that line, they would tell us not more, and the reason is that that throne speech was barren, completely empty of any economic plan or direction for this province.

So I want to say that so the members on the government side have resorted to attacking the opposition. They have attacked the Leader of the Opposition. And I want to say that they have nothing concrete to say about the throne speech. I want to say that the members on the government side are something like a fighter hanging on the ropes, in trouble, and they are blindly striking out, blindly striking out, hoping upon hope that they can somehow score some points and last the round.

Mr. Speaker, I would want to say that indeed the impressions that we get in respect to this government . . . And if one looks at the history of Saskatchewan there is no doubt that this province had a history of strong leadership. T.C. Douglas, Woodrow Lloyd, Ross Thatcher, Allan Blakeney. Today, Mr. Speaker, things are different in Saskatchewan. Things are different, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In Saskatchewan today we have a ship without a captain, and a crew on the verge of mutiny.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this throne speech is an important document, for it shows clearly the profound differences between the NDP, the New Democratic Party, and the Conservative philosophy. And I want to spend some time on that.

On the one hand there is the corporate capitalist — a philosophy based on a commitment to the dignity and the well-being of big business at the expense, often, of small business; a commitment to compensate loving care of profits. In the words written on the walls of the general manager of SGI, Don Black, “he who has gold, he who has gold, rules.” A government with a philosophy, “It is every man for himself,” as the elephant said when he was dancing among the chickens. A government whose moral values can best be summed up in these words: “In God we trust; all others pay cash.” Or, “Trust everyone; but cut the cards.” A government that is more concerned about an NHL franchise in Saskatoon than it is with jobs, in jobs for our young people, housing, job security, concern with unemployment and health services. A government that cannot provide decent water to hundreds of thousands of citizens, but can afford to establish a horse-racing commission. A government that freezes minimum wage and expands the number of liquor outlets.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, they hope the poor, the disenfranchised, the downtrodden in society, the unemployed, will drown their sorrows in a sea of booze.

Contrast that mundane bankrupt philosophy with the idea of a co-operative commonwealth — the idea born in the Great Depression and brought to fruition here in Saskatchewan by people who, out of their hardships, and out of their suffering, learned to work together for mutual advantage.

The inescapable fact is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we build a society based on greed and selfishness and ruthless competition, we reap the tragic harvest of economic and social insecurity and injustices.

I have listened to the speakers opposite with their song and praise of corporate capitalism. And I am reminded of the words of the Roman Catholic bishop, Bishop Remi De Roo, who indicated that indeed society, all of society, is not accepting the slogans and the philosophical basis of economic development as propounded by the capitalist system. And I want to read what Bishop De Roo had to say. This is in Vancouver.

An unrepentant bishop, Remi De Roo, Catholic Bishop of Victoria, has reiterated his call for radical overhaul of Canadian society by a worker movement striving for economic justice. The bishop, criticized earlier this year for the controversial report on the Canadian economy, said Saturday, that the creative spirit of workers were being crushed by an economically and moral flawed capitalist system. "It is something that is wrong, that is unacceptable, that can be changed by human decisions, and therefore there is moral responsibility," said Bishop De Roo. "We see the recession as a continued structural crisis in the capitalist society itself. Let's grasp the opportunity," said Bishop De Roo. "Let us not be overwhelmed by fear," he said. "If we don't hang together, we'll hang separately."

Mr. Speaker, the history of this province has been a history of the struggle of our people. First they battled the elements — savage prairie winters, drought, plagues of grasshoppers, ever-present threat of frost. We can understand those battles, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But there were other enemies they had to fight. There were the railways and their political friends; the banks and their political friends; the mortgage companies and their political friends; the grain exchange and their political friends. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the capitalist system has its friend then, and it has its friend today.

And there they sit, Mr. Speaker, in supine splendour, and I'm reminded of some splendid lines that I might, that I might entitle, "Ode to a Conservative Politician."

To serve a country other than his own  
Is the highest duty known.  
Hence, thought the northland calls him free,  
He never sheds his servility.  
His keen ambition after several knocks  
Soon finds an outlet in the orthodox.  
He does not recognize new frontiers  
Which began as a goal for pioneers.  
So he is proud, not seeing far,  
To hitch his wagon to the CPR.

“And Ode to a Conservative Politician.”

I want to say that this was not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how the West was won. The West was won by the spirit of independence of newcomers who settled on the Prairies; prairie farmers who quickly established the Grain Growers grain company a farmer-owned co-operative; prairie farmers who developed the moving of grain to collectively owned marketing companies known as pools; prairie farmers developing their own co-operative institutions because they realized that most of their money went to the railways via monopoly freight rates, to the grain exchange through their control over the prices.

