

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 3, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Report of the Select Special Committee Appointed to Prepare Lists of Members to Compose Select Standing Committees

THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY: — Mr. Dyck from the select special committee appointed to prepare lists of members to compose the select standing committees of the Assembly presents the first report of the said committee which is as follows: The lists of the standing committee are appended to the report and will appear in tonight's *Votes and Proceedings*.

MR. DYCK moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake, Mr. McLeod:

That the first report of the select special committee appointed to prepare lists of members to compose the select standing committees of the Assembly be now concurred in.

Motion agreed.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. BAKER: — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce a group of students seated in the west gallery, 33 in number, from Glen Elm school. I believe they are all in grade 8. They are accompanied by Mr. Freitag and Heather Cooke, their teachers. I want to wish them a fruitful stay here this afternoon watching the proceedings our democratic parliamentary system — a system that is needed badly in many parts of the world today. We extend a warm welcome to you and I hope you have a pleasant stay. I will spend a little time with them after they leave the Assembly for picture taking and a short social hour.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Increase in Bankruptcies in Saskatchewan

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Mr. Minister, in light of the announcement yesterday and today of the 50 per cent increase in bankruptcies in Saskatchewan and the fact that today we have three times as many bankruptcies in Saskatchewan as the national average, and with the tremendous and vast resources of this province and the unlimited opportunities available, has your department attempted to determine why this dismal record exists?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I, too, have heard the announcement, but I don't think the record is quite as dismal as the hon. member tries to make it out. Mr. Speaker, just a few statistics for the hon. member: in 1971 we only had 864 businesses incorporated in the province of Saskatchewan; in 1975 we had 2,048 incorporated, gradually going up; in 1978 we had 3,097; in 1979 we had 3,589 incorporated

businesses and in 1980 we've already reached the 4,000 mark and we're looking for more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, when you take a 50 per cent increase compared to what we had in 1971, I don't think the increase is that dismal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I would like to start out, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the statistics of the minister do not impress me or any members on this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Or any person who uses his head.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes, or anyone who might use his head in determining them. That, Mr. Minister, does not answer my question why the rate in Saskatchewan, regardless of the number of businesses in this province we still have three times the national average of bankruptcies in this province. That was the question I asked and you haven't answered it. Mr. Minister, in the throne speech last week, and I will read the preamble, it said:

As we enter the new decade, we find ourselves in the grip of a national economic recession, Saskatchewan's positive response to these realities reflects the developing strength and resilience of our economy.

Is that what you call strength and resiliency of our economy, Mr. Minister, three times the national average of bankruptcies in Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the hon. member gets his figures but when we take into consideration the increase in interest rates over the last six or eight months and in particular the last year or so, and the small capital that some of our businesses have had over year's previous, there is no wonder that some of them had to go under because of the strain. I don't think our government can take the responsibility for losing that number of businesses.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I asked you two questions. You still haven't answered them. The first one was: have you tried to determine why it's happening and why the three times the national average? How are you attempting to determine why and what are you going to do about it in your department?

I will go on with the one more Mr. Minister. In the speech of the Premier on Monday he indicated that the free enterprise system was to blame for the boarded-up businesses in Saskatchewan in the years 1964-71. Tell me, Mr. Minister, are the denials of the freedoms of the individual and the restrictions that you have placed on freedoms the answer? Is your system any better than what he was talking about in his speech? And I'd like an answer to the questions that I placed to you in the first place.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, one straightforward answer to the hon. member is for him to speak to the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce and the various private enterprise people in the province of Saskatchewan to get an answer to prove to him whether or not this government is anti-private enterprise or not.

Liquor Board Strike Negotiations

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

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

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

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

Cabinet Members Not MLAs

MR. COLLVER: — I'll address a question to the Premier, and I hope he is beyond his laughter with the liquor board strike. I mentioned it yesterday in this Assembly in a speech: why and what precedent do you possibly have for the continuation of a member of the cabinet to act as a member of the cabinet when he is not a member of this legislature?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Of course there are a good number of precedents, but the two members who are members of the cabinet will not be members of the cabinet long after having ceased to be members of the legislature — certainly not as long as, let us say, the Hon. Mr. Pinder, who was a cabinet minister from May of 1964 to January of 1965 without ever being a member of the legislature. That creates some sort of a record.

Mr. Speaker, the facts will show that there never was a return of election electing the hon. member for Hanley as he then was. Mr. Pinder . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Please check the record. The member for Thunder Creek seems to be outlining what he believes the facts were. There was in fact no controverted election in Hanley. There was in fact a recount. No one is declared elected until after the recount. The recount gave the riding to Mr. Walker. Mr. Walker then resigned and there was indeed a by-election and Mr. Pinder was indeed defeated, and he never was a member of this House. For some seven or eight months he served in the cabinet.

Just last year Dr. Faris was a member of the cabinet for a while after he was no longer a member of the legislature. One may be critical or not of the practice, but certainly there are many precedents.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier will be aware of course, that some of the previous examples occurred between sessions of the legislature (and I'm not referring to the Pinder one, which I'm not going to debate in this legislature). One can certainly appreciate a cabinet minister staying for a week or two or even three, after he ceases to be a member because the people reject him, in order to clean up the affairs of his office.

But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could tell this Assembly, and the people of Saskatchewan why it is necessary when this legislature is in session, to retain the member for Kelsey-Tisdale as the Minister of Mineral Resources and the former member for The Battlefords as the Minister of Highways, when the members of this opposition have no opportunity to question the responsible ministers of the Crown on those important areas to the people of Saskatchewan? Why is that so necessary? Why can you not appoint a new minister now and let those outside members perhaps drop in from time to time to help elucidate the issues for the new ministers?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, it is clearly not entirely necessary that the current practice be followed. There is no necessary reason why they have to continue. It seems, however, to me desirable and they will not be in the offices for long.

I know the member for Nipawin will not ordinarily be familiar with the British practice — he is directing his attention southward — but in the House of Commons at Westminster, of course, there are many ministers who sit in the House of Lords and who never are available for questioning in the House of Commons. In Ottawa there are ministers who sit in the Senate. Certainly a spectacular example of that was Mr. De Cotret, who was appointed as minister of a very sensitive portfolio and sat in the Senate. There were then people in the House who spoke for him and may I remind the hon. member that speaking for the Department of Mineral Resources is the member for Biggar, the Provincial Secretary (who I think will be able to answer all questions directed with respect to that portfolio), and speaking on behalf of the Department of Highways is the member for Morse, the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. I have every confidence that they will be able to advise the House on any questions which may arise.

Sale of American Beer in Canada

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, about a month ago, there was an announcement that a local provincial distillery was going to commence the production and sale of an American beer known as Budweiser. Mr. Premier, you were quoted at a press conference as suggesting that the government had no alternative but to make a move to curtail this situation. You indicated that you had not decided whether you were going to take the Budweiser off the shelves or not allow it to be sold in provincial liquor stores or, conversely, whether you would act to remove the liquor advertising, beer advertising, on American cable networks. Mr. Premier, are you prepared today to make some definitive announcement as to what course of action your government is planning?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I cannot give the hon. member a definitive statement of what course of action will be followed. There are three or four options and I'm not able to advise him what the position of the government will be. The Attorney General is looking at some of the alternatives with respect to the existing legislation. We have not yet reached a conclusion as to what our course of action should be.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, I'm sure you're aware that the government now owns 60 per cent of a medium known as Teletheatre. I'm sure the Premier is aware of some of the movies that are shown on there and what type they are. I refer to North Dallas Forty and The Rose which are a couple of movies, one in particular, that show explicit sex acts, lesbianism and atrocious language. Since your opposition to beer and liquor advertising on the American cable networks is well known, I would like the Premier to elucidate the logic, by what hypocritical moral standard, your government rationalizes that it is fine for the young people in this province to watch movies like this on prime time and yet at the same time, you can rationalize that it is wrong to see an innocuous Rodney Dangerfield beer commercial which is probably the best done on television?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a difficulty. He is asking me how I rationalize seeing North Forty or something that he referred to on Teletheatre and a Rodney Dangerfield commercial. I find myself in the difficulty of never to my knowledge having seen a Rodney Dangerfield commercial and never to my knowledge having seen the North Dallas Forty or whatever movie he refers to. I'm therefore totally unable to compare them and offer any comment by way of comparison.

Extra Billing of Patients

MR. SOLOMON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I address my question to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, during the 1979 Regina North-West by-election, the problem of extra billing of patients by doctors was brought to my attention by some 20 families. Over the past few months, I have received an additional 20 complaints from patients regarding extra billing in my constituency. A resolution dealing with the elimination of extra billing of patients by doctors emanating from my constituency's annual convention was passed almost unanimously at the 1979 NDP provincial convention. It was introduced once again at this year's convention and unanimously adopted.

The Hall reports states extra billing is contrary to the spirit of the medical care act and denies accessibility, particularly to the poor. Hall as advised that no single province shall go it alone in eliminating extra billing and calls upon the federal government to take the initiative in outlawing extra billing in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I wonder if the members could keep quiet so I could hear the member.

MR. SOLOMON: — My question, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister. What are your intentions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member for Regina North-West.

MR. SOLOMON: — I would like to reiterate my question, Mr. Speaker. What are your intentions regarding extra billing and what specifically are you going to do to ensure that the major recommendations of the Hall report are carried out?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, the question directed to me by the member is certainly a very important question. Let me tell the House that we have taken a number of steps to try to convince other provinces and governments to support our position on extra billing and direct billing.

When we met in Winnipeg at the end of September, we put a proposition before the other ministers and the federal minister urging that a concerted effort be made through legislation that extra billing be disallowed in Canada. We did not receive support from many of the other provincial governments, although they didn't take a definitive position at that particular time. We are meeting again at the beginning of next week in Toronto. This topic will be further discussed.

I must admit that the federal minister, the Hon. Monique Begin, has not made a commitment in this regard, although she has publicly stated that she is opposed to extra billing, as I have done in a number of occasions.

I want to inform the member that tremendous progress has been made in this province. The extra billing has decreased from 7 or 8 per cent to a little less than 3 per cent in this province. We have, I think, set up a pretty good relationship with the doctors of this province and the Saskatchewan Medical Association. I have made it, however, very clear to them.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. Final supplementary.

MR. SOLOMON: — First supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I am quite prepared to use up the question period trying to maintain order in the House. Order. The member for Regina North-West.

