

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Tuesday, March 6, 1979.

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.
On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly, 48 Grade 5 and Grade 6 students from McCannel School. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Brenda Clark and Mr. Wayne Wilson, as well as the principal, Mr. Don MacDougall. They are seated in the east gallery. These students are presently involved in a mock parliament and have chosen this visit as part of their studies. The student legislature parallels the proceedings of the provincial legislature complete with leaders — House and opposition. Their Premier is Todd Miller. The Leader of the Opposition is Susan Nurse and the leader of the third party is Caroline Petersen. I know the members on both sides of this Assembly will join me in welcoming these students and wish them success in their legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.F. McARTHUR (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, through you I'd like to join with the member for Regina South in welcoming the students from McCannel School. I know that some of the students also reside in Regina Lakeview constituency. I'd like to wish them a joyful time while they're here and a safe journey back to their school.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B.M. DYCK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to the other members of this Chamber, as well as welcome, 34 students from Grade 8 from St. Pauls School in Saskatoon Mayfair constituency. I've been at St. Pauls School many times and it's an excellent school; they offer an excellent French program there. I'm very delighted to have them in the legislature here this afternoon with us. I hope they find these proceedings worthwhile and informative and I look forward to the opportunity of meeting with the group at 2:45 o'clock in the rotunda area. I also want to welcome their teacher who is accompanying them, Mr. Reiger.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS
Refusal to Hold Raffle

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — First of all, let me express the deepest condolences and sympathy from our caucus in your recent loss. I would like to address my question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Whelan). Mr. Minister, did you receive a letter addressed to you by the Redberry Progressive Conservative Ladies' Association asking for permission to hold a raffle and did you on February 9, 1979, reply to those ladies and refuse that permission?

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I receive many letters of this kind from political organizations asking to hold raffles and I probably

March 6, 1979

answered it. I can't say for sure, but if you have a copy of it, it's probably correct.

MR. COLLVER: — Yes, I do have a copy in which the minister refused this permission. How then, Mr. Minister, in supplementary, do you account for the following item that appeared in the Shellbrook Chronicle dated February 14, 1979? 'Friday, February 9' — incidentally, the same day that you wrote the letter — Friday, February 9, the Redberry NDP ladies held a very successful tea and bake sale in the Marcelin New Horizons Hall everybody enjoyed the strawberry shortcake . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — . . . as well as the opportunity to purchase from the grand array of cakes, breads, buns, cookies etc., on the bake table. Two cakes were raffled, and the winners were Mrs. Mike Kirykl and Mr. Dennis Bonin. How do you account for that, Mr. Minister?

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, I think I can get the hon. member for Nipawin letters from many New Democrat organizations asking for permission, and the answer is the same. The ruling is the same, and it is bound by legislation and bound by law. The legislation is written by the federal people. It says that a political party is not a charitable organization; there are many, many bonafide excellent decisions that are followed through going back to 1949 that sets out in British law, clearly, that a political party is not a charitable organization. If you ask me if a charitable organization can hold a raffle, my answer is going to be to every political party, Liberal, Progressive Conservative, New Democrat — it is always going to be no, because the federal legislation will not permit it, and because the political party is not a charitable organization, but in law is known as a historic organization. I can't tell you the reasons that the court gave, but the court decisions are all the same — no political party can be a charitable organization. My answer is always going to be the same no matter what the newspaper clipping . . .

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

Regarding Pressure on Coronach Dam

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Question to the minister in charge of SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation). The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Engel) mentioned yesterday that the Coronach Dam was almost full of water. In addition, the news media is reporting almost daily and continuing to report, that the run-off in the Southern Saskatchewan could be almost two times normal, and if water is not released severe damage pressures could be placed on the structure of this dam. Is the minister aware of this situation?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I am aware that water is building up at the Coronach Dam. We have announced, after the conclusion of discussion with the Department of Environment, that we are trying to run down the reservoir as much as possible in anticipation of heavy run-off waters. I have not been informed of any problem with the structural foundation or the actual dam itself. And, I would be very surprised if we are concerned about a weakness in that dam. The member knows that it has been reviewed several times by not only the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and its consultant engineers, but some people who were concerned from the state of Montana about the structural soundness of that dam. Every test that has been put to that structure to date has proven it to be far superior than the minimum requirements.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, I am advised that the gates of this dam are frozen shut and that SPC cannot open them and they are having difficulty opening the gates. Are you aware of this situation?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of a problem in operating the dam at this particular point in time.

MR. LARTER: — With the water not being released and with the potential run-off, there is deep concern in Montana and among the people of the Coronach area. Can you tell me what contingency plans you would make in a situation like this?

MR. MESSER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of what the member for Estevan is alluding to. I remind him that a few short years ago, before there was a dam, there were absolutely no means of being able to control the flood waters and they were subject to this kind of situation on an ongoing basis every year if there was high run-off. At least they have the confidence that under normal conditions, given the dam is operating satisfactorily, we can control the run-off waters and I'm certain that if there is a problem SPC is now doing everything it can in order to correct it.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — You've indicated that there was concern from other sources about the structure of this dam but you've had engineering studies done which, in your words I believe, show that the dam is above minimum standard. Would you now be prepared to table the studies that you have obtained and make public the statements which seem to indicate the security of that dam in spite of some very widespread concerns?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, one thing you can credit the member for Qu'Appelle with is that he's always prepared to answer a question about something he knows absolutely nothing about, absolutely nothing about! The member, if he'd been listening in past sessions of this Legislative Assembly and/or Crown corporations, will know that we invited the concerned groups from the state of Montana to appoint their own engineers along with our engineers and consultants to investigate, come up to the site and personally review the structuring of the dam and the plans that were followed in building that dam. Those engineers and those people went away satisfied that the dam was far superior to the minimum requirements. The member knows that because it was conveyed to this Legislative Assembly several years ago as it was conveyed to Crown corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hospital T-4 Slips — 53-Week Year

MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. I would like to ask him if he's aware that several of the hospitals in the province have issued T-4 slips to their employees covering a 53-week year. This is a little unusual. Were you aware this was taking place?

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that this had taken place. We are not in the habit of sitting on the door-steps of hospitals which have independent boards which administer their hospitals. If this has happened I'm sure that those hospitals which are very capable will take the steps necessary to make any corrections that will be needed to be made.

March 6, 1979

MR. SWAN: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise us really what is happening to correct the situation. This is a concern raised by people in the hospitals. We would like to know what you're doing.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I hope that the people who have raised those issues with the member opposite have also raised them with their hospital boards and administrators . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — . . . because I'm quite confident, Mr. Speaker, that those hospital boards which are appointed by autonomous municipalities throughout the province, are quite capable of handling the administration of their hospitals and I have confidence that they will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It's come to our attention as well that a number of employees of these hospitals had their income tax forms complete, had paid money out to firms to prepare their reports and now have had to go back and have amendments made. This is costing them a considerable amount when you add it together, and I am wondering whether you are prepared to give some assistance to these people for the duplication.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I have never been so amazed as I have been in the last week at the kind of questions we've had coming from the members opposite. They stand in the House and they talk about local autonomy, and they talk about the rights of those local government bodies and say that government should not interfere with them. Here we have in the case in point an example of how contradictory they are. If there is such a difficulty then obviously it needs some correction, and I will agree with the member for Rosetown-Elrose that there ought to be. Now I will also agree with the member for Rosetown-Elrose because I am sure he will not disagree with me, that that correction is something that has to be made between the employer and the employee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — And it so happens to be the case, Mr. Speaker, that the employer is the hospital board, whether it's the Rosetown Union Hospital or the St. Elizabeth Hospital in Humboldt. and the employees are represented by their respective unions in those hospitals. Therefore, I don't think it's necessary for the government to become involved in that local issue, and I think that it will be resolved where it ought to be, between the board and its employees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Colostomy-Ostomate Appliances

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Health and to the Attorney General. I have far more confidence in local hospital boards than I have in the administration of the department. But my question to the Minister of

Health, Mr. Speaker, my question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and pardon me for interrupting, my question to the Minister of Health . . . yesterday in your reply to the throne speech you indicated that the Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living (SAIL) did in fact supply appliances at no cost to all colostomy-ostomate appliance users in Saskatchewan.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — In answer, I don't know whether the transcript of the debate from last night is yet out. I don't think it is; it's probably too early. But if the member will check in my remarks yesterday in the throne speech debate I made no reference to colostomy-ostomate appliances whatsoever. I made reference to the Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living (SAIL) program, and I said that for those items that are covered by that program, there is no charge.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I don't have the transcripts but I remember distinctly that you were referring to a policy of the Tories in the last election which said they would supply free of charge colostomy-ostomate appliances at no cost. You said that SAIL already does that and my question to you is, if they do, you better tell them and you better tell the users in Saskatchewan. We have 12,000 to 13,000 of them and they are not getting them free of charge . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, in order to answer the member's question I want him to be and to put the record straight I want him to be reminded that in my remarks I was referring to comments made by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) which specifically dealt with not colostomy-ostomate appliances but with the SAIL (Saskatchewan Aid to Independent Living) program and that is what I said. Let me further add that I would invite the member to consider the fact that we have only had the throne speech in this Legislative Assembly, we have yet the budget speech to come. Who knows, maybe in the budget speech there will be some consideration given to the matter of colostomy-ostomate appliances but it is too early yet to tell.

MR. BERNTSON: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The policy of SAIL as it now stands is that appliances are, in fact, provided free to people who need them as a result of paraplegia but not to people who need them as a result of surgical procedure. Would the minister not agree that this is something less than fair and will you not announce that SAIL will, in fact, change its policy direction and provide these appliances to all users at no cost?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared at this time to announce any changes to the SAIL program. It is an excellent program, in fact, one of its kind in Canada. It has done a very commendable job providing to people appliances free of charge, which the member has referred to and which people have had a need for. If there are any policy changes to be announced by the government or by myself on behalf of the government, they will be done so in due course.

Foreign Investment Policy

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — A question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In 1976 the government set out its policy under your hand for foreign investment policy for the province of Saskatchewan. That two or three pages sets out, for example, the clear policy guidelines and in particular deals with the tertiary sector which includes financial institutions. For the government's information Queen City Credit Bureau of

March 6, 1979

the city of Regina has been taken over through subsidiaries by a company known as Equifax Inc. of the United States, a company which is headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia. It means, of course, that all the computer records and personal financial records of Saskatchewan citizens are now being held in Atlanta, Georgia. What action did the government take on its foreign investment review of this particular take-over by an American corporation of a Regina business?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to reply to that question at this time because I don't have the information at my fingertips. However, it is a foreign investment review policy to go through the federal department and then through our department. I will take the question under advisement and see if I can get you some information.

MR. LANE: — By way of supplementary to the minister. Will the minister admit that if this purchase has, in fact, gone through, it raises very serious questions about your capability to deal with this particular situation and that such a take-over is highly dangerous to the people of Saskatchewan when all their personal financial records, business records are now out of the jurisdiction of both Saskatchewan and Canada and in fact being held in the United States.

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult for me again to reply although it's strictly an assumption on behalf of the hon. member. If the information that he is giving me is correct, then as I stated before I will bring the answer back to him tomorrow or at a later date.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took notice of a question asked I believe by the hon. Leader of the Opposition respecting statutory authority for payments on the CIGOL (Canadian Industrial Gas and Oil Limited) case. He wanted to know the section. I'm advised the sections are 6(2)(e) and section 56 of The Department of Finance Act.