Only by collective action, only by collective actions, did they assert some control over their economic lives. But it was not, however, until the election of the CCF that the people of Saskatchewan saw that the government as a positive instrument of social and economic progress. The CCF established the first publicly funded hospitalization plan in North American. The CCF pioneered the medicare. The CCF established the first publicly owned automobile and general insurance company in North America. The CCF established and encouraged the development of high professional career civil service. The CCF pioneered the establishing of the best labour legislation for workers in North America. The CCF established an economic climate in which small business would flourish and expand. For 20 years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the CCF government governed Saskatchewan and the province prospered.

People assumed that it made no difference what form of government you had, prosperity would be always present, and soon a new voice was heard across Saskatchewan — a new message for the people of our province, old cliches wrapped up in a bright new package, a new salesman selling the same old snake oil.

“There could be a new Saskatchewan,” they said. “a truly prosperous Saskatchewan.” All we had to do was to believe in free enterprise. All we had to do was to unshackle free enterprise. All we had to do was to roll out the welcome mat to free enterprise, and everybody would have more, so much more, they said. There was so much more we could be.

But some people worried, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It sounded great, but what would happen to our medicare programs? “Never fear,” they said. “free enterprise would generate more funds so that we could have better medicare.” So what happened to our civil servants if we had less government? “Never fear,” they said. “professional civil servants have nothing to fear from free enterprise.” But what would happen to trade unionists? “Never fear,” they said., “trade unionists will have even more freedom under free enterprise.” But what would happen to our crown corporations? “Never fear,” they said, “for crown corporations will be more, even more efficient under free enterprise.” And this was the general gospel according to the late Ross Thatcher, premier of this province under a Liberal administration. And I want to say, for seven years Saskatchewan had had the benefits of free enterprise. Saskatchewan was open for business. The welcome mat was out for private investment. And did the people rejoice during these seven years?

Some did. Parsons and Whitemore did. The oil companies did. The CPR did. The barons of Bay Street certainly did, for they had been given the personalized licence to loot, and they did. But it was seven long years for the people of Saskatchewan, seven lean years for the people of Saskatchewan, seven cruel years for the people of Saskatchewan. Professional civil servants, Mr. Deputy Speaker, had nothing to lose

under free enterprise — only their jobs. Medicare would have everything to gain from free enterprise — and we gained deterrent fees. Trade unions had nothing to lose under free enterprise — except their rights to bargain collectively. Crown corporations would be more efficient under free enterprise because now they will be run by private enterprise — unless in order to improve services, they were disbanded.

Finally, the people said, enough is enough, and once again they're turned to the traditional ways of Saskatchewan. Once again they endorsed the idea of a judicious mix of public and private enterprise, and they elected the New Democratic Party. The people of Saskatchewan realized that those who knew best for the Saskatchewan lived in Main Street, Saskatchewan — not Bay Street, Ontario; not Wall Street, U.S.A. — Main Street, Saskatchewan. Home-grown people, home-grown decisions resulting in head offices here in Saskatchewan.

And prosperity returned to Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and our people returned to Saskatchewan; no longer was the moving industry a growth industry in Saskatchewan. And I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the pride returned to Saskatchewan, the pride based on mutual accomplishments and co-operation. Saskatchewan people proved that Saskatchewan people could manage their own affairs, and even as other parts of Canada faltered, Saskatchewan prospered.

And again, the voices were heard, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Again, the old slogans appeared: "there's so much more we can be. Private enterprise can do it better. Free enterprise will do much more. The only thing wrong with foreign investment," they say, "is that we don't have enough of it." Free enterprise will improve our health care," they're saying again. "Free enterprise will lower your taxes. Free enterprise will freeze utility rates."

And again, there were those who wondered what would happen to the civil servants under free enterprise. And again, they were told, "Professional civil servants would have nothing to fear from free enterprise." What would happen to crown corporations under free enterprise? And again, they were told, "Crown Corporations would be more efficient under free enterprise. There would be no losers in Saskatchewan under free enterprise," they said.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's examine the record, the 11 sorry months in Saskatchewan was open to business by this administration. Hundreds of civil servants have been fired. Hundreds of civil servants have been forced to early retirement. Crown, crown corporations have been gutted, their profitable operations turned over to the free enterprise to loot. Crown corporations have been shut down, some which have been in existence for 37 years. Civil servants are transferred into . . . transferred if they exercise their freedom of speech. Sixty thousand people had their wages frozen for two years. Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government may have opened up Saskatchewan for foreign business, but you have slammed the door of opportunity shut for thousands of people living right here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, since the early history of this province, our people have fought here in Saskatchewan to throw off the shackles of Bay Street. And today we have the sorry sight of the Premier of this province going down to Bay Street, an begging for them to come, "Come back to Saskatchewan. Take over our resources. Give

us back our change,” the Premier has said. Ah, it was a brave speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our Premier made, made to the bankers, to the investment dealers, the bond dealers of Bay Street. He was among friend, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and then he knew it. They warmed to his folksy ways. They applauded when he said, “To heck with the recession. Saskatchewan has decided not to participate.”