MR. SOLOMON: — Mr. Speaker, my constituents and many citizens in Saskatchewan are concerned about extra billing. They are also concerned that the doctors who provide such a good service to our province be adequately compensated by the medical care insurance commission. The Saskatchewan Medical Association has been complaining that many of their members are undergoing salary pressures due to inflation and other factors. Could the minister make available to this Assembly the list of doctors who are paid a portion of their salaries from the medical care insurance commission, what those payments are for each doctor for the past 12 months, and could . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take the next question. The member for Kelsey-Tisdale.

Woody Lake Fire Salvage Operations

MR. HARDY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the minister responsible for tourism and renewable resources. In view of our Woody Lake fire in which we lost a great deal of prime timber in the Hudson Bay area and in view of the fact that the minister knows full well that two of our local industries rely solely on our forests for wood, can he explain to me why he is allowing crews from Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation in Carrot River to come into Hudson Bay to log our timber and deprive our local people of jobs?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the point which the member makes is that Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation should not be allowed to come in and salvage the timber which has been burned through the Woody Lake fire. I think the concern from a forestry point of view is that we pick up the salvaged timber as quickly as possible and that we do everything in our power to accommodate that process. Indeed it requires more equipment and manpower to do that. The option was made to Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation as it was to the other timber companies in

the area to do that. The salvage is now in process and will continue in that way.

MR. HARDY: — Supplementary to the minister. Will the minister assure the people of Hudson Bay, through this House, that the wood which has been taken away from our area will be returned to our area? Excuse me. I will reword that. Will the wood that has been taken away from our mills be returned from Saskatchewan Forest Product's cutting area to the Hudson Bay cutting area?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't guarantee any such thing. The idea and the concept your work on when you have a burned out area is that you do everything in your power to expedite the salvaging of timber in that area — in this case, some 322,000 cords lying out there. The idea is to have it picked up and make use of it before it rots and deteriorates. I think that is our objective and we are going to continue to have the salvage picked up.

MR. HARDY: — A further supplementary to the minister. Does the minister realize that they have taken 80,000 cords of our most valuable and best timber to reallocate to the Carrot River area? During the summer the Saskatchewan government promised to do a study on the Woody Lake fire and file a complete report. To this time I haven't seen that report. Would the minister kindly assure the House that this report will be tabled in the Legislative Assembly?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, the first point the member made in his question is that he wanted us to guarantee that the Hudson Bay people would receive their timber back. The timber of the forests belong to all the people of the province: it is not the private preserve of one area over another area and the wood is allocated on that basis.

As I said in my other two answers to his question, the timber is being allocated as quickly as possible so we don't lose any timber and so that it doesn't deteriorate and rot. I don't think we should be looking at whether or not it is good for one area or bad for another area. I think the idea is to get the timber out as quickly as possible and do it in the most economical and reasonable fashion possible. And incidentally, the way we are doing it has been agreed to by the timber companies in that area. At a meeting as late as November 20 when the final allocations were made, the estimates were put in and agreed to by those companies with full support. So I don't think the situation is what the member makes it, that we are depleting an area and phasing out an area in order to ship it some place else. The idea is to get rid of salvage timber as quickly as you can so that it doesn't waste and rot. I think that is the important point here.

Advertising on American Cable TV

MR. THATCHER: — A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, I'm sure you are aware there is advertising on American cable as it pertains to American wines and there has been since it came to Canada. Mr. Premier, I'm sure you are aware that many of the wines advertised on American cable are available in Saskatchewan liquor stores. In fact you may recall the other night at the opening of the legislature, one of the brands which was served that night, Gallo, was widely advertised on all three networks. The other ones are also well known, Mr. Premier. I'm sure the minister in charge of the liquor board stores will tell you that there has been no particular fun on California wines that have been advertised since cable came to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Premier, in light of that, which I'm sure that minister will confirm as fact, why are we

fooling around with a medium like cable when it is having no discernible effect on our economy and in the case of wine has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the sale of that product in Canada?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the point the hon. member makes has some merit. Certainly there are a number of products advertised on American cable television which are sold in Saskatchewan liquor stores. An even more conspicuous example was Colt 45 (a beer). We simply had to decide when a product was likely to be marketed which would be a major product and which would raise in the minds of the other brewers the suggestion that they ought similarly to be able to advertise their products on radio and television contrary to existing Saskatchewan law. That difficulty which we contemplated would arise is now in a sense with us. We have to decide how we are going to deal with it and we are considering the alternatives.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to open my remarks today by suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to this Assembly that the rather strange and strained difficulties between giving a speech yesterday afternoon and having to repeat myself today, have to do primarily with the allocation of radio time. If I do say a few things today that I happened to say yesterday, I do hope you will forgive me.

It is a great pleasure for me to address this particular Speech from the Throne since it said absolutely nothing, and since the opposition failed to lack confidence in the government, thereby exhibiting confidence in the government, it is incumbent upon a two-member caucus in this legislature to show that and to prove that the people of Saskatchewan should not have confidence in the present Government of Saskatchewan.

It is a pleasure for me to represent the Nipawin constituency. I say to you that we thank the Government of Saskatchewan for all of their recent activity in Nipawin. However, I would like to suggest to the Premier and others in the government that although we appreciate all of the efforts made lately to try to influence the people of Nipawin (because I have already announced that I will not be seeking re-election in the Nipawin constituency and the NDP are attempting to win that seat), it will not be the NDP that wins Nipawin in the next provincial general election. We thank you very much for bringing all of these goodies to Nipawin; we hope this will continue during the next two years. The people of Nipawin are deserving of these goodies and for whatever reason you are bringing them, please keep it up because the people of Nipawin thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the problems facing Canada and most primarily western Canada today are serious and long-reaching. I say to you they are long-reaching because I'm going to use the words today of the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan five years ago to tell you how far-reaching they are. This was an address that the Premier of Saskatchewan made in Prince Albert prior to the 1975 election. The report is as follows:

In a speech to Prince Albert campaign workers Thursday, Premier Allen Blakeney again hammered home federal-provincial differences as the main NDP election issue.

Now this was 1975, Mr. Speaker.

Speaking to approximately 300 workers from the constituencies of Prince Albert, Prince Albert-Duck Lake, Shellbrook and Melfort, Mr. Blakeney said the western provinces are subject to a one-two punch. The first punch is the federal government's attack on our resources with its double taxation and the number two punch is its attack on the Crowsnest freight rates, he said.

Describing the federal western policies as a serious threat to the future of Saskatchewan, Mr. Blakeney said only the NDP, "which is beholden to no one, has the policies, determination and guts to fight for the people of Saskatchewan."

Mr. Speaker, that was in 1975. Yesterday in his address to this Assembly the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan repeated that one of the most serious attacks on Saskatchewan was the attack by the federal government on the Crowsnest freight rates. That's five years later. Yesterday in this Assembly the Premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Blakeney, stated that the federal government's attack on our resource revenues in western Canada is a serious attack on Saskatchewan and western Canada. And only if he can negotiate that particular provision out of the constitutional changes that Mr. Trudeau is putting forward does the Premier say he is prepared to accept them.

Five years later the Premier of Saskatchewan says that the same attack on western Canada that was occurring in 1975 is occurring again in 1980. The federal government is still taking the vast bulk and far more than its fair share of our resource revenues through its double-taxation policies and through its export tax on natural gas and oil.

Well, whether or not the Premier believes that this latest tax is an export tax or just a huge tax on natural gas is beside the point. The point is that it is still taking an inordinate amount of western Canada's wealth to support inefficient eastern Canadian industries, to support and maintain an oil pricing policy in central Canada in order to support those inefficient eastern Canadian industries because if world price were allowed for Saskatchewan oil and natural gas, eastern industries could not compete without a 60 cent Canadian dollar. Those are the economic facts.

The Canadian dollar would have to drop to 60 cents in relation to the United States if Mr. Trudeau were not using the wealth of western Canada to maintain a low oil and gas price in central Canada. The effect of that on our economy, on our pensioners, and on the poor in Canada, as the Premier well knows, is terrible. The poor are the hardest hit by inflation; the senior citizens are the hardest hit by inflation.

This rampant inflation in Canada, which has not been solved and cannot be solved by the Premier of Saskatchewan or by the Prime Minister of Canada, can only be solved by a concerted effort by free-speaking people in North America and, I say, by a combination of the resolve and will of the American people and of the Canadian people. And that is the only way that inflation is going to be solved.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said yesterday that he was not prepared to fight for western Canada and to fight the central government. He said as follows on page 104 in *Hansard*:

Would Mr. Trudeau's resolve melt away before a concerted provincial opposition? Anyone who believes that has not lived in Canada these last 13 years. Anyone who believes that probably bet on the Hamilton Tiger Cats to win the Grey Cup!

You say, "Perhaps we don't have to melt Mr. Trudeau's intransigence. What about the courts?" Will the courts rule against the federal government?

And then Mr. Blakeney suggest they will not. Then he says, in short, that it is impossible to predict with certainty if the various provincial countermeasures would succeed.

I say to the Premier of Saskatchewan, and I say to the people of Saskatchewan, that unless there is a viable alternative to Mr. Trudeau's centralization of power and unless the people of western Canada have a real choice presented to them, Mr. Trudeau will get his way. And Mr. Trudeau's way is compulsory bilingualism, resource control and taxation for the benefit of central Canadian industries, freight rate disparities, discriminatory customs duties and excise tariffs, unilateral patriation of the constitution by the federal government, and Trudeau's arrogant disregard of the dreams and aspirations of western Canada.

Faced with that kind of centralization of power, the people of Saskatchewan and the people of the West must have some true, viable alternative, and must have people who are prepared to stand up and fight Mr. Trudeau, or else they will have no future left except a centralized future which Mr. Trudeau envisages for Canada.

Trudeau's Canada is not Canada! Trudeau's Canada is not the Canada of our forefathers. It is not the Canada we fought wars over. Trudeau's Canada is a dictatorship. It removes the dreams and aspirations of people. It removes the right of western Canadians to self-determination. I say those who are prepared to stand up as Mr. Blakeney is doing today, and acquiesce to Mr. Trudeau's kind of Canada are selling out the interests of the people of Saskatchewan and are selling out western Canadians.

The people of western Canadian and Saskatchewan have four choices, that's all — four alternatives which are reasonable for reasonable people:

1. To accept a Trudeau Canada, centralized in Ottawa for the benefit of inefficient central Canadian business people in Toronto and Montreal. The people of western Canada, Mr. Speaker, have rejected in the past election, will reject today and will reject resoundingly in the future, a Trudeau Canada. That is not Canada.