Grain Producer Cars

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, probably as old as The Wheat Board Act itself is an additional law that enables a producer who chooses not to go through an elevator company that he is given the opportunity to order his own grain car. In essence then he has the option of loading it and sending it to whichever terminal that is appropriate. It is then taken over by a company, Mr. Minister, I'm sure you're aware of changes that the Wheat Board has recently gone into whereby it would appear that a producer is losing this option. Granted he may still order a car but he must now designate the company. He must also load it with grain as specified — grade and dockage as specified by the Canadian Wheat Board and most important, the company then loses that car out of its allocation and therefore, Mr. Minister, it's obvious that the companies are really not offering the service. My question to the Minister is, does your government approve of this practice by the Canadian Wheat Board which if it is not actually breaking a law is probably sabotaging it at the very least?

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I think we have to look at what's happening in the producer car field. We do have a problem with producer cars and everybody has over a period of time recognized the rights of producers to get a producer car when he so requests but I think we also have to look at the implications of what is happening with the existing system. When a producer loads a car which has

grain in it, which is not designated to a specific destination or not to a specific terminal or is loaded with grain which is not the kind of grain which is required in the system, then immediately it creates a confusion and chaos in the system. A great deal of that has happened in the last few months and I think it is incumbent on the Wheat Board in this particular case to look at ways and means in which it can prevent that kind of disruption of the delivery system. We are hearing people all over the country talking about the need to streamline our delivery system — a need to have not to have grain in the system which we can't move. This is precisely what happens if you allow producers to use a producer car without adequate assurance that that grain is going to reach a destination and it's going to be useful and so it can be absorbed into the system without creating a lot of confusion and this is precisely, I believe, what the Wheat Board has attempted to do and I support that.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, I am sure you're aware that hearings into this matter are being held presently by the Canadian Grain Commission (CGC) to make a recommendation on precisely the subject that you mentioned. The minister, I am sure, is aware that it has come out very conclusively at these hearings that these producer cars have never made up more than 2.5 per cent of the total. Therefore, is the minister telling this Assembly today that he supports a government agency deliberately trying to circumvent the individual rights of a producer by, if not adhering to the letter of the law, certainly violating the spirit of that law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that this is a criticism again of the Canadian Wheat Board, which is not unusual coming from that side of the House, but I'm not prepared to accept that only 2.5 per cent of the total of grain is going through that mechanism. Maybe that's the correct figure. But whether it is 2.5 per cent or 1.5 per cent, the fact is that, with the kind of tight system we have right out there now, the lack of capacity to move grain, even 2.5 per cent, if it disrupts the system, if it creates problems in the delivery system, causes situations where you have to uncouple cars to get this car to its destination. All of those things have a major impact on the turn-around time we have getting our cars back to a position where they can again pick up another load. I think all of us are looking at ways and means in which we can streamline the system and certainly I think the Wheat Board is correct in trying to do whatever it can, in this particular case, to prevent a circumvention of the system.

Totalled Vehicles

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of SGIO (Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office). Mr. Minister, in the past I directed a question to you regarding written-off or totalled vehicles that had been repaired and are being put back on Saskatchewan highways without proper inspections. Your answer at the time was that the Highways Legislative Safety Committee recommended inspections before the vehicles are put back on the road. In light of that statement, Mr. Minister, are you aware that these vehicles are still being put back on the road without these inspections?

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Yes, I'm aware of it.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Minister, will you assure this House now that steps will be taken today that will ensure that proof of inspections are made on these vehicles before somebody

is killed or injured?

MR. WHELAN: — I think, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestion is a bit ridiculous in view of the fact that no such legislation exists in many of the provinces. I'm well aware of what is taking place and so is the Highway Traffic Board, and it's under consideration, that we are considering, but the whole pattern of how the inspections are carried out and how extensive they should be, is something that I think should really concern you, because you're talking about how you don't want bureaucratic interference all the time. This would be a compulsory inspection. This is something that we have to have a great number of people to look after it. Are you suggesting that we should have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . inspectors in every corner of the province — everywhere there's an autobody shop — is that what you're suggesting? That's really bureaucratic control you know.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I think the minister again, as usual, misunderstands. I'm referring to vehicles that have been totalled . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . or written off by your department, by SGIO, which are being purchased and repaired and put back on the highways. They are potentially very dangerous and you recommended (or Safety Committee recommended) inspections and you are condoning such a policy. Let's get the inspection compulsory if you like — but let's get these vehicles inspected.

MR. WHELAN: — I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, of what the committee recommended. I am well aware of the circumstances. I understand completely what you are saying . . . but up against a criticism of too many bureaucratic inspectors . . . looking at this sort of thing coming from your people all the time. This is one of the things I have to put up with and one of the things that I have to consider. We have to consider writing in legislation that people don't want bureaucratic interference under any circumstances. They want the freedom to repair their own cars and do what they like. This is your argument. You are arguing against yourselves.

School Project at Turnor Lake

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — In reply to a question from the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod) . . . his question was: have you rejected the late tenders submitted after closing of tenders by the Ile-a-la-Crosse Industries?

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's question is no. The millwork portion of the school project at Turnor Lake was not awarded under the tender process. It is true that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan called for tenders on the millwork portion of the Turnor Lake School project. The closing date for submitting tenders was December 18 and as of that date no documents were taken out and no bids were tendered. After December 18, 1978 the Department of Northern Saskatchewan commenced negotiations with at least three companies to submit a price for the millwork of the Turnor Lake School. This process is not regarded as an official tendering process and Ile-a-la-Crosse Industries was engaged on the basis of the subsequent negotiations as their bid was the lowest.

MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Byers), by way of a supplement to that answer.

Would you not admit at this time, Mr. Minister, that the companies that were asked to submit prices considered this to be a tendering process?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I don't care what they considered it to be. It was not a tendering process. They were invited to submit estimates and prices and on the basis of the response to the invitations Ile-a-la-Crosse Industries was awarded the work on the basis that their estimate was the lowest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McLEOD: — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Even if they did not consider this to be a tendering process, which I believe they did consider it to be why then (regardless of what they considered it to be) did your department not see that the lowest tender was accepted? Let me clarify that . . . the lowest tender that was submitted up to the date that they specified?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, of the three prices submitted (in response to the invitations) Ile-a-la-Crosse was the lowest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Mr. Minister, did you say that this was the lowest price on the closing date of the 18th, that this was the lowest price that was submitted and was this the closing date?

MR. BYERS: — No, I said that after December 18 when no tenders were submitted, nor no documents taken out for the tenders then the Department of Northern Saskatchewan commenced negotiations and invited potential contractors to submit their estimates for this work. There were at least three estimates which came in. This is not regarded as the normal tendering process. The work was awarded to Ile-a-la-Crosse Industries on the basis that their offer was the lowest.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. White (Regina Wascana) for an address in reply.

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to rise once again in this House to speak on behalf of my constituents. First of all, I would like to thank them for giving me another vote of confidence in 1978. It will be a pleasure to work on their behalf in the next four years. I would also like to thank those who worked or who contributed or spoke on my behalf, whether they were workers, farmers or businessmen. In Yorkton we faced two of the ablest candidates who had run in Yorkton for many years, but the people of the Yorkton constituency voted for the planned intelligent government headed by Allan Blakeney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — The Leader of the Opposition was asking the other day where is leadership? The people of Saskatchewan answered that question for him on October 18. The people of Yorkton constantly said to me, Mr. Speaker, Allan Blakeney is a statesman. Allan Blakeney is a trusted, brilliant fighter who can be depended upon to

March 6, 1979

state Saskatchewan's case before the government in Ottawa. Allan Blakeney is a solid citizen and his government is showing leadership which our country needs. But whatever the causes, I am most grateful to the people of the Yorkton constituency for returning me for a second term. You can't lose with help like I had.

Mr. Speaker, I am most honored to be part of a team which has since 1944 produced such tremendous social, health, agricultural and industrial programs. This government has made Saskatchewan a place which is a model all across Canada, all over North America. I am pleased and honored to be a part of the team that sets forth in this throne speech the first steps of a pattern for planned progress for the next decade, the decade of the '80s.

Mr. Speaker, new members will enjoy watching the Premier of this province and his deputy, who sit side by side, whose heads are often together planning and working for the people of this province. Then when they look across the way, it will be somewhat different. In the last session we watched the Leader of the Conservatives and the runner-up at his leadership convention and we saw them looking in opposite directions. In fact, it was the former member for Rosetown-Elrose who was supposed to have said to the news media that he couldn't stand the Leader of the Opposition and had to leave. But, Mr. Speaker, it was Julius Caesar who spoke of wanting to have sleek, fat men about him that would be satisfied. Ah, Mr. Speaker, I see a lot of lean, hungry looks across the way and if Caesar were here as Leader of the Opposition, he might well have fear. In fact, I've been told that the PC caucus had advised their leader to be very careful how he talks on account of his throat. They're all ready to slit it. But it wasn't just his throat last fall that caused all the problems. I heard it was his nose. I heard that he got it stuck into a 62-year-old buzz saw that he found on the north steps of the Legislative Building. And I heard that it had a sudden and sobering effect upon him. But, Mr. Speaker, it was the verbal attacks on the workers located at the front door that shows the attitude and the mentality of the Leader of the Opposition. It shows the attitude of a man who lost an election and who couldn't take it. That's why he made the attack on the people who work at the front door of the Legislative Building.

Now, some politicians, Mr. Speaker, love to throw dirt, but here is the leader with a difference. In his opening speech in this session of the House, he talked about homosexuals on this side of the House. I can only say again, here is a man, if that's what you can call him, who lost an election and couldn't take it. And when he lost what did he do? Why he looked for what he thought would be the filthiest thing that he could throw at his opponent — at least that's the reaction that I picked from my constituents in the Yorkton area. It bears no further comment. He's a poor loser showing his own level of mentality. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, to all members of his caucus, either they should repudiate their leader or accept the fact that they too are branded as poor losers with a low mentality. But I have a sneaking suspicion, Mr. Speaker, that it's going to be a little bit of fun watching from this side of the House, watching the famous man of the Progressive Conservative Party from down East, that gentleman by the name of Dalton Camp — you know the fellow with the knives. We're just waiting for him to come with his special array of knives and brandish them about. Why, it's going to be better than any television show and much more interesting too, because after all we know this is real life, not just play-acting.

The members opposite, Mr. Speaker, talk about the bad management of public enterprise. They talk about the bad management in our Crown corporations. That means, Mr. Speaker, that the people who run the public enterprises — such as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Sask Housing, you name it — have to be lazy,

conniving and corrupt. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, do not believe this. We have a great respect for the vast majority of the workers within those Crown corporations. We're proud of the work of such people as David Dombowski of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. We're proud of such people as the miners and all the workers who work there. We do not insult their intelligence, their honesty and their diligence. But maybe the members have good cause for doubting the management of these corporations because they doubt their own ability to manage and hence they doubt everyone else's. We have confidence in the people in the public enterprises. We have confidence in what they are doing now and what they will do in the future. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and we have confidence too, in the many small businesses throughout the province, people who are helping to make it tick. Just as we have confidence in the farmers and the workers, Mr. Speaker, we have great confidence in this province. We on this side of the House say that Saskatchewan people can do whatever they set their minds to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Now, Jean Chretien, the Minister of Finance for Canada stated a short while ago that Canada must export and I agree. But just let's look at one enterprise out of many to see what is happening as a result of their policy. Just take a look at INCO (International Nickel Company) of Sudbury, Ontario. Mr. Speaker, INCO owes the people of Canada \$400 million in unpaid taxes, and no interest is being charged on it. The federal government gave them another \$70 million in a tax handout. The Progressive Conservative Government of Ontario gave a \$10 million tax break to them. And why did they do this? They do it all in the name of building Canada through these huge private entrepreneurs.