Why doesn't the, the Premier of this province tell the 1,200 steelworkers that were laid off? Why doesn't the Premier tell the 120 SGI workers fired to remove the so-called fat? Why doesn't he tell me the eight workers dismissed in the SED Systems? Why doesn't he tell the 100 management staff of PCS that have been fired? Why doesn't he told, tell the 1,200 miners in the, in the potash corporations that were laid off? The 20 Gulf workers in Moose Jaw laid off? Why doesn't he tell the nine dismissed in Wilkinson Steel closed in Regina? Fifty-two jobs lost in, when Swertz Brothers was liquidated in Weyburn; 320 workers laid off in the Prince Albert pulp mill; 223 laid off in Northern Telecom. Why join others, and the question, I guess, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is: why join others in participating in a recession when you can start your own recession here in this province?

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan expect more from us the politicians, more than the slogans and cliches, than the cries of indignation and attack — for our province and our world is changing. The old era is ending. The old ways can no longer serve. Here in Saskatchewan the changing face of our future is truly revolutionary: a technological revolution on the farm; an urban population revolution; a peaceful revolution of native rights demanding an end to discrimination and seeking equality of participant in the daily lives of our province; a medical revolution; a revolution of automation; a revolution of communications; a revolution of transportation.

Here in Saskatchewan we stand on what was once the last frontier. From the East, from . . . (inaudible) . . . Europe and other parts of the world our pioneers of old came to build a new world in the West. Today some members opposite would say that those struggles are over, that all the horizons have been explored, that there is no longer a frontier. But the problems are not solved and the battles are not all won. Today we stand on the edge of a new frontier: a frontier of unknown opportunities and paths; a frontier of unfulfilled hopes and dreams; a frontier of challenges.

It would be easy to shrink back, to look to the safe mediocrity of an outworn philosophy, to seek refuge in slogans and clinics and the safe solace of the personalized licence plate. That is the route that this government has chosen to take. This is their vision, bereft of ideas, shorn of compassion, riddled with slogans. Eleven months in office, yet already too tired to govern. Though the times demand innovation, invention, imagination and decision, this government provides rhetoric and little else. The only substance in this government is that which they have awarded their friends in the orgy of patronage.

It is difficult, Mr. Deputy Speaker. These are difficult times facing the province — indeed, the country — and it seems to me that the throne speech offered the government an opportunity to demonstrate to the people of Saskatchewan the leadership which they deserve. But this government no longer leads; it follows. It follows a myth, the myth of free enterprise. They believe that free enterprise will lead us along the yellow brick road to the Land of Oz, but there isn't an Oz. This is Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan deserve more than this splendid myth, persistent though it may be, persuasive though it may be, unrealistic though it may be.

I want to say that we cannot afford the luxury of a government that holds fast to clichés of the past, that enjoys the comfort of opinion to the rigors of thought. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say that this here throne speech is totally barren of any direction for this province. The success or the failure of this government will be measured by the answer to these five questions. First, were you truly men of courage; second, were you truly men of judgement; third, were you truly men of integrity; fourth, were you truly men of dedication; and finally, and most important of all, were you truly men of compassion?

And that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is where this government has failed, trapped by a philosophy that places profits before people, that believes the rich are paid by taxes on the poor, that dividends are more important than wages, that public assets should be given a way to the businesses to exploit. And all this, Mr. Speaker, is done in the name of restoring free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at the past let us resolve to be the masters, not the victims, of our history. Let us remember that man's destiny cannot be settled in the market-place. Let us remember that man's destiny is not a matter of chance, it is matter of choice. Let us remember that man's destiny is not a thing to be waited; it is a thing to be achieved — man's destiny achieved by a society that would teach its people that there is a better way than the exploitation of man by man, of nation by nation — a way of life that would firmly teach that we are, indeed, our brothers' keepers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to conclude . . . (inaudible) . . . with the words of a poet, Frank R. Scott:

The world (he says) is my country,  
The human race is my face.  
The spirit of man is my God,  
The future of man is my heaven.