2. A united Canada with a real federation of provincial interests and real powers for local governments and provincial governments — a true federation. That's the Canada that western Canadians are prepared to fight for: that's the Canada that I am prepared to fight for. Will it happen? The answer is, Mr. Speaker, no. It won't happen for a number of very important reason, one of which is that the Government of Saskatchewan has chickened out. The Government of Saskatchewan has backed off from it's fight with Ottawa and has said, "We'll accept a Trudeau Canada. We think it is fine politically."

Why have they said that, Mr. Speaker? Because they see now that Trudeau and his group are becoming more and more centralist and socialistic. They are using the same tactics on Canada which they used in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the people of the West are refusing that; they have in the past refused it. Witness the 12 per cent showing of the Liberal Party in the most recent by-election; witness the 12 per cent showing of the Liberal Party in 1978; witness the showing of the Liberal Party in Manitoba, in Alberta and British Columbia. They have rejected Trudeau's Canada. They want politicians and leaders to stand up and fight.

3. An independent western Canada, Mr. Speaker, with 5 million people in the largest land mass in the world, or one of the largest, we would be one of the weakest resource-based countries in the world. History shows us that with only 5 million people and not many resources, the industrialized nations would step on us. There is no possible way that our people could survive and achieve the kind of standard of living which they have come to appreciate.

4. The fourth alternative, which is realistic and reasonable, is that the people of western Canada seek union with the United States. Do they want it? Do I want it? No. But, Mr. Speaker, it's the only alternative which will fight Mr. Trudeau. It is the only real alternative in which people's standard of living will not go down. It is the only alternative in which the aspirations and dreams of western Canadian could be realized. It is the only alternative that will make eastern Canadians believe we are serious about our future, that we are not prepared to be stepped on by Trudeau and his cohorts in Ottawa. It is the only possible alternative that will make them believers in the spirit of our pioneers, in the spirit as western Canadians, that we are prepared to stand up and fight.

Mr. Speaker, as long as there is breath in my body and in the body of the member for Swift Current, we are going to continue to present that alternative to the people of Saskatchewan and the people of western Canada, so that they do have a choice, so they don't have to accept a Trudeau Canada which is not Canada at all.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support this throne speech and I move, seconded by the member for Swift Current, that the following words be added to the motion:

But that this Assembly has no confidence in the government and condemns it for its failure to deal with the most serious concerns and problems facing our nation, and for not taking a firm stand on:

1. Resource control and taxation;
2. Compulsory bilingualism;
3. Freight rate disparities;
4. Centralization of power;
5. Discriminatory custom duties and tariffs;
6. The unilateral repatriation of the constitution by the federal government;
7. Trudeau's arrogant disregard of the dreams and aspirations of western

Canadians.

Which policies, if continued, will be disastrous for the citizens of Saskatchewan and western Canada.

Debate continues on the motion and the amendment concurrently.

MR. MINER: — Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to take part in my first throne speech debate. I have been very impressed by the obvious ability and the competence shown by my colleagues, the member for Yorkton who moved the address in reply and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg who seconded the motion.

I would like to take this opportunity as well to congratulate my fellow rookies, Neil Hardy and Jack Chapman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MINER: — Mr. Chapman, as you can see, is my seatmate and I must admit that his victory was sweet indeed.

I am proud of the achievements of this government, Mr. Speaker. I am proud of the leadership of our Premier, Allan Blakeney, and I feel both proud and privileged to have the opportunity to represent the constituency of The Battlefords.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MINER: — The constituency of The Battlefords has been ably represented for 28 years by a man who has been my personal friend for almost as long as he has been a representative.

Eiling Kramer left a legacy of a constituency that has enjoyed dedication and unlimited energy in pursuit of service to his constituency, the like of which has seldom been seen by any other member. I feel a deep sense of responsibility in the knowledge that Eiling's a very difficult act to follow. Eiling was a politician with his own distinctive style. He spoke his mind in a manner peculiar to himself and his constituency loved him for it. Eiling, in return developed a deep sense of affection and loyalty to The Battlefords constituency and to its people. Now that part will not be a difficult act to follow.

The Battlefords is nestled into the part of Saskatchewan that I love the best. Why shouldn't I? It's my home. It's made up of a distinctive mix of rural and urban people, people of mixed ethnic and cultural backgrounds, not unlike the background of the province itself. It will indeed be a pleasure and a privilege to serve in Her Majesty's government on behalf of the people of the Battlefords. I can do no more than pledge myself to their service to the best of my ability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MINER: — Mr. Speaker, let me very briefly talk about the recent by-election in The Battlefords. There are two impressions that I was left with from that campaign which stood out above all others. They are the complete negativeness of the policies of the old-line parties and their inability to stick to the facts. The Tories and Liberals seem to be people who are just naturally against almost everything and have a great deal of difficulty distinguishing between fact and fiction. In some cases I am left with the impression that it is just plain misrepresentation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this kind of nonsense from the Tories, twisting of facts, personification of the negative and total absence of the positive was highlighted when the hon. member for Souris-Cannington coincidentally came to North Battleford during the by-election to hold a press conference. I suppose the coincidence occurred when he just happened to be passing through on his way to Kelsey-Tisdale, but his chance passing produced a press conference in which he disclosed (so he said) some of the so-called horror stories about the land bank and FarmStart programs. He came to the defence of a couple of British Columbia residents and it would seem to me that if the hon. member for Souris-Cannington wants to represent British Columbia residents then he should move out there and run for election. That would give the Tories a chance once again to try to bring their leader down from his lofty perch in the galleries so he can try to pull together the group of wanderers who sit opposite into a cohesive opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but think that these would be two steps in the right direction — one Tory moving west and another moving again, this time to the east. If they were unsuccessful once again, then they could follow their former leader south, although I am afraid they may find that Reagan's policies are just a little too left-wing for them.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to examine these allegations brought forward by the member for Souris-Cannington. There was no misrepresentation either to Mr. Parker or Mr. Vick, the individuals referred to, by either the land bank counsellor or the FarmStart representative as the press release claims. No one coerced either of these two gentlemen into coming to Saskatchewan. Indeed the records show that both came of their own free will and that both FarmStart and land bank employees tried to assist them in every way they could.

You see, Mr. Speaker, what the Tories don't seem to understand is that people who enroll the services of either the land bank or FarmStart programs do so entirely of their own free will. There's nothing mandatory that draws the clients to land bank or FarmStart. There is only a very real need. It's the need of starting and developing farmers to be provided with an opportunity to farm. We don't have to look for clients, much less go to B.C. to do it. There's a long waiting list for each of these very popular programs. Those long waiting lists are testimony to their success, their popularity and to their demand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MINER: — Almost 7,000 farmers have enjoyed the benefits of these programs. The Premier very ably demonstrated to this House that the government has enjoyed unequalled success in providing a climate within which young farmers can start farming and expect to succeed. Only a handful fail. By almost every measure possible, this government's agricultural programming is shown to be serving the needs of the farmers. In Saskatchewan we make it possible to become a farmer. Now that's a record of success and one I'm proud of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MINER: — Mr. Speaker, I bring these matters to the attention of this Assembly merely to point out that while my opponents in that by-election worked hard in their campaigns; their parties ran campaigns that were totally negative, opposed to most things, in favour of nothing, offering nothing as an alternative. What is even more

disappointing is that this opposition is based on misinformation, poorly researched information, or in some cases a misrepresentation of facts, either intentionally or through insufficient research.

Well, let's contrast that to the record of the Blakeney government. The Blakeney government has a strong record, especially on social issues. Following in the NDP tradition of medicare, this government has moved to provide a wide range of services needed by a variety of groups in our society.

The first area I'd like to discuss is the program for disabled persons. Mr. Speaker, 1980 is the United Nations International Year of Disabled Persons. The Government of Saskatchewan supports the objectives of the year which are to promote the integration of the disabled into the community and to work toward the prevention of disabling conditions. To that end, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Social Services has contributed \$127,000 to the Saskatchewan Committee of the International Year of the Disabled Persons. The provincial government is also providing financial support for the establishment of an institution for the prevention of handicaps.

A third recently announced grant of \$45,000 has been approved by the Saskatchewan Association of Rehabilitation Centres. The grant will be used to uncover and develop markets for the sale of items made by handicapped person in sheltered workshops and other activity centres.

Now, these programs are over and above the \$1.8 million that the Department of Social Services provides to help operate 28 sheltered workshops and activity centres for the benefit of over 1,240 handicapped persons. I am proud to say that this government is concerned about the special needs of all parts of our society and it transfers that concern into action.

The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation has a rural and native housing program. In addition to its main purpose of assisting families in smaller centres to obtain house, the program also involves local laborers and subcontractors.

The Human Resources Development Agency provides funds to a variety of native groups such as the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, the Metis Society and the Saskatchewan friendship centres.

The Department of Education provides grants to fund special-needs program. In addition there are a number of adult-upgrading and general interest courses offered through the community colleges program, another Government of Saskatchewan development, and through the Indian colleges affiliated with the two universities of Saskatchewan.

The Department of Social Services offers a number of services and funds programs for native people: native women's centres, employment support programs, alcohol commission rehabilitation and detoxification centres, family counselling services and child care.

Now, time doesn't permit me to list all of the programs that are available or that have been implemented by this government, but let's very quickly look at a few of them and the kinds of numbers of people who are enjoying their services: Saskatchewan Income Plan — 31,000 persons; senior citizens' tax rebate — 61,000; renters' rebate — 15,000; seniors' tax exemption — 64,000; the list goes on and on and on.

I have picked only a few examples of the kind of programs that the Blakeney government has participated in. It amounts to a new deal for people. Almost every group in society has benefited from some type of program aimed at gaining for people of Saskatchewan a fuller, richer life.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that the Government of Saskatchewan has been able to initiate these policies is because we have the resource revenues to fund them. There is only one reason that we have been able to collect these revenues and that is because of the leadership provided by this NDP government in resource ownership and development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MINER: — Saskatchewan's economy is booming. It is living proof of the success of Crown corporations and taxation aimed at those with the ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, Crown corporations like the potash corporation stay in Saskatchewan and earn profits for the people of Saskatchewan — \$116 million in profits in 1979-80 alone, and at that they paid \$63 million in taxes while paying the carrying costs on the capital debt of the initial investment of \$450 million. Now, that represents about a 25 per cent return on the province's investment, not to mention the province's improved equity position because of the increased value of the mines themselves.