Mr. Speaker, a capitalist is not necessary a nationalist concerned about the financial state of his country. No, he takes his money where he can make the best buck for his investment. And where does INCO think that they can make the best money for their investment — in Canada? No, in Guatemala, Mr. Speaker, where the people are not just too sure how much the local people of that country value that investment. That is the Liberal and Conservative style of building Canada — in Guatemala, in the United States, and oh yes, in Switzerland. Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party say, if you give major tax concessions, if you give grants to any corporation, it is done only with the guarantee that the money will be invested in Canada for the benefit of the people of Canada.

But, since 1973, more money has been going out of Canada than has been coming in in investments. In 1978, to the end of the third-quarter, \$5.1 billion was invested outside of Canada. By the end of 1977, back awhile, the direct Canadian investment in foreign manufacturing had climbed to approximately \$7 billion, a 26 per cent increase since 1975. And Canada sits with an unemployment rate of over one million people. What do Liberal and Conservative policies do? They create jobs elsewhere, outside of Canada, in Guatemala, in the United States and yes, in Switzerland.

Mr. Speaker, it was interesting for me to see the other day in the Leader Post, a listing of the holdings for the hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver). And I found some strange things, and I quote:

1. The Phoenix Housing Developments, which has \$40,000 in cash:
2. Richard Collver Incorporated, which manages land in Arizona owns about

March 6, 1979

\$20,000 in equipment, and about \$150,000 in cash — in Arizona.

3. Land and buildings on a former dude ranch in Arizona — the ranch is 340 acres and Collver has estimated that it might be worth \$150,000.

One of fourteen units held by investors who bought 600 acres in Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, big capitalists are supposed to know how to build their own country but where did they build it? Why, in the United States, yes, and in Switzerland.

But, say the PC's, people won't invest in Saskatchewan. I would like them to have a look at Yorkton. Yorkton has grown to nearly 16,000 people. It is a city mainly of shops and agro-industries, serving an area containing about 150,000 people. On the east side of the city within the last two years a huge shopping centre has been developed. By whom? By Alarco Enterprises. And where do they come from? Why, from sunny Edmonton Conservative Alberta. We talk of Morris Rodweeder. Yes, it has expanded in the United States, but it has also expanded in Yorkton. There are now 350 people working there. And when it comes to investment, Mr. Speaker, it's strange, very strange that there's one industry in Yorkton but the PC's don't seem to know this at all. That is Leons. It's owned by Leon and Ray Malanowski. Now, I think the PC's have heard of Ray Malanowski somehow, at least they should have. Leons has developed into quite a sizeable farm manufacturing industry also, and then, the same people own Ram Industries. Ram, which makes hydraulic cylinders was established in 1974. And strange, there was an NDP government in power at the time. And they have just now completed an expansion which almost tripled its original size.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Our Department of Industry and Commerce has a whole series of programs to help small businesses, I invite members opposite to look them over carefully. Other people in Saskatchewan are, obviously. The Progressive Conservatives sit back, say sit back, take no action in business, act as a referee, laissez faire. Let the industries develop as they want. And these purists, Liberal and Conservative in Canada stood back for 112 years to watch the foreign take-over of our land . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

But what, Mr. Speaker, is an alternative to deal with these huge corporations that come into our country? I say the crown corporations that we now have. Now the PC's say that they would even encourage Alberta to sell out Pacific Western Airlines, the Alberta government owned airlines. So, Mr. Speaker, what would they do to Saskatchewan Government Telephones? It's obvious. Sell it to Bell Telephones. After all, they say, Bell telephones are much more efficient. Now they charge far far more than Sask Tel, but that doesn't matter, they're more efficient — at putting money in their own pockets, that is. And what about SGIO (Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office), SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) and several other crown corporations? Why, Mr. Speaker, they would have a fire sale at bargain basement prices.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side believe in public enterprise. We also believe in assisting Saskatchewan small businesses, and all of its people, by the proper use of resource revenue.

Just look at how the Blakeney government has handled the resources to the benefit of the small businesses, and of the people in Saskatchewan. Since 1971, \$364 million

has been taken in potash revenue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — If we had followed Tory Liberal advice we would have taken only \$38,500,000 in potash revenues . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — . . . a loss to the Saskatchewan people of \$325,583,000.

We say that the resource companies must pay their full share. And when the potash companies quarrelled over their fair payment of taxes, we insisted on payment. The upshot of that quarrel is that the Saskatchewan people now own over 40 per cent of the productive capacity of potash in Saskatchewan.

In the last election, the people on the doorsteps told me, 'We're glad that the potash mines were bought, that was the thing to do.' In my social studies class last year at school one of my students asked this question: 'Why on earth did Liberals and Conservatives oppose potash take-over?' It was echoed by students all over the room.

PCs and Liberals tried to tell the people in the election that they didn't need the potash mines. Just holes in the ground, they said. But, Mr. Speaker, on October 18 last year the people of Saskatchewan told the Progressive Conservative Party and also the Liberal Party, but they don't seem to learn. They're still talking in the same old vein.

Throughout Saskatchewan we see a growing array of small and medium-sized businesses and also a number of Crown corporations doing business for the people of Saskatchewan in an efficient, business-like manner. We in this province have a healthy mixture of private and public businesses. We encourage small and medium businesses but our government does not hesitate to take part in business to prevent our country from being taken over by the huge monopolistic enterprises from other lands.

Mr. Speaker, in this throne speech I can see continued concern for the people of Saskatchewan for a plan for its future. That is why I'm proud to support this government. This is just another step in the process controlling Saskatchewan's economy for the people of Saskatchewan — controlling our economy by the people of Saskatchewan, for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be supporting the main motion; I shall be opposing the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N.H. MacAULEY (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, rising to take part in this debate, I would like to first express my appreciation to the voters of the Cumberland constituency for returning me, for the second time, to this legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — Secondly, may I congratulate all new elected members. Many of my voters were young people and I want to especially thank that group who really came out to help on the day on the election and did a perfect job.

March 6, 1979

Mr. Speaker, Cumberland constituency has come with new ideas and they continue to look at young people to help us provide these young ideas. It is now time to get down to work and live up to the trust placed in us by the electors of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the government for continuing to improve and provide roads for northern communities. Our northern half of the province changes rapidly and since the early 1970s, since the DNS was created, the activities have grown to a fantastic position. The population is increasing by leaps and bounds and it's most encouraging to see the North grow.

The opening of new mines and forest industry has created more jobs for Northerners and I'd like to see the people of Indian ancestry get a fair shake out of these programs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — Most of us who've lived in the North have seen the changes development has brought about in our lives. We must look at improving educational opportunities for older people who have lived in the North all their lives. A good start has been made in this area but these opportunities must be extended.

We should also be looking at technical schools in two areas in Northern Saskatchewan, mainly in Buffalo Narrows and La Ronge, to provide young people with a continuous education after high school without having to leave the North. People of Indian ancestry have not been too successful in coming south to the colleges for this type of education.

Fishing industry and forestry. With rumblings of more industrial development coming into the northern half of the province, I would like to pressure all levels of government to start long-term planning so that no mistakes can occur as have happened in the past. We must continue to encourage small businesses established in our north country to make up for the loss of employment due to deterioration of the fishing industry. Mr. Speaker, since the Co-operative Fisheries Limited was taken over by the Federal Fish Marketing Corporation, not only has the quantity of fish deteriorated in many of the fishing lakes but the marketing of fish has not been satisfactory to the fishermen of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY:—The federal government has seen fit to tie up all free marketing systems that we once knew in this province. The Co-operative Fisheries were established in late 1950 and did a terrific job of marketing fish for the people of this province but that is all over now; all marketing is done through the federal system which is not working at this stage. At one time, we had seven fish plants working on the north-east side of the province when the fish marketing was being marketed by Co-op Fisheries. Now we have one working on the east side and many of the people have been put out of work on this account.

Mr. Speaker, I turn now to another northern industry, namely trapping and hunting. The trappers at their convention in Prince Albert recently complained that they are not satisfied with what's happening with their trap lines. The deterioration of big game is so noticeable, we should be considering discontinuing licences for the American hunters to enable the people who live in the North to carry on with their hunting until such time as the government has had a chance to look at a long-term solution with regard to this

problem. The people must be considered because they are not trained yet to make a living any other way but by trapping and hunting. It is not all their fault that they are placed in this position today. When the white settlers moved into Northern Saskatchewan, hunting and fishing was what the native people were encouraged to do and that has been going on for generations. The people of Indian ancestry that are trappers should be given land where they have their trapping cabins and it should be classed as homestead land. In this way, no outsiders can encroach on their property as has happened in the past and is still happening.

The treaty people are in a different position because they are on reserves although in many instances the land is very poor that they're on. The reason there are so many Metis people in the North is because of the way the laws have been made as far as they are concerned today. However, something should be done now to encourage them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes now to talk about something of great concern to a number of my constituents. My constituency covers the whole eastern half of Northern Saskatchewan. Many of my constituents make their living by close co-operation with nature. In fact, for many people in Cumberland constituency, hunting, fishing and trapping are not recreational. They are a livelihood to them. Trappers in particular, Mr. Speaker, have lately been expressing objection to the practices employed by some of the pulp mills. At their recent meeting in Prince Albert the Saskatchewan Trapper's Association pointed out that a number of abuses had been made on the forest resources. They had been carried on by timber companies for the last 15 years or more. Mr. Speaker, I think back to the agreements between the Thatcher government and Parsons and Whittemore, signed in the mid 1960s. Those agreements were very favorable to the company operating the pulp mill but very unfavorable to this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — The pulp mill company is not subject to any of the standard charges, fees, taxes and licences, only those spelled out in the agreement. PAPCO still only pays stumpage fees of 70 cents a cord for spruce, 80 cents a cord for jack pine and 38 cents for species of other trees.

January 1 of next year rates will move up to 98 cents, 80 cents and 50 cents respectively and that is still far below what other operators must pay, including the Saskatchewan Forest Products.

Mr. Speaker, the Thatcher government committed the province to build 200 miles of all-weather roads for the first 10 years of the agreement and another 200 miles after that — expensive roads through bush and rugged northern countryside.

The province agreed in the contract to provide natural gas, electricity and telephone at the lowest competitive rate and even built a paved highway to the mill, all at government expense. In addition, pulpwood was delivered to the mill with the Crown corporation standing the loss.

Mr. Speaker, what other Canadian company in this country would get such a priority?

Mr. Speaker, the provincial government of that time was not at all concerned about the environment. In the contract that was signed the pulp company only had to operate at

March 6, 1979

pollution levels which were the same as other pulp mills in Canada. Many of these mills had already poisoned rivers and lakes.

The Thatcher government, for its part, promised in the words of the contract to 'take all necessary steps to prevent the pollution of water in the North Saskatchewan River above the mill site . . .' so the company could have pure water for its mill. It did not worry about the people below the mill site and the rest of the people downstream, including Cumberland House, which has a population of approximately 1,300 people.

Mr. Speaker, the deal between the pulp mill owners and the Thatcher government was an extremely bad one for all those reasons I have just listed, but perhaps the worst part of the deal was having to do with forest management. Thousands of acres of forest were clear-cut and the province was left with the responsibility of reforestation at public expense. All these thousands of acres, where every tree was cut down, hauled to the mill for pulpwood, only two square miles were replanted with seedlings before the Thatcher government was thrown out of office in the spring of 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — Now the results of the Liberal Party policies can be seen — there is not one Liberal sitting in this House today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — I suggest the hon. members sitting opposite take a hard look at this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the time to tell the story once more of the P.A. Pulp Mill coming to Saskatchewan because the public should not forget it.

