

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 4, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

### Report of the Select Standing Committee on Radio Broadcasting

**THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:** — Mr. MacMurchy, as chairman of the select standing committee on radio broadcasting of selected proceedings, presents the first report of the said committee which is as follows: your committee has had under consideration the division of 525 minutes or radio time arranged for the current address in reply debate. Your committee recommends to the Assembly that time be shared as follows: 378 minutes to the government members and 147 minutes to the opposition members for the current address in reply debate. Your committee further recommends that the allocation of time to the individual members be arranged through the usual channels.

**MR. BANDA** moved, seconded by the member for Arm River, Mr. Muirhead:

That the first report of the select standing committee on radio broadcasting of selected proceedings be now concurred in.

Motion agreed.

## WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Don Cody who is unavoidably absent today, I would like to introduce to the members of the Assembly 45 high school students from Birch Hills who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. I understand they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Mareschal and Mr. Hilkewich, also by Mr. Gibson who is the manger of the credit union in Birch Hills and Mr. Homeniuk who is the manger of the local co-operative. I understand they have completed a tour of the building. They will be in the Chamber until the end of the question period. I trust they will find the proceedings interesting and educational. I will meet them shortly after the question period and endeavour to answer any inquiries they may have with regard to proceedings in the Chamber.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Alleged Fraud in the DNS

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Minister, last years a judge had some pretty damning things to say about your department, in particular that it had run amuck and that there were people in your department actively or passively participating in fraud. I now understand that high officials in your department, as late as June of 1980, were flying off to Vegas for holidays at public expense under the guise of studying affirmative action programs.

My question, Mr. Minister, is this. Last year you begged off the fraud scandal by saying that you weren't in the department or you weren't running the department at that time. I

don't think you can use that excuse any more and I would like you to advise the Assembly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What is your question?

**MR. ANDREW:** — My question, Mr. Minister, basically is this: you indicated that you would be straightening out the mess in DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) and it appears to me that the mess is simply being precipitated and would you not agree that it's gong downhill farther under your administration?

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — No. Mr. Speaker, I would not agree, and if the hon. member has any evidence of the charges he brings forward we'll be pleased to investigate them. But I assume, Mr. Speaker, these are like many of the charges the hon. member for Kindersley was making in this Assembly during the last session and he refused to produce any evidence. I think it is not fitting, although it is not unusual, for that member to indulge in innuendo and to cast that kind of reflection upon . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. ANDREW:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member knows that you are not able to table evidence in the question period. What I have here, Mr. Minister, is a request for prior approval for out-of-province travel for a Mr. Dagdick and a Mr. Aubichon, and that request basically says the place to be travelled is New Mexico from June 23 to June 27. The purpose of the trip was to travel to see the affirmative action program of the Navaho nations in New Mexico.

I also have an S-4 weekly expense sheet, which I intend to table in this Assembly after question period according to the rules, Mr. Minister, which in fact shows that one-half of the time those two people were away they were in fact in Las Vegas under public pay and drawing their full salary.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Minister, are you prepared to assure this Assembly that you will do a full investigation into this allegation including the Las Vegas leg of that escapade?

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member provides me with the alleged evidence, we will be pleased to review it and to report back to him.

**MR. ANDREW:** — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, when the minister is taking notice of that question, whether he would also take notice of the fact and advise the Assembly of when these two gentlemen travelled to New Mexico and later on to Las Vegas whether or not anyone else travelled with them from your department, and whether or not they travelled on to Las Vegas as well, or came home?

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, it is not clear that people travelled on government time, or at government expense, or that no recovery of payment was made. I will undertake the investigation when provided with the evidence and will report back to the hon. member.

#### **Authorization of DNS Employees for Credit Card Use**

**MR. ANDREW:** — A new question, Mr. Speaker. This is a letter dated June 19, 1980 from a Mr. R. Purdie, deputy minister, to a La Ronge travel agency. It's a very short letter, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to read it.

To whom it may concern:

This is to advise that Mr. Brian Dagdick, as an employee of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, is authorized to use my Air Canada credit card No. . . .