The success story of potash is being repeated in oil. The people of Saskatchewan are also participating directly in the development of this critical resource through their own company. Last year SaskOil was the second highest driller in the province — 199 wells — and first in exploratory wells. The corporation is partner in heavy oil projects worth \$120 million, including a \$100 million joint exploration and development measure with Petro-Canada and Gulf Canada (which project benefits my own constituency).

In the last three years SaskOil has paid 46 per cent of its gross revenues or \$166 million to the province. But it's apparent that the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan doesn't want the people of Saskatchewan to have their own resources revenues. In their policy manual on energy, they stick to the old-line party rhetoric when they say that they want to aggressively encourage the oil industry, to give incentives, to consult with the resource industries and to achieve a fair level of royalties and taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but wonder what is that fair level of royalties and taxation that the Conservatives speak of. They have on numerous occasions said that we should tax our oil industry like Alberta. That would have meant that our province would have failed to collect over \$650 million in resource revenue to the end of 1979, and that is a cautious estimate. In other words, a Conservative government would have thrown the oil companies 1.5 times as much money as the NDP spent buying the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan doesn't need a Conservative resource giveaway, or any half-baked schemes of selling companies like SaskOil, or slashing company taxes. What the people need, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of government that they are getting in Saskatchewan of which they can be justifiably proud — an economic model over the last ten years that they can be very proud of, and one that they can look forward to continued prosperity as a result of.

Unemployment is low. Population is at an all time high. The provincial budget is balanced, and unlike the national economy, real economic growth is forecast for this province. all this transfers into opportunities for people. Mr. Speaker, this land is strong — strong because of the record of this government, strong because we propose, implement, and deliver programs for people, together with policies that ensure that there will be the money there to implement such programs.

The throne speech is yet another example of the high level of responsibility typical for this government. It is an excellent balance between battenning down the hatches of measures that exist while introducing measures to assure the people of this province continued access to a fair share of the benefits of this bounteous land.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the amendment, and there is no doubt that I will without hesitation support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to enter into the throne speech debate. I am pleased to have the opportunity to represent the constituency of Rosetown-Elrose and the find group of people who make up that constituency. Through the Celebrate Saskatchewan events this year I've had the opportunity to move around the constituency and to meet with many of my constituents. I've had an opportunity to share with them many of the concerns that they have and the concerns that I have about the operation of this province. I believe that it has been a good summer and has provided more opportunity for me to represent them in a better way. I would like to say that I've enjoyed the Celebrate Saskatchewan summer, and I believe that the constituents whom I represent will be served better because of it.

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the three new members to our Assembly. I'm sure that each of them has had a considerable amount of satisfaction from his significant win, his hard fought election. I welcome them here in this Chamber to begin to take in the operation of the government of this province. I hope that they are going to enjoy their portion as an elected MLA in this legislature.

I would like to say also that I enjoyed working with Bob Larter, the former member for Estevan, during the period that he was here. I was with some dismay that I heard the Premier in one breath say that Bob Larter had been a good member and that he had represented his constituency well, and in the next statement turn and tell the people of Saskatchewan that Bob Larter was not telling them the truth when he told his constituents that he resigned for health reasons.

Bob Larter has, for a considerable length of time, stated that his health was not good and that the health of his wife was not good as well, and that he wanted out. This was an opportune time for him to make that move and he made it, and he did make that move for health reasons. I want to assure the people of Saskatchewan that Bob Larter was not turfed out, as the Premier suggested, but rather he resigned because of family pressures and because of health. I would like to say that Bob Larter was a good member, one whom we enjoyed working with. We wish him well in his retirement years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: — I would like now to raise one particular item that has been of much concern in my constituency, one that I've brought forward in the legislature before, and one that has been taken to the Minister of Health. It is the need for a level 4 facility in the town of Rosetown.

The town of Rosetown has had, for some time, to take their level 4 patients, when they could get a bed available, either to Saskatoon or to Swift Current. Many times the facilities in both of those locations are filled and there is a long waiting list. You're not doubt aware that the district of Rosetown has been able to use a couple of level 4 beds in the hospital but that is really a pittance relative to what is needed. I would like to encourage the government to make a level 4 facility available to the town of Rosetown and to provide funds in this year's budget for that facility.

I would like, also, to renew my request to the Department of Highways and to the provincial highway system, for the road that links Riverhurst Ferry with the towns of Demaine and Beechy. This matter was brought forward to the Minister of Highways and to the Minister of Rural Affairs during the provincial convention of SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) last March. This road is needed as an access road to bring in the fuel supplies needed for the agricultural district. It's also the highway that would be the connecting link for people crossing on the Saskatchewan Landing bridge, travelling Highway No. 4 to the junction of Highway No. 342, and proceeding to follow Diefenbaker Lake in the recreation area through to the Riverhurst Ferry. We're not talking about a vast number of miles. But we are talking about an area that is very important to those communities. I would like to encourage the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Rural Affairs to consider this matter seriously and to provide funding for it in this year's budget.

I would like to now touch on a few agricultural items which are of interest to my constituency and, also, I believe, to the province as a whole. Irrigation is an item which I have raised a number of times in the last two years but I have had very little action from the government offices. This year, in the estimates, I raised with the Premier the need to proceed with the west-side irrigation project leading from Macrorie to Conquest and on north. At that time, the Premier indicated to me that, if I could come up with a list of at least 50 names of people who are interested in irrigation, he would seriously consider that project. Well, Mr. Premier, I have forwarded with the first list 106 names and with the additional list another 19 names for a total of 125. That's two and one-half times the number of people that you requested. I'm no waiting to receive further names from people who have contacted me by telephone.

I had a meeting with the Minister of Agriculture in late October. At that time, he indicated that he was seriously looking at the project and was considering a commitment to put water in the existing ditch. I thank him for looking at it at least that far, but that's not nearly enough. Perhaps, for this year, that's as far as we could expect to get. I would encourage the minister to indeed proceed to put water in that canal but, also, to look at expanding the irrigation project at a fairly steady pace so that the province of Saskatchewan will begin to make use of the natural resources that are ours, of the land that is there, and of the water that is there, so that in another drought situation like we faced this year, we will not have to go to Ontario or Alberta or Manitoba to buy the hay supplies that are needed for our livestock industry. Rather, these supplies would be available in the Outlook irrigation area or any other irrigation area in the province that is available close enough to water with land that is suitable to irrigate. I would encourage this government to make a more firm commitment to the agriculture industry and that irrigation be one of their early projects that will begin to break the

need for Saskatchewan to go outside its boundaries for fodder supplies to maintain a viable livestock industry.

This year has been a fairly short crop year in the district which I represent. Inflation has been running rampant with increases in interest rates, energy costs, cost of equipment, land taxes and almost every input which is needed to maintain the livestock and grain economy. I believe it is time that this government approach the federal government for ways of putting a stop to the inflationary trends which we are experiencing across Canada.

Just to add a little insult to injury, we read this week that Larry Kristjanson, the assistant chief commissioner of the wheat board, decided to take \$100 million that the wheat board is holding which belongs to farmers and put it into the addition to the Prince Rupert grain terminal, interest free. I believe this terminal may be needed. But I doubt that the wheat board has the right to take farmers' money and spend that money on a project which as really not been discussed with the farmers and using money which rightfully belongs to the farm people.

I think what the wheat board is doing is wrong and that the Government of Saskatchewan should be making every effort to see that the wheat board does not use money which should be paid out in the final payment to farmers for this purpose. If there is a need for the addition to the Prince Rupert grain terminal then I believe that money could be raised for that purpose. But if the terminal is to be a viable terminal, it should not need interest-free money. That kind of money is not available to me as a private individual. It's not available to the other businessmen in the communities of Saskatchewan. I don't believe it's need for a large consortium like the Prince Rupert terminal.

I'd like to raise the matter of the least increases for hay and pasture land which ranchers have experienced in the past three years. Just to give an example, one section of hay lease in 1978 cost \$248. In 1979 the same section of hay least cost \$900 and in 1980 it increased again to \$1,152. I believe that increases of this magnitude are going beyond the capability of the livestock industry to compete and to continue to survive in our province. In 1979 when cattle prices increased approximately 17 per cent, the lease rate increased by 232 per cent. How can Saskatchewan's livestock industry survive if the government of this province has this kind of attitude toward the industry? The livestock industry has been going through very difficult times. The government, to add to their difficulties, increases their lease by 232 per cent, a very unrealistic approach, in my opinion.

Over the pas number of years, there has been an ongoing debate with regard to the crowrate. We now hear the federal government say that it is their option, in their opinion, that it is time for change. They are looking at January 1 as a possible time for that change. The Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan is still saying, "No change in the crowrate." Perhaps that is a good stand but I wonder if it is a realistic stand. The three wheat pools in western provinces, meeting in an agriculture conference, suggested jointly that there is need for change. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, as it met as a delegate body this year in November, was moving away from what had been its long-time stand of no change in the crowrates to a position which would pretty much support the western conference move. This would suggest that they are ready to sit down and take a pretty hard look at some type of negotiation which would perhaps change the crowrate but retain the crowrate benefit for western farmers.

This is the policy that the Conservative government in Ottawa put forward during its short term in office, there was need for some change but the western farmers should retain the crow benefit. We were chastised time after time by the government opposite because the federal Conservative Party was doing just that. It is my opinion that, as the wheat pool sits down to discuss with the federal government and with the transportation authorities a change in the crow benefit, the government should get its head out of the sand and begin to look at something more realistic.

If the crowrate is the best thing, then after everybody sits down and looks at it, that is what we will end up with. If that is the decision, fine. But if the group sits down and makes the decision that the railway cannot continue to survive on the crowrate and provide any kind of service, if it decides that the federal government should pay a subsidy to the railways so that the farmers retain the crowrate benefit, then again I say that that's fine. I believe that is something which has been needed for a number of years.

It is interesting to note that this government, which has said, "No change in the crowrate," didn't hesitate to go out and buy 1,000 hopper cars and put them into service on the railways. But it is pretty hard to understand how you can do that and still say, "Maintain the crowrate," because you broke the crowrate the minute you moved away and purchased the hopper cars. This government, in my opinion, has already broken the crowrate, but it is still standing there with it's head in the sand saying, "no, retain the crowrate."

Gentlemen, I don't think you can have it both ways. Sometimes you must take a stand; you can't sand and straddle the fence forever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the area of special-care homes, and the provision of the service to our senior citizens. In our province we have a number of special-care homes and a number of different levels going from 1 to 3 in social services and moving on to level 4 in health. This has been a confusing system which has caused much concern to the residents in these homes.