If a private enterprise government is put in charge of natural resources of this province, pretty soon some fast talking huckster from another country has the right to them and tells the province to go jump in the lake. We older people have suffered from this sort of exploitation in the past and we must see to it that the Canadians of the future are protected regardless of costs.

Mr. Speaker, in 1971 the New Democratic Party formed the government and set about changing the resource policies. It was a slow business. In some cases long-term contracts had been signed; in other cases the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan lined up with the big resource companies against the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — But slowly things change. In 1970, the provincial treasury was collecting \$33 million on the sale of resources. Last year, the figures were \$462 million. Mr. Speaker, our environment is now as well protected as that of any other province in Canada. Our forest management is being improved each passing year. But, Mr. Speaker, my constituents are still concerned about the attitude of some of the timber operators. Some trappers have returned in the fall and found their lines and all the trees gone. We must see policies established to prevent these happenings in the future.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 2,000 licenced trappers in our province. Many of them live

in my constituency. They are important people to our economy. In 1977-78, over \$1.5 million in furs were trapped in this province and most of them come from the North. We must protect this industry for these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — Mr. Speaker, one of the main problems we're having in the province today and which plagues the people of Indian ancestry and others, is alcohol. And if this problem is not corrected, then this province will stand to lose not only employment opportunities in industry, but the promise of a good life in the future. It is very important that the provincial government and the federal government place high priority on combatting this terrible problem. Otherwise, as I see it, we can only look for increased problems, broken homes, and unemployment into the next century.

The New Democratic Party has put in a great deal of good housing in the northern part of the province — a very good idea for northern people. But if this alcohol problem is not attacked with extreme seriousness, then everything done in the past will be useless.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last year or two, we have heard continuing rumblings about one part of our great country separating from the other part. May I say that many Canadians of different ethnic origins have fought in two world wars for freedom, to decide to be known as Canadians and as one Canada. I'm sure northern residents will agree with me that there should be one Canada, including Quebec, and not sovereignty association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacAULEY: — Referring to the throne speech, I was pleased to see forest management mentioned, Mr. Speaker. This means that the Blakeney government is going to continue to move in the direction of the people of the North for the people of the North. I thought there was a great deal of good in the speech, something for everybody; for the North, for the working people, for the farmers, for the senior citizens and for the young people as a whole. Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks in this debate I would like to say we must all work together for the benefit of the people of this province. I will be voting for the motion and against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor and pleasure to rise in this Assembly to speak on behalf of the Bengough-Milestone constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — First I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank on his re-appointment as Speaker of this House. Also, I would like to convey my congratulations to the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) on his reappointment as the Deputy Speaker.

I would at this time like to thank all my supporters and those who worked so hard on my behalf to get me elected in the October 18 election. Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, I am the first Progressive Conservative to represent the Bengough-Milestone constituency . . .

March 6, 1979

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — . . . in the legislature. I hope I am just the first in a long string of Progressive Conservatives to represent my constituency in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — I will do my utmost to represent the people of Bengough-Milestone to the best of my ability over the next four years. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a new challenge for me. Although dating back to my teens and over the years, I consider my life to be a great challenge. After all to remain a farmer in a province governed by a socialist party has to be a challenge in itself!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — Those are not all the challenges I have faced. I have had the honor and privilege, Mr. Speaker, to be a part of a team to represent my province in the Canadian Curling Championships on six different occasions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — As a result, Mr. Speaker, challenges indeed have become a very important part of my life. Over the past years I have made acquaintances in all 11 provinces of my country. I have been made aware of many problems which face us in Canada as a nation; also I have become familiar with the problems and concerns of the other respective provinces . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You missed the broom so far!

MR. PICKERING: — . . . Out turn please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in the Wilcox-Milestone area and as a result I know the Bengough-Milestone constituency very well. My constituency consists mainly of grain farmers and ranchers who cater to the small towns throughout. There are many established machinery dealers scattered throughout but due to the centralization of some companies our farmers are forced to travel many miles for repairs. However, Mr. Speaker, there are also other resources within the constituency. For example, we have a brick factory located in the northwest part at Claybank that distributes their product to all parts of Canada and parts of the U.S. We also have a salt plant at Ormiston which is located in the extreme western part of the constituency that has created employment for many over the years.

I am also proud to say, Mr. Speaker, a discovery of benonite has been made within the constituency and a processing plant has been set up at Wilcox which started operations approximately a year-and-one-half ago. Demand for this mineral has increased the last few years because they are finding more uses for it, for instance, in the manufacture of certain types of steel. As a result it is being exported to different countries throughout the world. Indications show that there is enough to last well into the next century.

Mr. Speaker, there are many concerns that have been expressed to me by my constituents over the past few months, not the least of which is the recent Prairie Rail Action Committee (PRAC) report. The report itself seems to me to be a rather shoddy piece of work and there seems to be a considerable number of discrepancies contained in it, when it is compared to the Canadian Transport Commission's application for abandonment. The PRAC report indicated, for instance, that there is no school in the town of Big Beaver and yet, in fact, there is a school in Big Beaver that caters to some 60 students. They also mention that there is no school in Minton. They have a school which caters to students from Grades 1 to 6. It is reported, for instance, that there are only four to five cars that should be spotted at Big Beaver and yet when I attended a meeting there in regard to PRAC there were 20 cars spotted that very day. The bushels handled at these points varied and also the capacities. Therefore, I cannot support the PRAC report for various reasons.

There were four separate portions of rail line recommended for abandonment within Bengough-Milestone. I have attended several meetings regarding these. Since then the Lewvan line has been maintained and put into the permanent network. This indicates to me that the upcoming federal election is involved with these decisions and I think this subject is not one that should be subject to political manipulation. I am, in fact, pleased that the Lewvan line is going back into the permanent network and I have no criticism of that. The point I am trying to make is simply that Liberal MPs are charging around the countryside like knights on white horses, saving rail lines in distress when, in fact, it is their own government which is responsible for the PRAC report in the first place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, another concern I often hear expressed in my constituency is due to the land bank. There is a widespread feeling that there are abuses in allocating lands for the land bank.

There is a considerable widespread belief that politics are involved when land-bank lands are allotted and there is also a great deal of criticism of the point system as it is presently set up.

The distribution of lease land is another major issue. A number of my constituents have voiced concern regarding the manner in which these, too, are allotted. Certain political affiliations would seem to have a priority.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government take a long hard look at its policies regarding land bank and lease land allotments.

Mr. Speaker, another area of concern is that of highways, secondary highways, in particular. No. 334 from Corinne just south of Regina to Avonlea and on to Kayville, which has an oil surface and is very narrow. I suggest that the Department of Highways spend thousands of dollars every year to repair the potholes that appear in the surface of this road because of the heavy loads that are being transported over it. In fact, this is the only road that gives access to the western part of the constituency, hauling necessary farm fuels and supplies to these so-called remote areas.

I would ask the government to start from scratch and build a road that will carry the loads that are demanded of it.

March 6, 1979

Mr. Speaker, immediately following the election all of the Department of Highway crews were removed throughout the constituency except for a Manitoba contractor who completed his contract from Radville to the junction of Highway No. 13. It seems strange that these crews would disappear so soon after October 18, especially in a constituency that the government did not win.

Mr. Speaker, another area of concern in my constituency is with the recent announced farm fuel reduction program, which the present government has just introduced in the throne speech, reacting, of course, to the pressure the Conservatives put on them over the last couple of years to introduce a scheme such as this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — However, unlike the Progressive Conservatives who urged that the rebate be provided by a reduction of the cost of the source of supply, the present government has seen fit to introduce an act with rebates to the farmer, a maximum of \$300 of farm fuel costs, thus bringing in all kinds of administration costs and also keeping the farmers' money tied up for a 12 month period rather than giving him the break at the time of the purchase.

Another concern in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, is with a number of young people forced to leave the constituency to obtain employment in the oil fields of Alberta because of the lack of development in this province. It would seem to me that the reason Saskatchewan's unemployment rate is one of the lowest in Canada is that so many of our people leave this province to obtain jobs elsewhere due to the lack of industrial development and resource development in Saskatchewan, brought about by the short-sighted policies of the present NDP government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the government on providing grants for recreational facilities, not only in my constituency, but throughout the province.

At this time I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I have respected all the premiers of this province ever since I realized what they stood for. Although I realize politics is a so-called dirty game, my biggest disappointment thus far is the fact that the Premier and his party would come out with deliberate lies pertaining to the PC Party medicare policies during the last election.

These policies were blown out of proportion and were blared out to my constituents. The elderly people in my constituency were very upset when they learned that this was not a fact. The introduction of deterrent fees brought about by the government have cost a lot of complaints and feedback which I know will continue to the next Saskatchewan election.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say again what a great honor it is for me to represent the people of the constituency of Bengough-Milestone, and that I shall do my best to bring their concerns to the floor of this House as they are brought to my attention through the course of the next four years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take part in this throne speech debate. In a few weeks, I will mark my fifteenth year as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — During those fifteen years I have participated in many throne speech debates, and I have listened to many members deliver speeches that were excellent and memorable ones. Mr. Speaker, I believe the member for Regina-Wascana (Mr. White) and the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter), who moved and seconded the address in reply, did as fine a job as any I have heard in my time in this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — For two freshmen MLAs making their first speeches in this Assembly, they can be extremely proud of their efforts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the member for Kinistino, the Hon. Don Cody, on his appointment to the cabinet. Mr. Cody was, of course, a cabinet minister previously, and built a solid reputation as a man who gets things done, and done right.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to congratulate you on again being chosen to undertake the important role of Speaker in this Legislative Assembly. Your even-handed decisions and your wise counsel to all members made you the obvious choice to again assume the Speaker's Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I have a number of things, Mr. Speaker, to say on the subject of the throne speech, but before I do that I want to say a few words about the Weyburn constituency which I have the honor to represent.

In the years since the first generation of pioneers the people of Weyburn constituency have been busy building a better society. The Wheat Pool, the largest farmer owned co-operative in the country, has always been well supported in my area. The city of Weyburn has one of the largest and most successful co-op stores in the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — The Pool, the co-ops, the credit unions in many smaller towns have kept the communities alive as service centres. The Royal Canadian Legion, the service clubs, 4-H, baseball and hockey teams, all thrive in the Weyburn area. And the reason I think, Mr. Speaker, is very clear because Saskatchewan people have a tradition of getting together and doing things for themselves. It doesn't seem to matter what the problem is, Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, tackle it and come out successfully.

When our province needed electricity and no private corporation would even consider undertaking the expense of supplying our rural communities and farmsteads with power lines, Saskatchewan people built the power corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — When the potash companies refused to pay their taxes or expand to take up a greater share of the world market, Saskatchewan people built the potash corporation.

March 6, 1979

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the darkest days of the great depression when governments turned a blind eye towards a million unemployed and to families losing their farms to eastern banks, Saskatchewan built a new political party, a party which would bring Saskatchewan a New Deal for People.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — The people of the Weyburn constituency have played their part; each time Saskatchewan has built something for a better society. I consider it a privilege to be here representing the Weyburn area as we debate the Speech from the Throne, the most recent installment of the New Deal for People.

I was pleased to hear a number of new projects by the Department of Highways mentioned in the throne speech. With a provincial population of less than a million people spread over more than 250,000 square miles, rapid and safe all-weather roads are a necessity.

The opposition members are new to this Assembly and may not know of the record of the CCF (the New Democratic Party) in developing the highway network our province has today. In 1944 when the CCF came into office there were approximately 8,000 miles of road in what was then the provincial highway system. Of that total, 4,873 miles were gravel surface, another 3,000 miles were dirt roads and the total of all the paved highway in Saskatchewan at that time was 138 miles.