Can you advise this Assembly if that is policy of this government for the deputy minister to authorize various members of the staff, various members of the public service to use . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. LANE:** — My question is: is it the policy of your department since you have become deputy . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

### **Use of Deputy Ministers' Credit Cards for Travel**

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan whether it is the policy of our department, or are you aware of it being the policy of any other department, for a deputy minister to make his credit card available for the use of any other employees within that department?

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, in normal circumstances the employee would pay for the airline ticket and be reimbursed if it were authorized travel. In a situation where travel would be very expensive, and would require an employee to put out ahead of time an unusual amount of cash, it is practice to purchase the ticket through the duly authorized credit card, duly authorized by the deputy minister.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the Minister. I didn't completely understand your answer. Are you saying that it is an accepted practice within your department for the deputy minister to allow other people to use his credit card on other transactions? Is it common? Has it ever been done before and do you approve of the practice?

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, I repeat the answer that, in circumstances where the trip is not lengthy and the cost of the ticket will not be high, the normal practice is for the employee to purchase the ticket and claim it back on his expense form. Any trip where the cost of the ticket will be unusually high, where it would be an inconvenience for the employee to have to pay out a great deal of cash ahead of time, it is normal practice for the deputy minister, who is authorized to do so, to authorize the use of his credit card to purchase that ticket, providing the travel is authorized. Yes I do approve of that.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, is it an accepted practice of other departments within your government to allow the use of deputy ministers' credit cards in the fashion which has just been enunciated by the minister in charge of northern Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — The answer is yes.

**MR. LANE:** — Because it will not necessarily show up in the record of travel of employees if they are using someone else's credit card, will you be prepared to table the S-4 vouchers of all the deputy ministers and insist on it as Premier of this province? Would you indicate who used those credit cards and the various trips involved? You know very well what is happening with your policy; it becomes impossible for the opposition to find out how much the credit cards are being used. They may in fact be attributable to one individual and used by two, three or any number of others.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I'm not at all sure what the hon. member is asking. I would have thought it perfectly clear that perhaps the best way to control the travel expenses in a particular department is to have all the air travel on the card of the deputy, whose office will get a list of all of the trips and then know precisely what is charged and whether or not it was all on government business and all authorized. Certainly people very frequently need to use a credit card if they are travelling. It is far easier to control expenses if there is one or a small number of credit cards rather than a large number of credit cards. Members opposite may feel that is unwise, but I think on reflection they will see it is a prudent way to control expenses . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The member for Regina South seems to be under the impression that "anyone at all" could use a credit card. In the instance which has already been made clear in this House, a very senior employee, Mr. Dagdick, was not able to use the card without the written authorization of the deputy. That is hardly a system which "allows anyone to use the card."

#### **Use of Credit Cards on Personal Trips**

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Premier, in a situation such as has been described to you today and which will be proven to you at the end of this question period, do you approve of the practice where an employee in La Ronge has a La Ronge travel agency make a reservation and then included in the use of that credit card is a personal trip (and I suggest very strongly a personal trip) to Las Vegas through the use of a government credit card? Are you telling us that is an accepted practice in all your departments?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I am obviously not saying anything of the kind.

**MR. LANE:** — Question to the Premier. The Minister of DNS indicated that it was accepted for short trips. Does the Premier feel that the use of a deputy minister's credit card by other government officials for a trip to Las Vegas is a short trip?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, for those who listened, the minister said rather clearly that for short trips the employee normally paid his fare and claimed reimbursement. He did not use a credit card. For long trips, where a substantial cash outlay may be involved, it was suggested that the use of a credit card was desirable. It was undesirable to have a large number of employees with credit cards; accordingly, employees embarking on long trips which might involve significant expense had the use for specific occasions of the deputy's card. I would regard New Mexico as a long trip.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary to the Premier. Does the Premier consider it an acceptable practice that after the employee used a deputy minister's credit card to purchase a ticket to destination A, which happened to be Albuquerque, New Mexico, he used it to purchase a plane ticket to destination B on the way back, which happened to be Las Vegas, Nevada, and that he happened to be on government time during the time

that he spent in Las Vegas? Is that an accepted and common practice in all other departments or is it strictly unique to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I simply do not acknowledge the truth of the alleged facts outlined by the hon. member. I'm not here to deny them since I don't know the facts, but I'm certainly not here to admit the, nor am I going to answer questions on the basis of the hon. member's statement of facts.