I want to say that this is indeed my philosophy, and the philosophy of my party.

While we still live on this planet, I suggest that what we have to do is to join hands, hearts and minds to work together to solve our problems so that the world of our children will be better than the world of ours, and the world of their children even better.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in view of the lack of direction in the throne speech, I want to indicate that I will be supporting the amendment, and voting against the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am indeed very pleased to enter this throne speech debate, and to support the amendment which was moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I have been somewhat amused, sitting in this legislature and listening to the government members trying to find something positive to say about the throne speech. Mr. Speaker, they have found no shortage of things to say, but whether the things that they were saying were relevant to the throne speech or not didn't really matter. Some of them used their old campaign speeches, and some of them used the Premier's one and

only speech that we've heard in this House. They spent some time in this throne speech telling the people at Ipsco, the unemployed workers at Ipsco, the unemployed PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) workers and the bankrupt small business people in Saskatchewan that they're open for business.

Mr. Speaker, other government members have been attacking the members of the opposition in their speeches. That seems to be all that they were able to find to talk about. They keep comparing the members of the opposition, in particular the Leader of the Opposition, comparing them to some storybook characters or to some movie titles. They used various comparisons and likeness. But it was quite understandable, Mr. Speaker. It is quite understandable because I think one would have to say that this government is still operating in a one Alice in Wonderland mentality.

But I guess one can say you can't blame the opposition. You can't blame the opposition because of some of their irresponsible campaign promises that they made. They have some financial problems. So they are trying to somehow make it appear that the opposition is responsible for all their promises, and the fact that they do not have the funds within government to cover off some of these promises, and they have to saddle the taxpayers of Saskatchewan with a huge deficit that's going to remain with them for many years to come.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the problem that this government has. And you see many of the members in their speeches trying to somehow put together a good speech and compliment the Premier of this province while they try to make it look so good because they know that the Premier is contemplating some changes to his cabinet, and they're all hopefuls out there.

And there are a few members that I can say maybe should be in cabinet. And one of the hopefuls I know is the member from Moosomin, and it would be nice to see him in cabinet — I think he's a member that should qualify for a cabinet position. And the member for Arm River, the member for Arm River who has been left out of the first cabinet post, but I'm sure he is hopeful that he will into the next one. The member for Weyburn and Regina Rosemont, and one member that I almost forgot, and I guess I can't forget him, and that would be the member for Turtleford. I would really like to see the member for Turtleford get into cabinet, because the member sits directly opposite us here, and it would be, I think, a pleasure for us to see that member in cabinet and on the other side of the floor where we wouldn't have to put with the continual bellowing of that member from Turtleford. It would make life a little more bearable on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to a few comments about the crown corporations. Mr. Speaker, this Conservative government's master plans with respect to the crown corporations has become quite clear over the past 10 months. This Conservative government has basically developed about three steps in which they plan to somehow do away with the crown corporations.

And first, they are going to force the crown corporations to give away the profitable parts of their operations to the private sector. They are going to privatize all the profitable parts and allow the private sector to handle all of those profitable operations.

Second, as a result of these give-aways, the government will be running large deficits within the crown corporations, and that will in some way allow them to tell the public



that these corporations cannot operate as a public corporation.

Finally, once the Conservatives have been able to convince enough people that these money-losing public corporations are somehow a drag on our economy, they will begin to break them up completely, to sell off their assets to the private sector and to close them down. Their ultimate goal, Mr. Speaker, is to dismantle the public sector wherever possible.

The three-step plan, Mr. Speaker, to privatize, discredit and dismantle, has already begun to take shape — even some of the public utilities, and Sask Tel for instance is one of the corporations that has been dealt with in this fashion. First the government forced Sask Tel to give up two profitable aspects of its operations. The extension telephone business now must be shared with multinational corporations like Radio Shack and Consumers Distributing; and Sask Tel's exclusive arrangement with one of the worlds' largest computer companies to distribute all their products in Saskatchewan has been given up to the private sector.

The profits from these two aspects of Sask Tel's operations, Mr. Speaker, provided the public utility with revenue that helped to keep down the cost of the public telephone service. Now these revenues have been privatized and, as a result, Sask Tel is in a desperate cash situation. And it has applied for one of the biggest single rate increases in history, an average of 19 per cent for 1983.