The government of T.C. Douglas began immediately to improve the condition of the province's highways. The Department of Highways began to acquire road-building equipment and put it to good use. Within 10 years of the time the CCF formed the government, there were only 414 miles of dirt road left in the provincial highway system. The number of miles of gravel-surfaced highway had grown to 6,368 and there were 1,160 miles of paved highway, almost a tenfold increase in the number of miles of dust-free driving.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the commitment of the Blakeney government to a first-class highway network is every bit as strong as was that of the Douglas government 30 years ago. The 18 per cent increase in the highway's budget last year is an indication of that commitment. Today, Saskatchewan's highway system includes no dirt roads. There are only 500 miles of gravel left and almost 10,000 miles of dust-free, hard-surfaced highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite should know that our province has approximately 4,000 more miles of paved highway than Manitoba and 3,000 more miles than Alberta. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you include all the community access roads in our province, many of them built under Operation Open Roads, Saskatchewan has a total of more than 12,500 miles of paved roads — the envy of all the rest of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I have been very pleased with activity undertaken recently by the Department of Highways in the Weyburn constituency. Highway No. 33 north-west of

Stoughton and Highway 47 north of Stoughton are undergoing major improvements. These are important highways to my constituents, Mr. Speaker. Highway 47 is a busy north-south link; No. 33 is the highway used by many people in the Fillmore/Stoughton area to travel to Regina. Highway No. 13 is being widened, resurfaced on a number of stretches and that is good news for many communities all across southern Saskatchewan that would like to see Highway 13 developed into a route like the Yellowhead linking Manitoba and Alberta. We would like to see that, Mr. Speaker.

Another area of transportation mentioned in the throne speech is that of the railway branch lines. I was pleased to hear the New Democratic Party government of Saskatchewan go once again on record in support of these communities fighting to retain their rail services.

The Weyburn constituency is hit by the recommendations of the Prairie Rail Action Committee just as every other area on the prairies is. PRAC recommended the abandonment of some 116.8 miles of CNR line between Regina and Minard junction. Now I think this is being reconsidered, Mr. Speaker, from what I hear. Despite the fact that it was not even part of the group of branch lines that PRAC was to be looking at, the Hall Commission had already recommended the line be placed in the permanent network.

Now, Mr. Speaker, several times in recent years more than 60,000 bushels of grain per track mile has come out of the line to this junction. Centres like Colfax, Cedoux, Worcester, Talmage, Brough, Griffin, Innes and Huntoon are on the line just in my constituency alone and several are large delivery points. There are somewhere over 660 permit holders who deliver to elevators on this line. If those farmers lose their delivery points they will have to haul to Stoughton, meaning an additional haul of 15 miles and more in cases.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the PRAC report also recommended the abandonment of the CNR line from Corning to Peebles by December, 1979. Sure this line is just about 14.4 miles in length, but remember, it serves almost 100 producers and in some cases these people will be faced with hauling their grain 20 to 30 miles from farm gate to elevator.

If the Canadian Transport Commission accepts the proposals of PRAC, or even a majority of them, it will be a severe blow to the western grain economy. Our course now should be just as it was outlined in the Speech from the Throne. We must stand with the many smaller communities and the hundreds of farmers who are fighting to save the country elevator system.

I was pleased to hear announced in the throne speech phase two of revenue sharing. Prior to revenue sharing, many local governments were finding it difficult to cover their costs without huge increases in property taxes. Then, under phase one of the program, many local governments had their funding from the province almost doubled. Revenue sharing has been extremely popular with municipal governments and local ratepayers and Mr. Speaker, will continue to be so.

The throne speech also forecasts some minor changes to resource legislation. Oil exploration activity in my own constituency has been up significantly since last year and in the province as a whole, is about double last year's pace. The future for potash and the heavy oil looks extremely bright, Mr. Speaker, and expansions are already underway or planned in a number of locations. The northern uranium mining

March 6, 1979

companies are in the process of making major new investments and all, Mr. Speaker, without the provincial government having to make the kind of resource give-aways that other provinces have made to attract this kind of activity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — The resource companies have learned that with the Blakeney government in office, there is no longer any room for fly-by-night operators to make a quick deal. In Saskatchewan today, resource companies get a fair deal and the people of the province, the owners of the resources, get a just return as well.

I was encouraged, Mr. Speaker, to see the throne speech included a section on the state of our nation — Canada. I have been very proud of the job done by our Premier Blakeney and those cabinet ministers who have attended the First Ministers Conferences. The voice of Saskatchewan has always been clear and decisive. I am sure the new Department of Intergovernmental Affairs will continue to keep our provincial government well prepared for future conferences. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, Canada is too important to us all for our provincial government to sit on the sidelines and watch. In the days ahead, the future of our nation is going to be decided and I agree with Premier Blakeney when he says, 'With hard work and good will, we will emerge a better and a stronger nation.'

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to comment on all of the announcements in the Speech from the Throne, but I do have this general statement to make in summing up my remarks. A throne speech is the government's blueprint for the coming year — a blueprint which will help us build a better society, a co-operative and compassionate society, where the supplying of human needs and the enrichment of human lives are the important goals; a society, Mr. Speaker, where profits and corporate power take a back seat to meeting the needs of those who still live in want and insecurity; a society where there are decent pensions to allow older citizens to live in dignity and good health; where all children get a first class education to properly equip them for a work environment and where there are enough jobs to employ the talents and skills of all people wanting to work; a society, Mr. Speaker, where not just the rich and the powerful enjoy a healthy life at an acceptable standard of living, but everyone is able to share in the good life.

We have a long way to go, Mr. Speaker, in building this better society, but the announcement in the throne speech moved us a step or two along our way. So I say, Mr. Speaker, from my remarks you will know that I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to once again represent the citizens of Regina Rosemont constituency in this the nineteenth legislature of the province of Saskatchewan. I want to thank the people of my constituency for the tremendous show of support in re-electing the Blakeney government on October 18.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — We increased our percentage of the popular vote in Rosemont from 49 per cent in 1975, to 61 per cent in 1978. This was a remarkable increase, and the major credit for it must go to the New Democrats of Rosemont who worked so hard to re-elect

their government — not just during the 28 days of the election period, but day in and day out, throughout the years. I know this is hard for opposition members to understand, but for our people politics is more than the exercise of going through a 28-day election period every four years, and it is more than the mere seeking after power. For we, who sit on this side of the Assembly, are merely the political expression of a much larger movement — a movement that is worldwide and is growing daily. It has its roots in our province in the social democratic movement, in the co-operative movement in the trade union movement, and in the social gospel.

And you who are new to politics in Saskatchewan should know that you will never defeat us — never defeat us! You may win the odd election — Ross Thatcher won a couple — but you will never be able to defeat the ideas and the ideals that motivate our people . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — . . . and keep them coming back at you again and again.

You over there might not understand but if you need a further explanation, you might ask your former colleagues from Prince Albert-Duck Lake and Saskatoon Sutherland. They know from experience what I am talking about.

I notice the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) has just walked into the House. Mr. Speaker, while listening to the member last night I was impressed by his complete grasp of international monetary issues and theories. In fact, I was reminded of a historical incident involving Major Douglas, who, as some of you might remember developed the Social Credit theory. Major Douglas, was seen by many people, I guess most people in the financial community as being a bit of a crackpot, a bit of a loony-tune. But William Aberhart viewed things differently. He and the Social Credit League of Alberta were so impressed by the funny-money theories of Major Douglas that immediately after the 1935 election that brought Aberhart to power, he sent a telegram to Major Douglas and it went like this, 'Major Douglas, Frig Tree Court, London. Victorious. When can you come? Aberhart.' I want to alert the Conservative Party's office staff here in this legislature. The Social Credit league is involved in another election in Alberta. I am frankly worried about the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck). I would keep an eye on this guy because what I heard from him last night I had read some place before. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, if the Social Credit in Alberta had a choice, they would be sending him a telegram that read, 'Mr. Birkbeck, Moosomin, Sask. Confused, please stay in Moosomin!'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, before getting into the main text of my remarks I want to make a reference to the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau), in this debate last Friday. He suggested that the government was levying a deterrent fee because some physicians were billing their patients directly. Because some doctors are charging directly, somehow the government is charging a deterrent fee. I must confess, I don't follow the hon. gentleman's convoluted logic. I want to point out to the member for Regina South that less than 4 per cent of the claims against MCIC (Medical Care Insurance Commission) are by the direct billing route — over 96 per cent are not. I want to congratulate publicly, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of doctors who are not billing their patients directly.

March 6, 1979

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — I want to congratulate them, Mr. Speaker, on their professional ethics in not inflicting hardship on their patients as a bargaining technique in their negotiations. It should also be pointed out to the hon. member for Regina South (and also to the member for Wilkie (Mr. Garner) who spoke on the same subject) that this direct billing has been part of the medicare system since 1962. This is not new. Up to this point it was 1.4 per cent. Since the negotiations have begun it's come up to something less than 4 per cent.

Now if we use the logic of the Conservative Party it seems to me the government would be left with two choices. One, the government could outlaw direct billing; or two, the government could capitulate to the demands of the medical profession. Those are the only two choices the member for Regina South and the Conservatives want to give the government. Now as to the first alternative, Mr. Member for Regina South, I would be interested in looking at a suggestion from the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan that the doctors not be allowed to bill directly, to have that wiped out from the law books of Saskatchewan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — . . . That's an interesting suggestion by the Conservative Party and one that I think I could support. However, I think that we would have a great deal of problems trying to settle the dispute with the medical profession if we moved to do that at this particular time.

Now as to the second alternative, Mr. Speaker, I would be disappointed if this government allowed itself to be intimidated by the medical profession or indeed any other group it bargained with into a settlement that is not in the public interest. For the Conservative Party to take the highly irresponsible position that we should pay anyone, including doctors, whatever they want — and that's your position — would lead to greatly increased taxes for our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — I believe that the position of the Conservative Party in this case, your position, is prolonging the dispute with the doctors in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that a settlement will be reached soon between the doctors and the government. I know, knowing this government, that settlement will be a fair settlement for the doctors and, yes, fair for the taxpayers who will opt for paying the bill for the settlement when it is reached.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to participate in this throne speech debate which marks the third term of the Blakeney government. In doing so, we look back at eight years of achievement by a democratic socialist government, and we look forward to building on those achievements to provide a more equitable and just community for our people.

I could spend a great deal of time talking about the achievements of this government over the last eight years, but time is short and I would rather talk about the future. The future of Saskatchewan is bright, Mr. Speaker. Our population is growing. New businesses are opening their doors every day, unemployment low, incomes high, investment at record levels in our province. In fact, the future for Saskatchewan is brighter than for any other province in Canada, including the province of Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — Alberta is now enjoying a windfall from oil, but what happens in a very few years when that oil runs out and they're stuck with a Conservative government, Mr. Speaker? Saskatchewan, on the other hand, has a multitude of resources to be developed — heavy oil, uranium, potash, coal, and many more. And of course our most precious resource, next to our people, is the millions of acres of arable land in a world whose population is growing rapidly and which will require the food our farmers produce.

This is an exciting time to be in Saskatchewan, an exciting time to be involved in the public life of our province. It is also a challenging time, for I believe we as legislators are being given an unique opportunity that others who came before us did not have. We have a relatively small population, living on a relatively large land base. Our resources are just in the developing stages. How we develop those resources and who receives the benefit from that development will be the test of our generation. In this, the International Year of the Child, I would like to think that our children will be the prime beneficiaries of this resource development.