If you are a level 1 person you must pay the complete cost of your care. If you are reclassified to level 2 the government provides some subsidy and the costs which the individual pays declines. So there is a clamour by residents to be reclassified to different levels. But perhaps more significant is the change which occurs if you are a level 3 resident and can be reclassified to level 4, and indeed find a bed in a level 4 facility. It is at this time that the complete cost of our care is covered by the Department of Health through MCIC.

In this province we have many people who are on waiting lists and who are unable to get into level 4 facilities. Because our residents are charged a fairly substantial fee to live in special-care homes, it doesn't take very long to reduce the money they have in their small savings accounts. These citizens then are cut back to the \$1,500 figure which the government recognizes as a nest egg that they must keep for burial expenses. At this time most of these people end up on social assistance. For many who have earned their way in their lifetime find this a degrading thing to have their life savings gone and to rely on the government for support.

In the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia and Manitoba, they have moved away

from the level of classification that we use. Instead they call them all special-care homes and each resident pays a flat room-and-board rate which can be covered by the old-age pension and supplement. I believe that if we could follow this example, we would provide our senior citizens with an opportunity to live in dignity through their declining years. I would encourage the Government of Saskatchewan to move in this direction and follow the example set by the other three western provinces. This would provide a more meaningful type of care for our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is running out. As you can understand from what I have said, I am not in support of the throne speech as presented by the government and I will not be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, it is nice to know that members opposite always look to my taking with great anticipation and I shall try not to let them down. Let me put it that way — if such a thing is possible.

I want to say that it is always a pleasure for me to represent Saskatoon Centre constituency and report to my constituents via the airways. I'm not going to get into the various details because I feel that an MLA can involve himself in details relative to his constituency outside the House and I will not spend my radio time on that; it will be a general talk.

First of all, I want to comment the three outgoing ministers, none of whom are here at this time. I found them to be good ministers, each working in his own way for the good of the department, for the good of this Assembly and for the good of the people of Saskatchewan. I also want to commend the three winners in the recent by-elections. I want to commend all three of them. I want to commend the hon. member for The Battlefords. I want to commend the hon. member for Estevan, and if I didn't tell him so before, I'll do it now publicly — what a tremendous victory it was. I also want to commend the hon. member for Kelsey-Tisdale. I know that his voice will be like a breath of fresh air coming from that side and it is something that is sorely needed, as has been demonstrated by members opposite over the last few days.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend a little time on something that has caused me great anxiety over the past few years and that is the Tory MLAs' constant belittling of our province. Mr. Speaker, Tory MLAs and their leader are always downgrading Saskatchewan. In fact, in a recent Tory pamphlet they referred to Saskatchewan as a second-rate province. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I thought the pamphlet was actually second-grade. It has poor grammar, poor punctuation and poor spelling. It was a second-rate pamphlet. If there is anything second-rate in the province, it's the pamphlet you people put out to the people of Saskatchewan. There it is there; I don't like that colour; could you take it away, please?

Mr. Speaker, we all know that a province is really its people. If the Tories classify Saskatchewan as a second-rate province, it logically follows that they think Saskatchewan citizens are second-rate too. They really believe that. I believe that they believe that. Mr. Speaker, New Democrats in this Legislative Assembly disagree with the Tories in that we believe that Saskatchewan citizens are first-class citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — We believe that Saskatchewan citizens are first-class citizens — they always were, they are, and they always will be. It is with this in mind that I ask Tory MLAs and their leader to publicly apologize for this slap in the face to our good citizens. An apology would be quite in order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our senior citizens worked hard in the past; they do not like being called second-class. Our present community leaders are not second-class as the Tories would suggest. Our farmers and our homemakers and our professional people and our youth are not second-class; they are first-class, Mr. Speaker, just as our business people are first-class.

Mr. Speaker, I want the good citizens of this province to remember this Tory tactic of ignoring the tremendous task our citizens tackled in the past — a task which has materialized into Saskatchewan's having become what many leading economists and socially conscious people (and even the news media the odd time) have termed the Cinderella story of the century.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Put another way, Mr. Speaker, experts from all walks of life in Canada claim that Saskatchewan has come a long way and that it has the best future of any province in Canada. I refer you to recent statements put out by the board of trade and the chamber of commerce which all attest to that fact.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this the result of the activities of second-class citizens, as Tories suggest? No, it is a result of our people having a sense of purpose and translating that sense of purpose into action. So I say to Tory members opposite, give our citizens the credit which they so richly deserve. If you can't, at least be silent. If you owe no loyalty to our citizens, at least owe loyalty to common decency, the kind of common decency for which the citizens of this province are well-known and rightly proud.

Related to this desire on the part of the Tories to belittle our citizens, there always seems to be a desire to compare Saskatchewan to Alberta. Now I will be the last person in this Assembly to condemn Alberta, for she knows what she wants and has. But I say to Tory MLAs opposite and their leader, who is not here today (and I wonder why), if you find Saskatchewan so distasteful why don't you move to Alberta as our urge others to do.

Now it is true Alberta has many things we do not have in our province. Alberta has 85 per cent of Canada's oil and has many wonderful people. These are desirable things. But do we want some of the other things Alberta has? Do we want the wheeler-dealer type of mentality so prevalent in the Alberta business community? Do we want the sacrificing of the solving of social problems so prevalent in Calgary and Edmonton? Do we want the family break-up capital of Canada moved from Calgary to a Saskatchewan city? No, I am sure we don't. Do we want the strikes which have plagued Alberta lately — some of them greatly affecting the schooling of their youth? Do we want the high crime rate which plagues Alberta? Do we want the separatist movement to gain the momentum in Saskatchewan which it has attained in Alberta? Do we want the various programs we have in Saskatchewan, or do we want them to be non-existent as in Alberta — programs such as the school dental care program, the lowest auto insurance, no premiums for medicare, as opposed to Alberta where they can reach up to \$200 per family per year? I see there is great agitation on the other side. Well I will tell

you one thing — yes, you will find insurance companies which will insure at a lower rate, but they are very selective as to whom they will insure. that's not so in this province.

Mr. Speaker, if Tory MLAs opposite want a resource giveaway to the huge multinational corporations, as in Alberta, then I feel sorry for them because they have misjudged the desires of our people.

No, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan want to go our own way, but in a united Canada. Let the Tories . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Thank you for the applause, members opposite. Let the Tories go their own way while the people of Saskatchewan, and this government, go the proper way — the Saskatchewan way.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask Tory members opposite why it is they never mention the fact that last year while approximately 12,000 Saskatchewan citizens left for Alberta, almost 11,000 people from Alberta left for Saskatchewan? In this regard, I am quoting from a recent article in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* that most prestigious of papers, the best daily paper in Saskatoon, which I have no doubt quoted Statistics Canada.

Mr. Speaker, should any Tory hereinafter belittle our great province, I know the people will register their wrath at the next election, which I predict will see all of the Tory MLAs lose their seats with the possible exception of one or two (and yes, I could even mean you). We in this great province will not tolerate those who would tear this province apart — valid criticism, yes, but Tory belittling, no!

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to another concern now. I want to bring to the attention of this Assembly something that pertains to a recent statement by the Tory leader wherein in his usual negative style he talked to a certain group of citizens and more or less told them that for every one of them there was someone receiving assistance (and I believe it was in that tone of voice). I thin he used the figure 67,000. At least that was the figure quoted to me by at last one member of his audience, one among many who were sickened by his hopeless desire to pit one segment of society against another.

What he did not mention, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that when he quoted the figure of 67,000 on assistance, he failed to mention that the figure includes those in nursing homes — as if our senior citizens in these homes are there by choice. What he failed to mention was that this figure included the handicapped, as if they are responsible for their condition. He also failed to mention that this figure included the many fine, single-parent adults who are trying to raise their children under difficult circumstances.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the leader of the Tory party wants to condemn the aged, the handicapped and the unfortunate — if he wants them to become the scapegoats in his scheme to pit citizen against citizen — then I say it is on his conscience and he must live with it. And if Tory MLAs do not disassociate themselves from their leader's vile and vicious remarks, then they too must live with this car on their consciences. I know they are all conscionable people and that they will not agree with their leader. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that some Tory MLAs do not condone such a despicable practice, and I look forward to a baring of the soul on their part in the near future, condemning this tragic incident, this anti-Saskatchewan, this unCanadian, and morally despicable . . .

Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend a few minutes on the remarks made yesterday in this Assembly by the Leader of the Unionist Party who is not in his seat at this time — the ex-leader of the Conservative Party, the member for Nipawin . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I do believe that he really is the leader, but not in name. Yes, he is their spiritual leader. We all accept that, and the people of Saskatchewan know that. It would seem to me that he too, has caught the Tory fever of downgrading our province. In fact, he thinks big, and so he downgrades Canada right from coast to coast. I would like his seatmate to relay that to him, wherever he is.

Now, I have no quarrel with anyone who suggest there are many ways in which Canada can be improved. In fact, we in western Canada know, and as a premier of this province has often stated, that one way of improving Canada is to give western Canada a fair deal — a deal wherein we can mature economically, culturally and socially within a united Canada. But Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I am not able to comprehend how the ex-Conservative leader is able to say during these troubled times for Canada, ‘Canada, I’ve done reasonably well here, but it’s a little rough going now so I’m going to suggest that we throw out a towline and ask to be towed by the United States.’

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that Canadians do not have the sense or the will to solve their problems is to suggest that our forefathers, and those who shed their blood for this country, sacrificed in vain. This, I can’t accept, and I know that most members in this House cannot accept it.

The ex-Conservative leader suggested Canada and Canadians have drastically changed over the past one or two decades, relative to their long-term desires and goals. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is not so much Canada that has changed, but rather the ex-Conservative has changed and that he has done in a political sense and in an allegiance sense and in a moral sense.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one (whose ancestors came from Europe), do not intend to turn my back on Canada. I intend to stay here and I intend to stay here all years round. I might add — and do my small bit to right the wrongs which we in western Canada feel we have been subject to. I, for one (on the strength of what I know the citizens of Saskatoon Centre constituency would want me to do), intend to back our Premier in his desire to work for a better united Canada, with western provinces receiving the recognition and consideration which we must secure from the ivory tower Trudeau regime which, at present, seems to represent central Canada and central Canada alone.