Would these rate increases be really necessary, Mr. Speaker, would they have been necessary if this government had not privatized parts of that corporation? Are these the kind of rate increases that we can be looking forward to in the future? Is this going to be the groundwork that the Conservative government is planning in which they will eventually possibly even destroy a corporation like Sask Tel? Mr. Speaker, I would hardly think that the government would go to that extent because Sask Tel has proven itself as a very popular corporation over the last number of years that it has been operating and it's been in operation a long time. And even this rightwing Conservative government would not like to destroy it.

However, as Sask Tel continues to lose money, and the demand for higher and higher increases every year is there, I think it will certainly make it a lot easier for this government to eventually discredit and dismantle even a corporation like Sask Tel.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a moment to review some of the accomplishments of the Minister of Highways. And I think it will only take a moment to do that because if you listen to what was said during the throne speech and of the budget speech last November, you would find that about the only thing that people describe the minister would be as a minister of signs, and I have used that description of the minister last fall.

And I think the reason that he was described as the minister of signs is because for his propensity to put up new signs along all major new highways or major highways, rather than repair them. And I can't really blame the minister, especially after his colleagues did away with the gas tax, and he can no longer afford to repair or construct highways.

But just not to say that I would be unfair to the minister, I thought that I should do a little more checking, do a little more checking and see just what the minister had accomplished in the past year while he held that portfolio. So I went back into the files and re-read every one of the minister's public statements. And since he took over his

duties of Minister of Highways, he has produced some 50 press releases.

There was one announcing that in 1983 highway maps were available, and they were complete, I might add, with the Open for business slogan at the back. There was a press release announcing that the Department of Highways had converted one truck — one, Mr. Speaker — to run on compressed natural gas. There was a press release announcing the introduction of personalized licence plates, another announcing 100 new signs for the Red Coat Trail, another announcing new signs for over-dimension vehicles. But my favourite, Mr. Speaker, was the one which announced to Saskatchewan that the Minister of Highways had spent the night with a road crew on the shores of Lake Athabasca.

All these press releases made for some very interesting reading, Mr. Speaker, but they sure didn't build any highways. In fact, since the minister took office, of about 50 of those news releases that had been put out, only about five of them announced any awarding of contracts, and this was for future work, work that may be done within the next year, and we hope that at least those five will be done in the next year.

Mr. Speaker, I think one can only say that if paper was pavement the minister would, to this point, have four-laned both the Trans-Canada and the Yellowhead. However, paper isn't pavement, and all that the minister has given us is paper, and I think instead of the paper and the PR, what the minister should do is try to give this province some pavement and some highways.

What has really been the record of the Minister of Highways in the past year — the record of cutbacks, cancellations, delays, and precious little pavement, Mr. Speaker? The minister himself confirmed that during a study of Department of Highways estimates, he was required to produce the last, the list of those highway projects which he had deleted when he took office, and it's along list, Mr. Speaker. In total it showed some \$19 million that were deleted from highways. Six million of those were in the northern part of Saskatchewan. Those cuts, and what the Minister of Highways said about the four-laning of the Trans-Canada being his top priority, suggest a pattern of this government, an approach to the highway system that is going to neglect, neglect many of the secondary road systems in this province.

Under the NDP government, the basic policy was to develop a network of highways through the whole province, not just along the major arteries like the Trans-Canada or the Yellowhead. We wanted everyone to benefit from a good highway system, not just those lucky enough to live along the main arteries, not someone just travelling through the highway, be it . . . or through the province, be it on business or for pleasure. But the policy was to provide everyone in the province with a very good road, if at all possible.

But that is not the policy of this minister. That policy to this point has gone out the window. His main emphasis is going to be four-laning the major arteries, and that seems to be his priority. And his government or cabinet colleagues have cut his budget. They've cut it to the point where if the minister continues to go with any of the four-laning that he has been talking about, I think we will see that there would be very little done to the major network of highways in this province.

And if you go according to the minister's own list of work along the highways, he has deleted roads like Highway 378 near Spiritwood, 155 near La Loche and Buffalo Narrows, No. 8 between Moosomin and Rocanville, 15 from Raymore to Semans, and the minister says these highways don't count. These highways will have to wait,

because I'm too busy four-laning some of the others.

Well, let me give the Minister of Highways a little warning, Mr. Speaker. He might be able to delay the highways from, maybe for a year, or maybe for longer, and you might be able to get away with putting them off and telling the people that he is prepared to do something else with his budget. But soon those delays and those cancellations are going to show up in the kind of roads that this province will have.