In the last election, we gave the voters a clear choice — vote Conservative and have others develop our resources and take away most of the benefits, or vote New Democrat and develop our resources ourselves to the benefit of all our people. Saskatchewan has spoken loud and clear, we want an NDP government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:—We want an NDP government and we want to do it ourselves. If we're going to develop our resources ourselves, we're going to have to have expertise. For years, the lack of this expertise was used as an excuse for giving our resources away to multinational corporations. But where did these multinational corporations gain this expertise? They were educated and trained to do these jobs in schools all over the world. I believe that the boys and girls in our schools today are just as bright and have as much drive and determination as boys and girls in schools in the United States or Germany or France or anywhere else. It's our responsibility to give our children an opportunity. I believe for a start we should build a school of resource technology to give our young people the training that is necessary to take the jobs that are opening up in the resource fields. This school might be a new building but it doesn't have to be. We could incorporate it with our technical schools and our university. What needs to be done is to catalogue the skills that are necessary to develop the resources and then see that young people are able to acquire those skills. We did it with the dental program, Mr. Speaker. We needed a dental program for our children. They had a good one in New Zealand, so we went and we got the people we needed to do the job. They did the job and now we have the best dental program in North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 6, 1979

MR. ALLEN: — We can do the same thing with our resources. All we require is the will to do it and the foresight to invest in our most important resource — our young people. Mr. Speaker, I was moved by the remarks made by the hon. member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Hammersmith) regarding the plight of native people in Saskatchewan. No one who lives in Regina can be unaware of the growing problems our community is experiencing. Lack of adequate housing, alcoholism, unemployment and violence are making our community a tinderbox which I believe could explode if something isn't done and done very soon. The tension between natives and non-natives in Regina is reaching a crisis. I don't think that we can legislate for our people to love one another. I don't believe that we can legislate out bigotry and legislate in tolerance. But I do believe we can provide jobs for many, many more native people in the future than we have in the past. The affirmative action programs have worked in other places and I believe they can work here. If we develop our resources to the fullest, if we make our province the richest in Canada and yet exclude native people from the benefits, what have we accomplished if our sons and our daughters don't feel safe to walk the streets of our capital city. Native people too must share in our wealth. The government has made a very good start with the Amok agreement regarding employment in the North. I look forward to even greater progress in the future. I will be supporting the motion, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley): — In entering the debate, Mr. Speaker, I would first of all wish to congratulate you in your appointment to your office. I truly trust that you will do your job properly and for that I congratulate you. I initially wish to thank the people of Kindersley who supported me and sent me here October 18. My riding, I suppose is one of the ridings, perhaps the richest riding for farmland in Saskatchewan. Not only is the farmland there, in the north part of the constituency we have a rich oil resource that has been developed for the last 20 years and is now, I suppose, on a decline. The jobs are fewer but it is still a rich resource. To the south we have the towns of Eston and Etonia. I think these are two towns which perhaps really know the significance of what they face ahead if they are to maintain themselves as proper trade centres and as proper communities.

Of course, in the middle of the constituency we have the town of Kindersley. Kindersley, of course, is where I reside and I believe perhaps is one of the most progressive and prosperous towns in the province of Saskatchewan. Now, in the past, this riding has been represented by NDPs and by the Liberals and they have been well-represented — recently Neil McMillan in the last House and prior to that Alex Taylor. These people have been something more than simply backbenchers in their cause. They did stand out and they did take a position with regard to their parties. I hope that I can carry on in that tradition representing my riding.

I suppose, like a lot of the ridings that my colleagues represent, it's the first time this riding has been represented by the Progressive Conservative Party and the same applies to the riding of Kindersley. However, back in 1929 one Sam Watley, looking at the pictures in the chamber below, represented the riding for the Progressives and he sat in the Anderson government. I suppose we could sort of claim that, as many of the Progressives did join with the Conservatives to form our present party later on in history.

Mr. Speaker, I think as legislators, we must do more than simply participate in what I will

quote as, 'I'm better than you, no you're not' type of debate. I think that's part of our parliamentary system but surely there are other facets of politics that are more important. There are challenges that we, as legislators, are surely going to face in the coming decades in this particular country.

The first challenge we face clearly is that of our country and to start this debate in my first address to the Chamber, I wish to say that I am a Canadian and I am very proud of that fact. I, like many other colleagues, I suppose on all sides of the House, do not intend to stand idly by while some person or some group tries to tear that apart. In 1967 Canada celebrated its 100th birthday. Along with that celebration came gestures of good will and solidarity and we, as a people, faced the future with hope and confidence. Now, some 12 years later that hope, that spirit of the centennial seems to have gone. Perhaps that spirit in 1967 was one of ceremony and the spirit that we need now is one of necessity because one province seems to be marching to a different drummer and that problem, I suppose, reflects the failures of our national governmental system to find effective reconciliation between national and regional interests. For Canada simultaneously is one country; it's a partnership between two languages; it's five regions, ten provinces and a vast northern area. To be successful our institutions must reflect these realities and provide a framework to create a dialogue between us. They must simultaneously allow for the free development of each element's true potential and combine the whole into a simple Canada-wide reality that fosters interests of us all. That is the challenge of our country. It is a challenge that we must face, not from a partisan political point of view, but as Canadians dedicated to the preservation of this country.

I said I was a Canadian. I am also a western Canadian. I am proud of that. You know the last several decades people have talked about Canada and they have said in a way that we are a sleeping giant and that the potential is there. It is becoming more and more evident as time marches on that where that giant is sleeping is in fact in western Canada.

Our forefathers, I think, sensed that and knew that and yet it is we, you and I, who for the first time really have the feeling, the optimism, the excitement of this great region. We must face the problems of a developing area and we must face those problems with growth, etc.

Now I think there are two areas that we can look at from a regional point of view — two areas that we must look at. One is the idea of industrialization. The West entered confederation; primarily the function of the West at the start of confederation was as a source of supply of natural resources and as a market for the eastern processed goods. But I think we can no longer accept that position, that function. We have a higher station in confederation. We can no longer pump our manufacturing potential or our jobs down the Trans-Canada Pipeline or the CNR main line. Rather, we must start to reverse that 100 year old trend and start moving people and the factories into the West.

I think the potential is there. Certain eastern industries, it seems to me, are becoming tired; their equipment is becoming obsolete. Their very existence is being propped up by a federal government that is searching for short-term solutions to remedy the problem. That is a challenge to attract that industry and again that isn't a partisan challenge.

The second problem we face as a region is that of transportation. That has been a traditional problem as well. Basically the transportation, I think, can be put into two

March 6, 1979

channels. Number one, as grain farms of western Canada and in particular of Saskatchewan, we must develop a transportation system that can basically put our grain into the international market. It strikes me there are basically three areas that we must resolve. Number one is the upgrading of our rail facilities, especially through the mountain region. Number two is to eliminate the bottleneck problems in the Vancouver and Lower Mainland area. And number three is to update the port facilities to facilitate quicker turn-around times and unloading. Those are not simple problems; those are difficult problems. But those are challenges I think that we as legislators must face.

The second part, and I think the Premier alluded to it in his address, is the concept that if we are to attract industry and if we are to attract the small manufacturing and the food processing, we must overcome the problem with the crow. And with regards to the crow I can state my position before the House and that is that the crow is something more than simply a subsidy to the western Canadian farmer. The crow is almost like part of our constitution and perhaps we can vary it as the Premier says, but we must never ever let it go because once it gets away from us then clearly we can never get it back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: — Now virtually every speaker in this debate has made reference either to the Hall Commission report or the Prairie Rail Action Committee report and I think most speakers, in fairness, have echoed the same thought. The people are saying the Hall Commission report is a landmark; it's a manifesto for western Canada. And there's really nothing magic in the Hall Commission report. It offers nothing that the farmer of western Canada or the western Canadian industrialist or small businessman haven't been saying for 50 years. The only difference between the Hall Commission and the other commissions is that the Hall Commission for the first time really gets into the grass roots and says what the people want and in a very, very detailed way. You know, the members opposite seem bent on accusing our party of being against the Hall Commission report and it's not going to work because that is not, in fact, true. Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, of course, is a long time friend of John Diefenbaker and in fact, John Diefenbaker was the person that elevated him to the Supreme Court of Canada. Without doubt from anyone, I think, Mr. Justice Emmett Hall is clearly the finest jurist every produced in this province. Mr. Justice Emmett Hall and John Diefenbaker grew up in the prairies, and they live the prairies and they feel the prairies and that whole thing is reflected in that report. I endorse that report 100 per cent.

I talk about my country and I talk about my region; now about our province. Saskatchewan, as many speakers have said, is clearly one of the two or three areas or provinces in Canada that have boom times. We are on the verge of unprecedented growth and development and we along with our friends in Alberta and the people of the North are clearly the new frontier in this country. We've not experienced that optimism and that excitement about the potential of growth for more than two decades when John Diefenbaker came to power. Mr. Diefenbaker in his own way, his own unique way, painted a dream for the future of this country and for the future of western Canada and the North. That optimism and excitement stayed for the two or three or four years and then disappeared and was replaced by, I suppose, a different attitude — the attitude of the '60s that called for more government services. People demanded more government services. Many of those programs were far overdue and new programs were brought in. I congratulate the members from the other side who brought in medicare. I support medicare and stand before this House with everything I've got; nobody can ever claim that I don't support medicare. Those programs came in in the '60s but that change of attitude in the '60s cost the people of Saskatchewan. It cost the

people in two ways.

Number one, it cost them in a financial way. All you people realize the great cost of these things but we must find revenues and continue to find them to support those costs of medicare and other social programs.

That also cost them in another way and it was in an attitude cost (that term after the Diefenbaker government). That attitude cost was that the government was going to do this for me. The government will do this for me; the government can build this industry or develop this resource. I say to the members opposite, governments don't build; people do! Governments don't foster initiative; they discourage it. Governments are not innovators; they are regulators.

That is the type of attitude I think we must change if we are to really realize our full potential. The air of excitement, the air of optimism as many speakers have referred to, is here. It's all so precious and we must never let it get away from us again.

It concerns me, Mr. Speaker, when some of the members opposite, after their new mandate, start to hedge their bet and start to slowly say, oh perhaps the resources are going to pay us in five or 10 years. Wait until the mid '80s and then we will really get the effect of our resource, development.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the people opposite that the optimism is here and the opportunities are here. You have your mandate and I say the people of Saskatchewan will decide four years from now.

Finally I should like to touch on an area that is very dear to me and that is rural Saskatchewan. Perhaps rural Saskatchewan is typified by two towns in my riding: One is the town of Coleville or the village of Coleville and the other is the town of Kindersley.

Now Coleville is on the CNR connecting line and, under the Hall Commission Report, it was to be transferred to the CP main line. Under the PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee) Report it was to be eliminated. That has an average hauling capacity of 97,000 bushels per mile and I defy very many people in this Chamber, who have rail lines in their constituency that have a hauling capacity of that high being abandoned. I believe that we can fight and perhaps succeed in saving the rail line into the town of Coleville.

Let's assume that we do stop at the PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee) Commission as it relates to Coleville. What else do we face? The town also has employees working for Imperial Oil, and the Imperial Oil employees, oh they're going to move them into Kindersley, and I don't blame you for that. The Sask Power employees, oh they're also going to move into Kindersley. The school population is decreasing. The tax base is gone. The senior citizen wants to live in the new high rise senior citizen centre in Kindersley. The hockey player wants to go to Kindersley.

I suppose what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that sure we may stop the ravages of Mr. Lang and stop the PRAC report, but we still are faced with many problems in these small towns, problems to stop that constant decay.