And so I urge the ex-Conservative leader or the present Conservative leader (I could never distinguish between the two) not to throw in the towel but to fight for the corrections which he thinks will get this country working harmoniously.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend just a minute or two urging the minister responsible that rent controls be maintained in Saskatoon and Regina. I know that consideration might be given in the near future to their removal. I urge that they not be removed.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that my time is up radio-wise — in fact I’m a little past it, and I can see that members opposite cannot wait to give me the thunderous applause which they obviously think I deserve.

I certainly will be opposing the amendment, Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting the motion. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here. It is both a serious responsibility and a great privilege for me to be able to add a few comments to the debate on behalf of the fine folks in the Estevan constituency.

I want to acknowledge the warm words of welcome which have been expressed to me by the other members of the Assembly. I also want to thank all of the members of this Assembly for their courtesy in speeding up the process whereby I could take my seat so soon after the by-election, so that I could get on with the job on behalf of the people of the Estevan constituency.

I join with other members in congratulating my fellow rookie members: my colleague, the member for The Battlefords, who was such an enviably handy winner on November 26, and the new member for the Kelsey-Tisdale constituency. I also want to tell the members from Yorkton and Assiniboia that I was impressed with their fine contribution to this debate. Their points were well made, and some I'm certain (after listening to the Leader of the Opposition), bear repeating, because they were substantive both in quality and in quantity.

In taking my place, I first want to acknowledge the contribution made by my predecessor, Mr. Larter. I know that he was a vigorous member of this Assembly and of its committees. Most of the folks at home considered him an approachable and a very congenial representatives. These aspects of Mr. Larter's contribution I hope to copy. I know that members opposite, from time to time, may also want to consider their importance in the nature of things political.

Secondly, I want to thank the people of Estevan constituency for sending me on November 26 to represent them in this Assembly. I will do my best to represent all of the people of our area, and to make the opinions of Saskatchewan's energy capital known in the government of Premier Allan Blakeney — a government with an outstanding record of accomplishments that contributed in no small way to my being here in this Assembly today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I want to thank again all those people in my constituency who worked so hard to help me get here. It's not unusual also in the by-election campaigns, I gather for other members of this Assembly to suit up and knock on doors on behalf of the candidate of their choice. I know that many of the members of this side — my new colleagues — exactly did that, with some apparent success, Mr. Speaker, for which I am heartily thankful to each one on this side of the House. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the speech by His Honour, Mr. McIntosh, addressed a couple of issues that received a fair bit of attention in the Estevan by-election. I want to comment on those issues, the manner in which they are being approached by our Premier and our government, and I may even have a comment or two on the approach taken by others, particularly in the campaign. I refer to the matter of continuing discussions about the constitutional reform in Canada. I also want to refer to the issues surrounding resource

ownership, control, taxation and development both from the perspective of those things we have done and are doing here in Saskatchewan, and from the perspective of those things that the government of Ottawa ought to be doing.

First I want to deal with the matter of the discussions about the reform of the constitution in our election campaign. Mr. Speaker, I'm no constitutional expert, nor have I had the exposure that so many of my colleagues have had — exposure to the articulate and the informed explanations of the issues by two so capable in this area as our Attorney General and our Premier. But I have been an interested observer, Mr. Speaker, and I followed this issue just as many interested taxpayers have. And I must say that I agree with a good deal of the independent evaluation of our government's performance — evaluations like that offered by the May 1 *Leader-Post* when it offered the opinion:

Premier Blakeney has brought our province a sense of stature, dignity and credibility that appears lacking in others in similar offices across this land.

The evaluation of the *Star-Phoenix* on October 27 said:

Premier Blakeney actually demonstrated his ability to rise to a higher level on constitutional matters than any of the other western provinces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — And they went on to say:

Saskatchewan has already reaped the rewards from this position.

Tories, Mr. Speaker, may be tired of hearing those lines. They figured prominently in our campaign literature. I am repeating them because they reflect how I feel about this issue.

Looking at the Tory line in the campaign, what the Liberals were saying, what we were saying, and looking at the outcome, I believe the people of Estevan constituency said that they wanted no part at all of the kind of rhetoric that's going to feed the kind of frightening development we see today in Alberta. I believe the results endorsed the view which recognizes that one of the greatest strengths of our country is in its diversity; that our country was built, has grown strong and flourished on accommodation and compromise; that our country can't work as a centralized state, nor can it survive as 10 warring principalities.

I believe the results in Estevan also endorsed the view that we need to take responsible actions which will preserve the essence of Canada, a truly federal state, grounded in our unique regions and cultural diversity, secure in the division of our powers, in our concern for the national welfare and in our ability, as one nation, to protect our heritage and share it among all Canadians. What the people of the Estevan constituency, Mr. Speaker, rejected in no unquestionable fashion was a stance that is a mere stone's throw away from a siren call to bust up our country.

We are pledged to continue to press for changes in federal policies. We are going about it in a reasonable and responsible manner. We are doing so because the cost of failure is too great to abandon negotiation. We are doing it because we believe in a free and united Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I support what our government is doing and I believe the people of the Estevan constituency support what I am doing.

I want to make a few comments about the development of our resources in the province of Saskatchewan. The policy decisions in this area have set this government and the opposition, whether Liberal or Tory, apart from each other more clearly than in any other area of public policy.

Nothing demonstrates this fact more dramatically than a few basic figures. In 1971, when the Blakeney government came to office, the province was receiving roughly \$32 million in non-renewable resource revenue. Last year the figure wasn't \$32 million; it was more like \$569 million — a seventeenfold increase.

Now, I know that some of the members would like to chalk that up to the fact that oil prices, increased dramatically and that it was no doing of this government. Well, they can try to do that but it would be a complete misrepresentation of the facts.

First, a good deal of the increase that has come about because this government decided the people, as the owners of the resource, deserve a better return. And a better return was claimed for us from potash, uranium, coal, and yes, our oil. When the government moved to collect this better return, the Liberals and Conservatives fought bitterly against the moves — particularly regarding potash and oil.

In 1976-77 the people opposite were saying that we should tax our oil like they do in Alberta. Had we taken their advice we would have lost a minimum of \$650 million in revenue to the end of 1979. That is \$650 million that would have gone to the oil companies (mostly to the majors) without any guarantee that Saskatchewan would have had one more foot of drilling done here at home, without any guarantee that one more dollar would have been spent on research into the technology required to get our enormous known supplied of heavy oil out of the ground and upgraded to the more readily marketable crude.

Jack Messer and his colleagues of the day deserve our compliments for sticking to their guns and putting in place a tax regime that gives us a fair return. I know from experience in my home area that they took some political lumps for their actions. They deserve our compliments for moving and putting in place a drilling incentive program and development agreements providing rebates tied to exploration and development work actually performed.

The fact that these programs have worked is demonstrated by the activity in the oil patch — across the province and in the southeast area where I come from. You'd never believe it if you listened to the totally unsubstantiated statements of the people opposite, both here and on the hustings, but there are some simple basic facts that prove these programs have worked.

Drilling activity in 1979 in the province was third on the all-time list for the number of wells drilled — 1,275 well. In 1980, up to October 10, the number of wells drilled was 138. that was ahead of the same period in 1979.

Let's take a further update on the facts of the oil patch activity in southeast

Saskatchewan. Yesterday's *Leader-Post*, December 2, 1980:

Southeast Saskatchewan's 'oil patch' is a hive of activity. Estevan has seen an increase in the number of drilling rigs servicing the area. On the average Estevan ran about 5 rigs. Currently there are 11 rigs drilling on sites and 2 more coming into the area with 33 licensed locations waiting to be drilled.

That may sound like a disaster to the doom-and-gloom boys, but it sounds like a success story to me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — The people in our area know it's a success story. They said so when they rejected the outlandish claims made by the Conservative leader from Saskatoon in the campaign.

People familiar with our area know about the enhanced-recovery pilot project in the Willmar oil field 30 miles east of Estevan and the potential it has of adding 400 million barrels of production to southeast oil fields if the techniques for recovery are proven up. People familiar with our area know that Dome Petroleum is in the process of constructing an ethane extraction facility at the Steelman gas plant 20 miles northeast of Estevan at a cost of some \$11 million. They are also aware of plans for further improvements to the tune of about another \$6 million.

I recognize it may have been expecting a bit too much of the Conservative candidate in Estevan to be fully conversant with these facts but I know the people who are. And they were simply amazed when he and his people were going about describing our situation as second-rate and trying to convince people that the oil patch had dried up and disappeared. Again, they rejected such outlandish claims.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people in my area, I want to welcome the November 20 announcement made by the Attorney General which will improve the situation for constituents of mine involved in the Saskatchewan Surface Rights Association. Our Attorney General announced he will introduce a number of changes, most important of which are more stringent abandonment procedures by oil companies withdrawing equipment from leased land, the reduction of the time period between surface lease renewals to three years from five years, and one of a number of alternatives to deal with the problem of caveats on land which has been or is under surface lease.

The announcements were well received by the southeast Saskatchewan surface holders' meeting. Mr. Bob Kohaly, the association's lawyer, stated he was very impressed with the progress made. Mr. Speaker, the announcements by our Attorney General will go a long way in meeting the concerns of my constituents in their lease-holding problems. I'm certain, as well, that other members like my colleagues from Shaunavon and from Lloydminster will find folks in their area as receptive as they were in the Estevan constituency.

I also want to encourage the government to pursue vigorously the potential for deep oil discovery in our area. It is important from the point of view of future oil security and

from the perspective of the continued high activity of the industry in our area that consideration be given to the level of incentives that we are providing for this type of exploration activity. We need, also, to look closely at encouraging investment in tertiary recovery through incentives in our own programs and by making the strongest case we possibly can to the federal government in respect to achieving adequate pricing arrangements for oil recovered through this type of activity.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my representations in this regard will be taken seriously by our government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — What we need is a solid effort by all members of this Assembly to see to it that our representations in respect to oil taxation and pricing policy are heeded by the government in Ottawa. I believe it's incumbent on all members to take this matter seriously. We need to examine the Saskatchewan situation, not the Alberta or the Arizona or the Montana situation, and make positive proposals which deal with our situation and which at the same time provide a good deal for the future of all Canadians where security of supply and the right to make our own decisions about our own resources are respected.