And I think this minister will then be known, or will then become the minister, not of good highways in the province of Saskatchewan, but very likely the minister of potholes throughout Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other bills that the minister is talking about introducing is The Vehicles Act, and he has had a white paper out regarding some of the changes or the proposed changes to The Vehicles Act, and he said that he will proceed with the new act in this session. And in any case, whatever will be within that act I would have to say that we will be looking very closely at this legislation, and we will deal with it at that time and in whatever manner it has to be dealt with.

I would only want to make one comment, thought, and that is to the statement that the minister made regarding the legislation which would allow mandatory body fluid samples, and I can't help but think back only a short time ago when the Minister of Highways, when he was a private member in opposition at that time, complained very strongly about the fact that this province had mandatory seat-belt legislation. He said that somehow it was infringement against the individual rights, and was an example of state socialism, or whatever else he may have used. But, Mr. Speaker, when he became the minister he was suddenly converted. He was converted to saying that seat-belts were good, and I don't know whether all that happened on the road to Damascus, or whenever it occurred, but anyway it was after the election.

Now that minister is prepared to allow mandatory body fluid samples, and that certainly invades the privacy and encroaches on the individual right, maybe more so than the seat-belts, but it seems that the minister has had a change of heart from when he was in opposition and when he was in government. But we will be looking closely at his legislation, and I am sure there will be much more debate on it in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say just a few words about rural affairs, and I was very disappointed that the Speech from the Throne did not clarify the position of the Department of Rural Affairs. All that speech was . . . All that Speech from the Throne said was that "My government has undertaken a comprehensive review of the position of Saskatchewan's municipalities, and believes a number of adjustments are required in the legal structures of governing local governments."

Mr. Speaker, that throne speech goes on to talk about The Planning and Development Act, a revision that the former NDP government had been in the process of working on. It talks about urban affairs, northern affairs, water and assessments. But it doesn't clear up that statement that appeared in the media a few weeks back, that there was some, some change coming to rural affairs.

In any case, I think the government did have some responsibility to clarify that issue, especially after it was raised in the press. And it was obvious then that the government was looking at doing away with the department. The minister tried to smooth over the trouble waters at the SARM convention, but I don't think he really satisfied anyone.

And I hope the government clears this matter up before this debate is concluded.

The NDP established the Department of Rural Affairs because it regarded the rural program and the rural affairs department a crucial part of an overall government program. It remains to be seen whether the present government will place the same priority on rural affairs. It wasn't just a case of having another department. That was especially set up for the rural municipalities to deal with. It was a case of having a department where all the R.M.s could go to with their problems, with their needs, and had a department that was there working specifically for them.

Mr. Speaker, rural Saskatchewan is an important part of this province not just in the sense of agriculture, but in the sense of having a rural . . . a healthy rural community. The rural people have the same advantages and the same opportunities as do people in urban centres. Rural life and rural communities have made Saskatchewan a better place to live in. They have made an unmeasurable contribution to the well-being of Saskatchewan. They have come under great pressure over the years, and have had to make many adjustments. And I think even more change will be coming in the future. The people of Saskatchewan will hold this government responsible for whatever happens to rural affairs and the rural population of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker one area that I'd like to spend a little more time on, and that relates to the transportation of grain in this province — or out of this province. And everyone, I think, would know that what I'm talking about, of course, is the Pepin plan. And we are told that the Conservative government has launched an all-out war against the Pepin plan. We are told that they are going to do everything possible to save the Crow rate. That's what we are being told, Mr. Speaker.

However, I think there are some very troublesome signs out there, and the reality is really different. There are some troublesome signs that the Conservative government has an all-out war against the Pepin plan. But that war is really a phoney war. And most disturbing of all are the signs of weakness of that government — the signs of a willingness to negotiate with Ottawa on the Pepin proposal.

This is the minister who is supposed to be leading the charge on behalf of Saskatchewan people against the Pepin plan. But what was the first public act following the declaration of war during that debate? Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister, about a week or so after he declared war against the Pepin plan, sat down to start negotiating the terms of surrender.

And I don't make this accusation lightly, Mr. Speaker, and I would prefer that it were not true. I would prefer that all Saskatchewan people could, in fact, be untied behind this government and the minister; be untied behind a government that would mean what they claim, when they say that they want to save the Crow rate. However, the minister himself has been doing and saying things that would bring the sincerity of his offensive against the Pepin plan into some question.

Let me review the events of the past few weeks. On February 1st when Pepin unveiled his plans to destroy the Crow rate and replace it with a statutory rate for the railways, the disastrous impact that the plan will have on our provincial economy, which we have been warning the people about for the past year, becomes quite clear now. It even becomes clear to the Tory government's pollster in Toronto, because shortly after that plan was announced the government decided that they had better get their act

together. I think this is the information they got for their pollster: they had better get their act together and get behind the farmers or face the consequences.