On the other hand, we have the town of Kindersley which is fortunately one of the lucky towns in this province, a town of perhaps 4,000 people. It's growing; it's strong; it's

March 6, 1979

progressive . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . But the town of Kindersley cannot be allowed simply to grow at the expense of the Colevilles and the Dodslands and the Eatonias. The town of Kindersley must grow because there is new industry attracted into those towns. I think it's important that we must sort of stop that drift as the people are tending to move to the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. There are towns and it's important that we maintain those towns.

In closing, I simply say to the members opposite that there are lots of issues, lots of issues that you can join issue with us on, not on the idea of where we stand in our country, or our region, or on transportation. There are lots of issues, Mr. Speaker, I do look forward to being in this House for the next four years I will be voting against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to thank my constituency for giving me the honor of returning to this legislature for my second term. I would also like to congratulate you on your re-election to this House as Speaker, and also to the hon. member for Weyburn on his election as Deputy Speaker.

Being the resource critic for the PC Party and what is happening in the areas of potash, oil and uranium gives me an opportunity to reply in many areas. Indeed, it really makes it imperative that we do put forth our party's view on the government's development of these resources.

First of all I'd like to say a few things about my home constituency. As you know, we're known as the power city of Saskatchewan, the sunshine capital of Canada, and more recently, the focal point of the finest eclipse, viewing the eclipse of the sun, and I'd like to advise the members opposite that that is the only time since 1975 the people of Estevan have been in the dark. The Estevan constituency itself is probably the biggest resource area in Saskatchewan, having both oil and gas as well as lignite coal to feed the huge Boundary Dam generating station, which puts out over 50 per cent of the power for the province of Saskatchewan. The oil industry since 1972 still sits in a state of stagnation, Mr. Minister of Mineral Resources, due to government policies. Regardless of what the minister says and keeps telling the people of this province, other than the heavy oil fields such as at Lloydminster, there has been a poor climate for oil companies to return to this province to do active drilling and exploration other than to use up their production credits. Every head of every company will tell you this, Mr. Minister. This is certainly proven in the Estevan area as there were only 11 wells drilled in the entire southeast portion of the province last year. Again, I must repeat, the only reason that these wells were drilled was to use up production credits. If these credits are not used within a 12-month period, as you know, they are lost back to the government. These credits, as you know as well, pay over 75 per cent of any drilling so there is no new drilling takes place since they are all mostly done on offshoots, on sure things. This is really all that is happening in the drilling in southeastern Saskatchewan.

With the light and medium oils in southern Saskatchewan I am disappointed that this government has not seen fit to create a better climate not only for drilling more wells in these very depleting fields but also for entering into more aggressive research and development of tertiary recovery of the proven fields. I believe Alberta is headed in this direction now. The oil we produce does not require the advanced technology and research required by the heavy oil of the Lloydminster area so we have a built-in market for our product.

Bill 47 passed in this legislature in 1978. With all its regulations it has created a bookkeeper's nightmare for the oil industry and particularly for some of the small companies in free-hold oil leases where numerous people own shares in individual wells. An extra bookkeeper had to be hired in many of these companies because there is now about 15 times more book work than there was previously. The media reported at the last premiers' conference that the Prime Minister had been somewhat receptive to the Premier's approach in the area of the province's responsibilities and claims on royalties. I believe that the Premier was quoting as saying that he hoped a much simpler bill to replace Bill 47 with all its regulations could be put into place, therefore, easing the work load and the book load of the various oil companies. We hope that this is the case.

The \$1.2 million Souris Basin study, the three-year study conducted by the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan in conjunction with the federal government, has done nothing to alleviate the fears, the concerns and the huge financial losses of the people who are affected in this flood-prone area. About all the study accomplished was to prove what all of the local people knew and that was that the flood-prone areas of land should be negotiated for and bought up by the government. The most disappointing thing of all about the recommendations was that there was no recommendation for any reimbursement for huge losses that these farmers had to bear over the last seven out of nine years, remembering, of course, that the flooding of the land on their farms at the bottom of the funnel were not acts of God but were acts of man on a drainage system at the top of the funnel. Certainly the Government of Saskatchewan has not recognized any responsibility in the flooding of these lands but rather has told the farmers both here and in the rest of the province, if you don't like what your neighbor is doing, sue him. This is what I would call a really fantastic climate to create among neighbors — instead of doing something to solve the problems as a body elected by the people of this province.

We wonder if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) and the former Minister of the Environment really believe that the terms of reference on the Souris Basin study were adequate. This is an international waterway and I think the people of this area were absolutely astounded, as were the people of North Dakota, that the North Dakota people were not even consulted in any way during this study. The Souris River directly affects the flooding of farm lands and the city of Minot in North Dakota. The farmers living in the Souris Valley on the North Dakota side had many suggestions for solutions of flooding problems but we did not even give them a chance to voice their opinions or hear some of their recommended solutions. Once again I believe this was strictly a lack of communication with neighbors to the south, as was the case in the Coronach pollution problem in the State of Montana. (The minister is going out, I just wanted to make sure he got that one.)

In a Western Producer article on January 4, 1979 the Minister of Agriculture is quoted as saying only two or three farmers are directly affected by the flooding. If such is the case, why does he not initiate negotiations to buy this farm land, remembering, of course, that these farmers cannot and will not accept any token settlements for these lands? Rather it must be settled on a basis of what it costs to relocate, as well as taking into consideration the losses suffered by these people over the years. I would agree with the minister that there are not many parcels of farm land involved. The minister should take aggressive action instead of taking an attitude of let's leave it alone, it will go away, I'll wait for one more flooding to cause further aggravation.

March 6, 1979

As a matter of fact, with all the snow in the southeast part of Saskatchewan, 1979 looks like a year that could compound this situation. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the news media over the last few days has been making forecasts that we could have up to two-and-a-half times the normal flood run-off in the southern part of Saskatchewan.

I do not have to tell the Minister of Agriculture nor the former Minister of the Environment that the people in the Souris Valley at the River Park area have also taken tremendous losses through the years. I would include in that the people who run the dance pavilion, the trailer court, the drive-in restaurant, as well as the famous Estevan greenhouses and nurseries. Also, it is mentioned in the report, the flooded area at Roche Percee affects the farmers in that area. A few of these farmers have been unable to seed portions of their land for seven of these nine years, creating a serious loss of income for them. I would strongly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to take aggressive action towards permanently solving the flooding problems affecting the people in the Souris Valley.

In this session I will be asking the minister in charge of SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) questions as to whether the minister and the SPC have acted upon their experience in the strike in 1975 at Boundary Dam where the supervisory staff and out-of-scope people not only looked after the running of this dam, this power unit, but did a complete annual inspection and overhaul. The minister at that time suggested he would be looking into the efficiency of this operation and that there could possibly be some changes made as a result of their experience. We will be asking the minister what has been done or if there is anything going to be done to improve the efficiency and the morale of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation at Estevan. We will also be asking the minister and the government if it is in their plans to do a reassessment of the way that the government building and projects, such as Boundary Dam, are assessed or if he would go to regular assessment in lieu of grants coming from these projects. We have told the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Power Corporation on many different occasions that Boundary Dam is truly a wonderful industry to have in the Estevan area, but there should be a different taxation method to cover the influx of construction workers which has happened to Estevan in the past 21 years and the increased population through this development, creating along with the economic benefits, certain growth problems for our municipal and our urban governments. We should think, and should hope, that more benefits should come to such communities as Estevan because of these government projects.

Another reason there should be a different method of taxing the government buildings is the fact that by use of our lignite coal in our area, we are able to generate the power for the Boundary Dam station at the lowest coal price delivered to the hoppers of any project in North America. Because of these low prices for fuel for power, it does come somewhat as a surprise that huge increases in the price of power have been announced for this year, I therefore, believe it is imperative that we look at the efficiency of the SPC operation, not only in Boundary Dam, but throughout Saskatchewan.

The Minister of Mineral Resources has indicated that the new 90 yard dragline would be leased to Utility Coal, a private company at Estevan, and I'm wondering if the government is already discovering that on their entry into the coal mining industry, the private sector can mine this coal cheaper than the government operation. As I mentioned before, the Boundary Dam project certainly is a boon to Estevan. Its many employees are excellent citizens and, not only in the past but at present, are some of the best community leaders we have. We have mentioned before to the Minister in charge of SPC that it is indeed hard to compete in the private sector in hiring people in this area

because under the SPC contract, with their employees, the minimum wage is something in the range of \$7.00 and the minimum wage throughout the rest of Saskatchewan, including Estevan, is \$3.50. Is it any wonder that it is almost impossible to hire other tradesmen or even laborers in the Estevan area? We would like to commend the Government of Saskatchewan and the Minister of Highways for the improvements on the rebuilding of portions of both Highways 18 and 47 in 1978. These are extremely good sections of highways and it is our hope that your experiment — with the fly ash on Highway 47 north will, indeed, live up to all of our expectations. There were two different contractors on Highways 18 and 47 and they both did a marvelous job under very adverse weather conditions in this past year. I might say that we still have approximately 10 miles of highway to do on No. 18, to be rebuilt. This is from out of Torquay, six miles on Highway No. 47 from Highway 361 to Benson. They are very much in need of rebuilding, as well as the entire 11 miles from Highway No. 47 to Lampman on Highway No. 361. It is my hope that it is within the government's plan to complete these sections of highway as soon as possible.

I would also like to commend the town of Midale for its very successful Winter Games held recently. This was truly a giant community effort and one which proved to be extremely successful. I think these Winter Games have done much to pull communities together, especially right in the middle of winter. I commend the government for their part in helping to promote these games.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the potash industry, I can only reiterate what has been said in the past about the government entering the potash industry. It is the opinion of our party that it was entirely unnecessary, as we have said many times before, to buy — as one of the members referred to it the other day — used holes in the ground. You did not create any more jobs and you did not produce one more pound of potash. I realize you have undertaken some expansions of some of the mines, which were purchased by the government and that you have increased your capacity to close to 45 per cent of the potash produced in Saskatchewan.

It is interesting to note that with your infringement into this private sector, there have been no companies attempting — even with our having 40 per cent of the best potash supplies in the world — there has been no company that has attempted to build a new mine. Again, this boils down to climate and the fact that the rules can change over night, or be expropriated if the government so desires. We object, very strenuously, to your increasing the government bureaucracy in this area.

I should qualify this because I did say you weren't creating one more job, but because you established PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) and buying up the potash mines, you did indicate — the Minister in charge of PCS — that the head office of PCS eventually would employ 450 people. So, I guess, it once again proves that the inefficiency and operations by government is so much that you require 450 additional people to handle approximately the same amount of potash produced in Saskatchewan by these mines . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I am being very reasonable.

Another thing I want to tell you is when we become the government in 1982, I am going to either raise this desk or lengthen my arms.