Mr. Speaker, the national energy program announced in the recent Mr. Trudeau budget has serious shortcomings. Unchanged it is unacceptable to us. If there is hope that change can be achieved which will serve our interests. I'm confident we couldn't have had a more capable team working for that change than Premier Blakeney and our Attorney General. I'm also confident that the people of the Estevan constituency would support that view.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that the member for Souris-Cannington is not in the House at this time. But let me in my concluding remarks bring some substantive, fresh information to support the government statement in the throne speech noting the sustained growth and prosperity of the province of Saskatchewan and, in particular, information on the vitality and the vital activity in my constituency — the use of lignite coal for the production of electrical energy in a thermal electric power station. This is the success story of the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Saskatchewan Power Corporation's use of lignite coal in electrical generation, developed by some 3,112 dedicated and hard-working electric and gas utility employees, has been looked at by a number of electric utility people in North America. These included electric utility people from Texas, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario and from as far away as Greece and Germany. Private profit-oriented electric utility people have come to Saskatchewan from Alberta, from Montana, from North Dakota, from Minnesota and from Texas to look at our success in the burning of lignite coal for power generation.

This success has enabled the establishment in my constituency of two major private coal companies with some five major operations. Included in that list of major operations is a coal company operating solely to supply lignite coal to the province of Ontario for Ontario Hydro's Thunder Bay thermal power station. Ontario Hydro has

invested in two major lignite thermal power stations based on the availability of Saskatchewan lignite and our success in burning lignite.

All of this activity has seen major capital investment in the coal industry in the constituency: new terminal facilities to load out for a rail shipment some 1.7 million tonnes annually; three new draglines, two of a 45 cubic metre capacity and one of an 83 cubic metre capacity, and much ancillary equipment such as 100 ton-trucks. These opportunities and developments, Mr. Speaker, in no small way were made possible by the technological developments and the operating techniques pioneered by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation employees, both past and present.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Lignite coal production in the province of Saskatchewan continues to show a sustained growth: in 1978, 5,029 million tonnes and in 1979, 5.115 million tonnes. The SPC Boundary Dam lignite fired thermal power station in meeting some 60 per cent of the province's electrical energy needs in 1979 consumed 4.34 million tonnes. To the date of November 30, 1980 the station has consumed some 4.04 million tonnes and is well on the way to breaking the records.

Mr. Speaker, it indeed is a privilege to represent a constituency which has within its boundaries a major energy source in lignite coal and to have had the privilege and opportunity of employment in that industry: some 18 years in the operation of a lignite fired power station and the past 10 years in the leadership of the operations.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity today to comment at some length about the issue of constitutional reform and about resource development and energy issues. Both of these subjects were highlighted in the by-election campaign we have just been through in Estevan. The people of the Estevan constituency delivered a message on November 26 and I have tried to convey that message to you and to the members of this Assembly to the best of my ability.

Agricultural issues, too, were discussed in that campaign. While I seek another occasion to comment more fully on the question concerning our province's number one industry, I do want to take this opportunity to point out to the opposition that they trotted out their complete program on agriculture in the campaign and they highlighted it. We were fortunate to have Mr. MacMurchy, the Minister of Agriculture, come in to our campaign and pitch in his story of the New Democratic Party government on agriculture. The outcome on election night was that the 1,700 vote lead with which the Tory candidate entered the campaign was chewed up in rural poll after rural pool and that, Mr. Speaker, is another message that needs to be delivered.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the message I bring on behalf of the people of Estevan can be summarized:

1. The people of our area have confidence in our area, our province and our country;
2. The people of our area have confidence in the leadership of Allan Blakeney;
3. They have confidence in this government's ability to lead this province into the '80s and to contribute positively to the problems that beset our nation.

I, too, sir, have that confidence and I will oppose the amendment to the adoption of the throne speech and I will be proud to vote for the motion moved by the member for Yorkton.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, let me first congratulate the three new members in the House on their wins last week.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that part of my address is aimed at a member who chose not to be here today. But as the rules of the Assembly allow us only so often and at certain times to speak, I will address them to see if he is capable of replying to them later.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak on the throne speech. Being a member who has sat through some of the speeches, I am not sure if the government knows the truth from fiction. I have hard story after story told which resembles a fair tale rather than facts. We had a long dissertation by the Premier, who seems to live in a world of fairyland of late and it seems as though the Premier's sense of reality is somewhat foggy. The Premier is developing a loss of memory for what he does not appreciate, or know to be facts which he does not like.

The Attorney General is developing another new image. He is developing into a man whose only concern is his image — not the rights and the freedoms of the people of Saskatchewan, of which he is the Attorney General and is supposed to protect.

In my constituency I see the Attorney General calling people reactionaries and other things because they do not agree with him. I look at the *Star-Phoenix*, November 28, 1980, where the Attorney General says the people are reactionaries because in a vote 1,200 people voted against what he wanted and only 200 people agreed with what the Attorney General wanted. Therefore, the Attorney General calls them reactionaries.

The Attorney General reminds me sometimes of the boy who brought the football to the game and because he couldn't be quarterback and because he couldn't spell out all the rules, he took his ball and went home. That is the kind of Attorney General we have developing.

It is interesting to note that quite often it is the Attorney General who does not agree with the majority — for example, the Supreme Court of Canada. In fact, the Premier was in that same boat and was challenging people. But, yet, when you don't agree with him you are a reactionary. When you do agree with him, you are right. It's a one-way street with that gentleman and it is a one-way street with your government.

To the Attorney General, as I have said once before in this House — be a man, admit your mistakes, and correct them. To this point he has not been man enough to stand in this House and correct an error which was made. Rather than correct his mistake, he keeps making comments using his high office in this Assembly, and rather than doing his job as the Attorney General he keeps playing games. The Meewasin Valley Authority (MVA) might have been well received if it had been properly designed and presented in the first place. But the truth is it wasn't.

The members sit in their seats and yell, “Are you opposed? Are you in favour?” Let’s talk about democracy. There was a vote in the R.M. of Corman Park. Do or do not the citizens of Corman Park want to partake in the MVA? The decision was clear. If you birds can’t understand it, it’s about time you had your ears cleaned out and your minds straightened out too. Twelve hundred votes to two. You know what that means — you lost. Now smarten up and straighten it out.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How did you vote?

MR. KATZMAN: — How did I vote? Let me tell you how I voted. I stood up and said I made a mistake, but you birds haven’t got the guts to do it. Now start smartening up.

There are certain rights this country has given us and one is the freedom of ownership. MVA is a good example of the strange twist which we see with your government. When it comes to putting caveats on peoples’ land, which is a very sensitive and emotional issue because of the freedom associated with land, you are very quick to arrange for them to be put on. When it comes to taking the caveats off, you are very slow. Some are still on the land one years later — one years after you promised to remove them. We passed legislation in this Chamber to remove them and you still haven’t done it. Do you call that a government which is concerned with the people?

It is unfortunate, but the way this government works . . . Especially the Attorney General — if he doesn’t like what you are doing he will show it and try to challenge you and attack you personally. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the member for Saskatoon Riversdale cannot be here today. I wish he were.

Mr. Speaker, today we see a situation in Poland which is very interesting . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . “What does that have to do with Saskatoon?” the member asks from his seat. Just listen. We see a union — called Solidarity — in a socialist country trying to ask that they not be tied to the political party of that country. Now we see threats coming from that government; if they do not knuckle under and realize that the union is the servant of the Communist Party, then the Communist Party will make arrangements to have that union taken over by force if necessary.

It is one of the first countries where the workers have rebelled against what is considered to be a socialist party in control, a party which is not really for the betterment of the people but for the betterment of the hierarchy of the socialist party.

Sometimes I think I can compare the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan, because it is not the unions in this province which need the NDP but the NDP which needs the unions. It is interesting to watch as they cater, kiss and bow to the management of the unions while ignoring and forgetting the needs and concerns of the general membership.

On that point, I will look at the Premier’s speech — page 82 of *Hansard* — where he makes comments about prior to 1971. Let me tell the Premier (and I am certain all you birds over there can repeat it to him) the game was that he went to every union in this province and said, “We need money to fight the government.” He wanted to deduct it off their dues. Some unions said, “No.” So what did they do? They made a deal with their friends in the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor to hide it in the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor checkoff. You birds need the union more than they need you.

You know, it is interesting to note — I always thought it was 15 cents (but the Minister of

Labor tells us in the House that it is now 25 cents every payday) off the employees toward your party. You don't even show it. You know, there is an old story which says, "He who pays the piper calls the tune." But unfortunately, it is Larry Brown and the boys in the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor who call the tune, not the average union membership of this province.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to represent the people of Rosthern since 1975. They are hard-working people. The citizens wish that the big brother government would stay out of their lives as much as possible. They pay their taxes. They do their neighbourly things and they wish to be left alone. The member for Biggar who, I guess, is away again, also represents a rural constituency where some of the people are affected by the MVA. They have had a lot to say, but it is unfortunate that that member is unwilling to stand up in this Assembly to voice the concerns of the people in that area.

Let me get back to the area for which I am the critic, the Department of Labor and the Department of Government Services. First of all, I am expecting a change in cabinet ministers in those portfolios. I think it is going to be enjoyable to get the man who calls "wolf" in the position to see what he does there. The member, who is better known as the man who calls "wolf," is the present Minister of Municipal Affairs. All of you who have been here since 1975 or earlier know how often he has called "wolf" and has not backed up his statements. The man leaving the Department of Labor has developed some reputation for being fairly fair, even though he occasionally lost his temper in this House. He has gained respect from most of the union people as being fair. I am going to miss him if he is removed from that post. You know, the minister who may take his place, I think, like to scrap a lot more. It would be a lot more fun to put him in his place.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the unions and management get to the table rapidly to resolve their disagreements. A prime example is the question asked by the member for Wilkie today when he spoke about the liquor strike. We all know the contact finished last March. The Trade Union Act says in section 33(4) that:

Not less than 30 days and not more than 60 days before the expiry date of an agreement, notice should be given so that both parties begin to negotiate.

They are supposed to start negotiating as quickly as possible. But that is not what has developed. The Department of Labor has idly sat by while Rome burned and the people suffer. They allow them to delay. You know, I have just been tempted to start my whole speech over again. The Attorney General has just arrived. It is interesting to note that the member for Regina North-West, who sits at his place as the forgotten man and will be forgotten when the cabinet changes come, has a lot to say from his seat.

The Trade Union Act suggest they should be getting to the bargaining tables so negotiate. Maybe it is time the government and the labor department made sure that that area was covered and that they got to the table. Therefore, we would have fewer disputes and fewer problems.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why are you PCs against the Meewasin Valley Authority, Ralph?