Finally, on February 22nd, about three weeks after the Pepin plan had been made public, the Conservative government announces a position. They tell the people of this province that their government has declared an all-out war on the Pepin plan. That was on February 22, Mr. Speaker. Six days later, the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture had a nice little cosy chat with the author of that plan right here in this Legislative Building.

Mr. Pepin sat down with the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, and what was told at that meeting, Mr. Speaker? Was he told that that plan was totally, totally unacceptable to the province and to the people of Saskatchewan? Was he warned that we would do very thing in our power to stop his plan from becoming law? Mr. Speaker, apparently, he was not told that. Apparently, our Premier and the Minister of Agriculture informed Pepin that they would be prepared to negotiate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. They were prepared to do some dickering with Pepin over what was in his plan. They did it here in this Legislative Building.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that that is a betrayal of the resolution passed in this Chamber on February 22nd. I suggest that is a betrayal of Saskatchewan farmers who have been told by this government that it will fight to save the Crow no matter what. They would spend dollars, they would do everything to save the Crow. And, throughout that debate in the legislature we have heard the Minister of Agriculture, and the Premier, and just about every Conservative member who spoke say that the farmers cannot afford to pay a penny more to move their grain. That, Mr. Speaker, is what they said in this legislature; that is what they have been saying to the media.

But what has the Minister of Agriculture been saying outside of this Chamber? He was saying something very different, Mr. Speaker. The minister was in Melville a few days ago, over the weekend, speaking to a chamber of commerce meeting. This is what the minister had to say to the chamber of commerce meeting regarding the Pepin plan. He said that we talked with Pepin and we feel that the farmers are willing to pay more to move their grain. That, Mr. Speaker, is what the Minister of Agriculture is telling the chambers of commerce. They are willing to pay more, but what we should be doing is somehow, in our negotiations, providing some type of safety net for the farmers.

And when he was asked at that meeting how much more he thought the farmer can pay, he said, "I don't know; I don't have a figure." It's much like his position was on the Crow to being with. He waits 'til the last minute and when he sees what's going to be popular, that is the position he takes. When he sees what Pepin is going to announce in the way of a rate, well, maybe he's going to take a position just a little bit lower than that. But the face will be that we will no longer have the Crow, we will then be trying to negotiate some type of safety for the farmers, some type of policy, that will not totally destroy all the farmers of western Canada. That, Mr. Speaker, is the type of attitude that has been taken by the Minister of Agriculture. He says one thing in the House and he says something totally different to groups that he thinks want to hear something different.

I would like to know from the Minister of Agriculture what has happened to that great policy of his where he was going to protect the farmers of this province. Is he saying, only in this House, that the farmers shouldn't be paying a penny more, and that we should be saving the Crow rate, and then what he is going . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . what he is going and saying then, Mr. Speaker, is that while the farmer can't afford

to pay him any more . . . a penny more, we are prepared to let the railways decide how much he really is going to pay because they don't even have a position on what they think the farmer can afford to pay?

And that's what has been coming from the Minister of Agriculture, I think all along what he has really been saying is that he is, and this government is, prepared to negotiate. They are not really dedicated to saving the Crow and to assisting the farmers of Saskatchewan. All they are doing is paying lip service, and trying to say what might be popular and what might be accepted out there in the public. And I'd like to know whether this charge that he is leading on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan is one that is going to be about as empty as many of the things that he has been saying. And is it going to be the policy of this government to say that the Crow is really not an issue, as we have said in the past, and whatever happens we will just accept it?

Mr. Speaker, when we supported the resolution in this House, we did not support that resolution for the minister to negotiate with Pepin. We supported that resolution so that there would be no negotiations, and we supported that resolution so that this government would go forward and put all of its resources, all of its resources available to fight to save the Crow. And no modified version of the Pepin plan will be acceptable to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

What the farmers of this province want is the Crow rate as it is. That's what they voted for. That's what we voted for in this House, and that's what this government has promised at that time. And that's what we really want them to deliver.

In addition to calling off some of the cosy chats that they are having with Pepin, what else should this government be doing to save the Crow? Well, to begin with, they should be helping to organize a prairie-wide plebiscite, a plebiscite of producers, of grain producers in this province and of western Canada. Let the farmers have their say. Let the farmers put that lie to rest. Let the farmers go and tell Pepin through a plebiscite that they are not prepared to negotiate the terms of the Crow. They want the Crow to remain in statute, and that is what this government has promised to do, and that is what they should be doing.