The profit picture for potash in 1977 of \$890,000 and in 1978 of some \$10 million, is dismal to say the least, especially when you consider the fact that over \$500 million is invested in these mines. The people of Saskatchewan could be drawing approximately \$50 million a year interest without investing one dime. Again, we say, when taking the

March 6, 1979

interest into account there is no doubt about it the people of Saskatchewan over the past two years have not made a profit of approximately \$11 million on potash but have probably lost \$80 million in interest that would have gone to the energy fund. The people of Saskatchewan know this, Mr. Speaker, and when the Premier or minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan makes a statement that this government was elected on its resource policies, I say, hogwash. I say you were elected in spite of your resource policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — Proof positive is that all the people in the resource areas were elected to our party and I'm talking about Estevan, Souris-Cannington, Moosomin, Swift Current and Kindersley — all resource areas of Saskatchewan, all elected PC. No, Mr. Speaker, the NDP government became government again in 1978 because of a very good campaign of hatred, lies, personal vilifications to members of our party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — I must say this in turn was perpetuated by the press and the electronic media, both on what they let the public know and on what they did not let the public know. At the start of the campaign, the Premier in a quote from Maclean's magazine stated, 'This is going to be a dirty campaign' and then proceeded with the NDP dirt. This was confirmed by the same article in Maclean's magazine; lies and innuendoes about what the Conservative Party would do with medicare if they came into power and that was the deception that did work on the public, particularly the whispering campaign among older citizens of this province that the PCs were to eliminate medicare should they be elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — In fact, Mr. Speaker, they even brought one of the most famous people and one of the most respected people from Saskatchewan and that's Tommy Douglas. They let him tell that lie in the Pelly by-election and I think that was a very bad slam for a man of his stature . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The personal vilification of certain members of our party was also assisted by the media when certain members of the media swore to destroy both our leader and our caucus and our chances of becoming government, doing a very grave injustice to the people of this province. These (I said swore to) members were judged guilty before they were proved innocent, quite the opposite to our democratic judicial system in Saskatchewan. No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we, on this side of the House, individually, would ever have the nerve or the will to lie and to deceive the public as the NDP did to win the campaign at any cost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — I personally feel that the NDP perpetuating the big lie and the power of the pen of some of the media denied the people of this province the chance of a government with possibly the finest candidates ever assembled under the umbrella of one political party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Speaker, the big lie is what elected the NDP government opposite and not their resource policies.

We do, however, share some of the blame for losing the election . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There was our inability to properly explain the owning of our resources through a share structure by the people of Saskatchewan. More recently, the plan was confirmed to be feasible and practical by the governments of British Columbia and Alaska, which are looking very closely in this direction. This is true ownership of the resources by the people and not ownership by the cabinet and initially the Premier.

The Bayda report, Mr. Speaker, on the future of uranium development of Saskatchewan has been laid before the people. The government of this province has a very major decision to make as to how far, and how fast it plans to go on the recommendations of this report. The Government of Saskatchewan was given the go-ahead on the Cluff Lake mining development, and tentative approval on other projects. The Minister of the Environment stated, at a recent meeting in Saskatoon when asked about the Warman Refinery, that the people had already voted on it, meaning that they elected in 1978 and that they now had the complete go-ahead not only for the mining but for the refinery as well.

I would like a list on the hog producer's vote on whether we should get a hog marketing board. This was mentioned before when Mr. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources) promised the hog producers they would have a vote for the marketing board. Then, after a provincial election he told producers you've had your vote. I certainly don't think his answer will satisfy the people of the Warman district. And if a refinery should be built there to handle the yellow keg, then I certainly believe that the people of this area should be the ones who make this decision.

The Government of Saskatchewan has stated that it would only commit itself up until 1990 and after that, by its indication, there may be a nuclear power plant in this province. I would like to ask the government, is there going to be a nuclear power plant? Is there one in the planning stages for the province of Saskatchewan? I'd like you to tell the people of Saskatchewan if you indeed do have a nuclear power plant planned for this province?

Mr. Speaker, SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) is involved in many of these uranium developments, as a partner or a shareholder, and it is our party's opinion the government should not be involved in the development of uranium but rather a monitor of the environment or a referee. If they are going to be involved in the development of uranium then certainly the environment should be monitored by a completely independent source. Our party does not feel that this government, by taking part in the mining, could possibly referee stringently enough. I think good examples are the PCB spill, and the Uranium City School incidents.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that after passing a heritage fund bill in 1978, we are now faced with the possibility that this government through SMDC and Saskoil is involved in so many partnership arrangements that the money supply will not permit the government to try to fulfil its partnership role in developing these resources. For this reason, the people of Saskatchewan will not see anything like the resource growth in the province of Alberta during the next few years. If they are unable to fulfil their partnership role, and instead control the growth, then certainly they will be giving away more of the resources to the partnership company in order to take part in the

March 6, 1979

development of these various areas. If they decide to go full out and play their partnership role in the development, then I am certain we can expect to see many huge deficits in our budget in the coming years. Certainly, if they are to play their full part in the partnership, we will not see any energy fund money accumulating for quite a number of years.

I am particularly pleased to see the northern residents, and particularly the native people of Saskatchewan, being trained to take a bigger role in the developing of these resources.

Again I must say it is strictly up to the government of Saskatchewan to make some very serious decisions on how far and how fast they are going in respect to development of this very controversial resource. I would like this government to tell the people of Saskatchewan if they do have plans for a nuclear power plant in the future — beyond the year 2000.

I would like to touch for a few moments on land bank. It is interesting to note that since the original picture-window sale of a portion of land-bank land to one individual, that the rules have been changed so drastically, that it would be absolutely out of reason for any farmer of land-bank land to even consider the purchase of this land. Of course, this is exactly the situation this government has been trying to create. The leases offered on land-bank land are now cheaper than when I was running farm land in 1962. Who would dare to think of purchasing land at present-day prices with such fantastically low leases? The people of Saskatchewan are getting a clear view of the final phases of the plan that leads to state ownership of farm lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — They are now buying this farm land up at any cost and leasing it back with no return to the taxpayers of this province. You can certainly bet there is not even return on the interest in any way, shape or form. No, Mr. Speaker, this government will not stop until it owns all, or almost all, of the farm land in Saskatchewan. You can be sure that with so many hundreds of thousands of people responsible to the master planners of this province, that we will soon be down to a one-party system and socialism. Mr. Minister, where next is it possible for the socialist pickle to slice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — No, Mr. Speaker, I say to this government, sell the land-bank lands to the people who are leasing this land. Sell it to them through the chartered banks with preferred interest rates and agreement for sale and backed by the government of Saskatchewan, without investing any more money. In this way, you will return this money to the government coffers and to your heritage fund. I say, get out of the resource industry. Let the people run the resources and build the resources in this province who know how to do it.

This government has the power to tax 100 per cent on every profit dollar. Why then, do they want to take part in the developing of these resources?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Because they're greedy.

MR. LARTER: — Spend your time governing this province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Run the utilities that should be run and run them well, particularly the Saskatchewan

Power Corporation and Sask Tel, and quit meddling in the affairs that can be better handled by the private sector.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — You have the right to tax these people as heavily as you want, at the same time expecting you to be reasonable in order to get the maximum return for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this government won the election of 1978 on one other issue other than the big lie. You won it by convincing the public on leadership I say, Mr. Speaker, leadership to what? Leadership to total domination of every person's life in this province? The total operation of all resources including the farmland by the bureaucrats and the government of this province? Leadership over everyone's lives in the future? Domination and total domination and freedom to tell the big lie? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The NDP has principles and if the people don't like them they have other ones, Mr. Speaker, if this is leadership for the people of Saskatchewan, God help Saskatchewan and its future under total socialism. I cannot support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 36

Pepper	Matsalla	Tchorzewski
Dyck	Robbins	Cody
Bowerman	MacMurchy	Koskie
Smishek	Banda	Lusney
Romanow	Whelan	Long
Messer	Kaeding	Gross
Snyder	Feschuk	Nelson
Byers	MacAuley	Thompson
Kramer	McArthur	Engel
Baker	Johnson	Lingenfelter
Skoberg	Allen	White
Kowalchuk	Vickar	Hammersmith

NAYS — 17

Collver	Taylor	Andrew
Larter	Lane	Duncan
Berntson	Birkbeck	Garner
Katzman	Ham	Muirhead
Swan	Pickering	Rousseau
Thatcher	McLeod	

March 6, 1979

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer):

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by such members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Committee of Finance

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder), the member for Moose Jaw South:

That this Assembly will, on Thursday, resolve itself into a Committee of Finance to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty and to consider the ways and means of raising the supply.

Motion agreed to.

CONDOLENCES — Mr. Speaker

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to express on behalf, I'm sure of all members of the Legislative Assembly, certainly members from this side of the House. and as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated in his capacity, on behalf of the members of the opposite side of the House, our sincere condolences to you on the sad occurrence of the death of your mother very recently. While I did not know Mrs. Brockelbank personally, she must have lived a very full and active life. I think that was inevitable, being married to such a dynamic person such as the late J.H. Brockelbank, your father. I'm advised that Mrs. Brockelbank was born in Scotland in 1899 and arrived in Canada in the very early 1900s. In 1919, she married J.H. Brockelbank and homesteaded in the Tisdale area. She was very active in a variety of community functions both in the Tisdale and the Regina area. And while she was not in good health in the last little while, certainly maintained a strong, keen interest in your activities and the activities of the family. She is survived by Mr. Speaker, by two daughters, Mrs. Anna Skene and Mrs. Sally McCallion.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I may before the orders of the day on behalf of all of us, express our sincere sympathies to you, Sir.

MOTION

Committee to Consider Regulations

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to, by leave of the Assembly, move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Robbins, (Minister of Revenue. Supply and Services):

That members, Lane, Andrew, Duncan, Hammersmith, McArthur, Prebble,

Romanow, Swan and White be constituted a special committee to consider every regulation filed with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly pursuant to the provisions of The Regulations Act, with a view to determining whether the special attention of the Assembly should be drawn to any of the said regulations on any of the following grounds: (a) that imposes a charge on the public revenues or prescribes a payment to be made to any public authority not specifically provided for by statute; (b) that it is excluded from challenge in the courts; (c) that it makes unusual or unexpected use of powers conferred by statute; (d) that it purports to have retrospective effect where the parent statute confers no express authority so to provide; (e) that it has been insufficiently promulgated; (f) that it is not clear in meaning and if they so determine, to report to that effect. That the committee have the assistance of legal counsel in reviewing the said regulations; that it be given the power to sit after prorogation of the Assembly and that it be required prior to reporting that the special attention of the Assembly be drawn to any regulation to inform the government department or authority concerned of its intention so to report; and that the committee be empowered to invite any regulation-making authority to submit a memorandum explaining any regulation which may be under consideration by the committee or to invite any regulation-making authority to appear before the committee as a witness for the purpose of explaining any such regulation; and that the committee be empowered to review the by-laws of the professional societies and amendments thereto as referred to the committee to determine whether or not they or any of them are in any way prejudicial to the public interest.

MR. SPEAKER: — Before putting the question on the motion which is before us I want to thank members on all sides of the House for their kind words of sympathy at this time.

Motion agreed to.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) by leave of the Assembly:

That the by-laws of the professional societies and amendments thereto tabled a sessional paper No. 25, 1978, and a sessional paper No. 3, 1979, plus addenda tabled today, be referred to the Special Committee on Regulations.

MR. COLLVER: — With regard to that question. I wonder if the Attorney General would just, very briefly, state what those documents are that are being referred. You just gave numbers.

MR. ROMANOW: — Usual documents that relate to such things as by-laws from professional organizations, pharmaceutical law society. These are some special regulations, or regulations which are tabled and are part of — I don't know what authority, what act, what statute there is — basically those are the documents that are being referred to the committee. It is the normal work of the committee which is being done, a regulations committee, a review of professional and other by-laws.

MR. COLLVER: — The Attorney General is not including in that any of the changes that were brought before the committee last year to determine whether or not The Medical Professions Act, for example, should be changed? That doesn't include any of these regulations?

March 6, 1979

MR. ROMANOW: — I don't believe it does. I haven't seen the documents, but I don't believe it does. What is being referred is what has been referred since I have been around, whatever that is and if there is something which does not meet with your approval in this area, raise it through one of your boys in the committee and we will table it or amend it in a subsequent motion.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:44 p.m.