MR. KATZMAN: — I am glad to hear the Attorney General back in his chair. Thank you, Mr. Attorney General. We were just missing your normal catcalls from your seat. Any member of this Assembly that has the right to call people reactionaries and use his high office to take his own personal . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. You said it. When 400 people out of 1200 people don't agree with you, you say they're reactionary,

they're not right. That's what you say. They are right. You're wrong. It's time you smartened up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — You know, Mr. Speaker, it's always great to have the Attorney General in his seat, because he always likes to change feet, you know, puts one . . . He stands up and says the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority) in Saskatoon . . . The people of Saskatoon will tell us what they want to do with the MVA. the people of Corman Park have told you what they want and if you can't separate the two things, Mr. Attorney General, you're in terrible trouble, because your mind seems to be bent so that you can't separate the two.

Mr. Romanow asks how come I voted for the bill. You know, Mr. Attorney General, I was man enough to stand up here and say I made an error. You haven't been man enough to do that yet. It's about time you do it!

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Government Services is another area which I have been the critic for. It seems that the Department of Government Services absorbs expenses on behalf of other departments and nobody really knows what the true costs are, because many of the costs are hidden in other departments. It is time to start streamlining government, making it more efficient and thereby saving money in many areas.

For example, the officer of the Premier seems to be growing at an incredible rate. I think only Prime Minister Trudeau's office grew faster. I watch them take up more and more space in the Legislative Building every year. The apartment of the Attorney General seems to be wanting to compete with the Premier's office and the funds could be better used to improve social programs, for example, medicare.

I would like to refer to a quote from Tommy Douglas, and I think you all know that gentleman. On August 17, 1979, the day following the death of the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker, in a column written by Mr. Douglas, which was published all over Ontario and other parts of Canada, he comments about medicare and Mr. Diefenbaker. In his comments (and I will paraphrase them) he says that if it wasn't for Mr. Diefenbaker medicare would not have lasted. That's Tommy Douglas that says it — not me. Tommy Douglas, your former leader, admits under his by-line that if it hadn't been for John Diefenbaker, medicare would have folded in this province. That's a fact. You guys won't argue that one. And Tommy Douglas said it. It reminds me of the last election after which the Premier said that you say anything you want to win an election, when he was interviewed by the press on his statement on medicare.

We hear from the Attorney General, the man who talks from his seat, about saying one thing and doing another. Well, he is the prime exhibitor of that idea. He does it better than anybody.

You know, Mr. Attorney General, you'll get your time to speak in this House. If you would like to speak, just let me know. We can arrange for that. I won't be going very long, Mr. Attorney General. We can arrange to have you go. If you would like you could make an amendment, Mr. Attorney General, so that I can come back and kick the tar out of you as you deserve.

Ceilings — you don't have any. Mr. Speaker, medicare needs more funds. We need more beds in the province. We need an input of funds to look after those who are

requiring medicare. We need more beds open, and that is important. We should be streamlining government in many areas to release more funds for social programs and for social needs — for example, medicare, level 2, level 3 and so forth. You know it was interesting to note in this House last years, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Kinistino made comments to the member for Rosetown-Elrose which referred to people who needed assistance, by saying that the government wasn't interest in helping them and that the member should personally help them. Is that what you call a government which shows concern? I do not think so.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the years have allowed the NDP time to brainwash the people of the province, slowly and methodically, in many different areas. We look at the school system now where we teach one form of business practice and ignore all other alternatives. Something is wrong when this happens, Mr. Speaker. I have always thought to be fair and impartial you give all the people all the options and not just the ones that you favour. On that point let me refer to the Minister of Agriculture who is reported to have said to his employees, "From now on you only speak the way the government wants you to speak. You have no personal feelings and no personal thoughts." You know that once again reminds me of Poland and the fight that the Solidarity union is having to be allowed freedoms, and once again, we slowly see the freedoms of the civil servants taken away by the political members of the government.

Mr. Speaker, one thing which has not been addressed, and let me address it before I wind up my statement, is Canada. (. . . inaudible interjection . . .) Roy, if the separatists offered you the leadership you'd take it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Let me comment that the fathers and forefathers of many of us here came from other countries for freedom. We are a melting pot. Mr. Speaker, as I said, the people came here for freedom of choice, freedom of ideas and to a country that offered many different opportunities. Let me suggest that they came to Canada, not to Alberta, not to Ontario, not to Saskatchewan, not to Quebec — but to Canada. They came to Canada because that was the country which offered them an opportunity within its provinces. It's unfortunate that today we now have a problem called separatists. And what do they want? I'm afraid they want more than our forefathers asked for. Our forefathers asked for the right to have a free country and to share with our neighbours, not be dominated by our neighbours. It is time that the Premier stands up and says, "We don't mind a share but we don't want to be dominated by any part of the country."

The truth is, Mr. Attorney General, on the constitution I have yet to hear anybody who would complain if it were brought home with only one change. The change is that it's brought from the U.K. to Canada and all 10 provinces and the federal government have to agree to changes. That's what every body really wants. But you play games with your friends, Pierre Trudeau and Company . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Attorney General, you're a lawyer. You've been at the conferences, You want to play with words. Let me give you this comment. If you don't give you're good enough to negotiate for the betterment of Saskatchewan, resign. We'll take the government and do it for you, because you sure don't seem to know how to do it.

Mr. Speaker, on that comment, I will suggest that the statements made in the moving of the speech come from a fairyland and are fiction. It is time we serve reality. Therefore, I cannot support the motion. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is time we all get serious and correct the problems instead of talking. I thank you for the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter this debate but, after listening to previous speakers on both sides of the House, one gets the urge and the desire to take part in placing a few facts before you to keep the record straight, fully realizing at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that I am not as entertaining to listen to as some members. However, on this, the 75th birthday of our province, I believe all of us should take part on this special occasion, on any opportunity we have, to help promote and celebrate the birthday of our province, of which we are all very proud. So, Mr. Speaker, as I will have further remarks to make at a later date, I now beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Point of Order on Question Period

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order which I would like to raise. I maybe should have brought it up immediately but I am afraid I was caught off guard by the different schedule today because of the radio time.

Mr. Speaker, for the second day in a row rather unusual occurrences have taken place in the question period. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, nine minutes were monopolized by a government member on a matter which I think, had one of us attempted to raise it, would have been ruled out of order very quickly by you. Fine, that happened and those things do occur because of the nature of the member. But, Mr. Speaker, today there was a similar occurrence when you recognized a government member in what is traditionally opposition time. Again, seven to eight minutes of the question period were used.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest to you today that the preamble allowed to the member for Regina North-West would not have been permitted to any member on this side of the House. I would like to ask you, on this point of order, is this going to become a common occurrence? If the government is going to put up this charade of having backbenchers pose questions to cabinet ministers in the Assembly, at a time which traditionally belongs to the opposition, obviously we need some change in the rules. I ask your consideration in this matter because, as you can tell, when it happens at that time there are very tense feelings on this side of the House. I ask you to consider the matter because these feeling are not necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am pleased the member has brought this to the attention of the House. It is difficult to tell what is important and what is unimportant. Yesterday was mentioned by the member for Thunder Creek. Possibly the introduction the member for Thunder Creek made of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday was frivolous. Some people may have thought it was serious. Possibly the member for Thunder Creek thought the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland was frivolous or had a subject which was not within the purview of the House. Those thoughts occur on both sides of the House.

I found the question from the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland to be a question properly directed to the members of the government, although I found the comments to be a bit long.

Now to deal directly with today. The member for Thunder Creek mentions the member for Regina North-West and the length of his preamble. It is good that there is somebody here who recognizes the length of a preamble as being too long. I already conveyed my views to the member for Regina North-West that the reason he was cut off in the question period was that he took too long and it sounded too much like a speech. I also remarked to him that I had done the same thing to the member for Thunder Creek today. I cut him off because he was too long in getting out his question.

While I am on my feet, I want to compliment the member for Kelsey-Tisdale in putting his question. I think he is learning fast in this Chamber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — He is learning from the people who are here that his questions can't be too long and that they must be to the point and succinct. I must compliment him on his question today because I thought he did it very well.

MOTION Radio Time

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Romanow:

That by leave of the Assembly the decision of division of radio time arranged for the current session be referred to the select standing committee on radio broadcasting of selected proceedings, the said committee to report its recommendations thereon with all convenient speed.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think I'm sort of in the middle of this. I'll be prepared to take the member's point of order afterward.

Motion agreed.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. THATCHER: — On a point of order. Again, I respectfully request that you consider the matter of exactly how often you are going to take questions from the government side of the House to cabinet ministers. I respectfully suggest to you — and I don't care where you make a ruling today or not — that whom you choose to accept a question from is entirely your prerogative. I think I pointed out to you earlier that when you choose to go to the government side of the House it causes very tense feelings on this side of the House. If government members have a point which they wish to make they have motions, they have their caucus. The question period traditionally, in any British parliamentary system, belongs to the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I ask you in the coming days to consider this matter. I suggest to you that it is a source of needless friction.

MR. SPEAKER: — With regard to the matter, I feel I can deal with it right now. The member, earlier in his comments, mentioned the word monopolize. I want to assure the

member that there will be no monopoly on the question period by one side of the House or the other.

The question period is the prerogative of the members, not the parties. I will recognize members roughly in proportion to the House, although I think traditionally I have recognized a far greater number of opposition members than I have government members. As a matter of fact it is very seldom that I recognize a government member. It just happened to be two days in a row that I recognized a government member. And I don't anticipate that will continue all the time. However, should questions arise on either side of the House I will recognize them as individual members. I always take great care to recognize the official opposition first, as I have always done.

MOTIONS **Public Accounts**

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow:

That by leave of the Assembly that the public accounts of the province of Saskatchewan for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1980, be referred as tabled to the select standing committee on public accounts and printing.

Motion agreed.

Report of Provincial Auditor

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow, by leave of the Assembly:

That the report of the provincial auditor for the fiscal years ended March 31, 1980, be referred as tabled to the select standing committee on public accounts and printing.

Motion agreed.

Annual Reports of Crown Corporations

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow, by leave of the Assembly:

That the annual reports and fiscal statements of the various Crown corporations and related agencies be referred as tabled to the select standing committee on Crown corporations.

Motion agreed.

Retention and Disposal Schedules

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow, by leave of the Assembly:

That the retention and disposal schedules approved by the public documents committee be referred as tabled to the select standing committee on library.

Motion agreed.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:41 p.m.