What they should also be doing is talking to the Conservative Premier from Alberta. They should be trying to convince the Premier of Alberta that he should also come on side and fight against any changes to the Pepin plan. And if they can't convince Mr. Lougheed from Alberta to be on their side, and to fight against any changes to the Crow, how do they expect the farmers of Saskatchewan to believe them when that . . . when they say that somehow they are going to convince eastern politicians and eastern businessmen that the Crow, that the Crow should remain intact? How do they expect people of this province to believe that they are sincere in what they are saying?

And once, once this government has been successful, has been successful in getting Lougheed to support them, then I think, Mr. Speaker, what they should be doing is going to Ottawa and trying to convince the present Leader of the, the House Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa, Mr. Nielson, I believe it is — is it? — Eric Nielson, who is the present House Leader in Ottawa. They keep changing them so often that it's hard to keep track of them.

But once they can convince Lougheed they should go to Ottawa and try to get some commitment from the Leader of the Opposition, the House Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa, and get a commitment from him that they are going to support the western

position, which is no changes to the Crow, because to this point even the members the Conservative members in Ottawa — have not been clear as to what their position is. They have not been clear, Mr. Speaker, and the Conservatives of Saskatchewan, the Conservatives of Alberta, the Conservatives of Ottawa should quit negotiating with Pepin on what type of changes are going to be made to the Crow. And they should take the position, take the position that they're prepared to assist the farmers, and to go with the farmers to save the Crow and be sincere about it, which to this point, Mr. Speaker, they are not.

One of the other interesting comments that have been coming out in this House, Mr. Speaker, and that is regarding the land bank. And we have the members of this House saying that the land bank is gone now, and since this government has come into power they are giving the land back to the farmers.

Well. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know just how many farmers they gave the land bank to. I am not aware of any farmer that was given any land by this government or any government in the past. If anybody got any land, even back in the '30s, it was at least for a \$10 or a \$20 fee, but somehow they seem to be trying to say in this House that they have given back the land to the farmers. And they have been talking about the 152 farmers that have, in the first couple of weeks or whatever period it was, that have purchased land under their new program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many of these people that they are talking about, these farmers that they are talking about, are new farmers. I would venture a guess that there aren't any new farmers involved in that program. All that they have done was transferred land for the land bank program, or possibly not even from the land bank program. All they have done is just transferred land from one farmer to another. It could be from a father to a son or what you. But they have created no new farms in this province, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I would think that in the near future you're going to see that there are going to be less of the new farmers, even the new farmers that have had land bank land, because if you look in the *Western Producer* you'll see a good number of land listings, listings under the Department of Agriculture that were land bank parcels, parcels that young farmers had long-term leases on. They are now being tendered in the *Western Producer*, Mr. Speaker. So that means that we're not looking at 152 new farmers who were given land. We are looking at hundreds of farmers that are going to be losing their land over the weeks and the months ahead, and that, Mr. Speaker, I think is something that the people should be aware of: that they are not allowing a lot of these young farmers to continue on that land. Some of them have had a difficult year this past year, especially in the North. They have had frost. They have not been able to sell utility wheat, and I have looked at the listing in the *Western Producer*, and I see about 20 farmers from my area that are being sold, being sold out from young farmers who had that land and who were farming.

This government is not even considering what is going to happen to these young farmers. This is the compassionate type of government that was so concerned about the farmer, but I say they are about as concerned about those young farmers that were on land bank land as they are concerned about trying to save the Crow. It was merely nothing more than a lot of words, with no sincerity and no compassion behind it at all.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of government that we have here in this House. That is the way this government has been operating. That is the way this government has been operating for 10 months, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we will see more of that type of government in the future, and it won't be long that the people of this

province will realize just what kind of government they really have. But I would have to say, as a member of Pelly constituency, I will continue to work on behalf with the members, for the constituents of Pelly, and I will continue to work on their behalf. Regardless of what is being proposed in this legislature, I will be working for the benefit of constituents of Pelly and of people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite obvious that I will be supporting the amendment, and voting against the main motion.

**MR. SAUDER:** — Mr. Speaker, due to the time it's getting to be, and the comments I'd like to make on this speech, I'd like to beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I was introducing under introduction of bills when we moved to move special orders, I wonder if we could revert back now and introduce those three bills.

#### **Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Public Works Act**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I would move first reading of a bill to amend The Public Works Act.

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

#### **Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I would move, Mr. Speaker, first reading of a bill to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

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

#### **Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I would move first reading of a bill to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act.

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

The Assembly adjourned at 5:02 p.m.