### **Government Employee's Attendance Sheet**

**MR. ANDREW:** — A question to the Premier, and I could perhaps assist the Premier in his answer. I also have an attendance sheet signed by one Brian Dagdick for the month of June 1980. There are three questions on it, and they relate to any leave taken during the month of June. Annual vacation — nil; sickness or pressing necessity — nil; other — nil. I think it's clear, Mr. Premier, that one Mr. Dagdick was sitting in Las Vegas for a couple of days, Thursday and Friday, drawing a salary as a member of government and this clearly proves that. This is a document from your Department of Northern Saskatchewan. So I ask: is that acceptable procedure? Can the Premier tell me if that is an acceptable procedure by some employee of the Government of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the question. As I already explained to the hon. member for Thunder Creek, I do not know the facts in this case, and accordingly I am unable to say whether the procedure is acceptable or unacceptable.

### **Government Employees in Las Vegas**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Would you explain to this House what necessitated the two days, Thursday and Friday, on which those two employees visited Las Vegas? What was the purpose?

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, obviously I don't have the facts on those two days. I would point out to the hon. member and to the House that it is not altogether clear at this moment whether or not such time was recovered from a subsequent pay cheque. We simply don't know those facts. I assure you again that we will investigate it and report back to you.

### **Increase in Automobile Insurance**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). Mr. Minister, in light of your recent announcement made some two or three weeks ago in Weyburn, in light of the major concern of all citizens in Saskatchewan, that major concern being inflation, and in light of the fact that you already have the highest automobile insurance rates in Canada, will you indicate to the Assembly today how much you intend to increase the insurance rates in Saskatchewan next year?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Speaker, the insurance rates will be increased a sufficient amount to meet the accident frequency and the cost of inflation in repairing automobiles.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, if I understand the minister with his reply, we can

expect a horrendous increase. Mr. Minister, with the dismal performance of SGI in the past couple of years, the horrendous losses that you have incurred, isn't it about time that you had a review, not only of your administrative policies in SGI but perhaps of the senior management level, to have a better-operating Crown corporation and to once again provide lower and perhaps the lowest rates of insurance in Canada instead of the highest.

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that all insurers are raising their automobile rates substantially. ICBC (Insurance Corporation of British Columbia) just raised theirs 38 per cent. Manitoba will be raising theirs substantially in the next year. It cannot be avoided if the frequency of accidents is sufficiently high and the inflationary trend is there with respect to automobile repairs. The fact of the matter is that the member for Regina South says they are the highest rates in Canada. I refute that; they are among the lowest. You can get examples both ways. I might mention that a minister of the Crown from Manitoba was in Saskatchewan recently and made a comment comparing Brandon and Moose Jaw. He said that \$189 was the cost for a 1979 Chev Impala in Brandon; for the same coverage in Moose Jaw he said it was \$215. He was correct with regard to Moose Jaw. He was incorrect with regard to Brandon because there are three rates there: one is \$189 if you have no drivers under 25 and you drive that car for pleasure only; one is \$209, called a preferred rate, and one is \$348 . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I would dearly love to debate the rates of insurance between Manitoba and other provinces of Canada with the minister, but I am sure that I wouldn't be allowed to do so. Mr. Minister, isn't it about time that instead of putting the blame and the cost of these rates onto the back of the drivers of Saskatchewan, you reviewed the policies of SGI and put the blame where it belongs — not on the backs of the drivers of the province. Because if you want to talk about rates, let's talk about all the surcharges these drivers are being faced with today; you are already penalizing them. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the administrative policies of SGI are what has to be reviewed.

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Speaker, if an investigation is required in SGI, it is required in ICBC; it is required in MPIC (Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation); it's required in every insurer in Canada.

### **Constitutional Negotiations**

**MR. COLLVER:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would direct a question to the Premier, now that the members to my right have proven that the employees of the Government of Saskatchewan prefer locations in the United States to those of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . And since it is extremely important that such proof be forthcoming in this legislature, I would ask the Premier if he has any time frame in mind in terms of his negotiations . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know that Las Vegas is more important than this question, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to put it to the Premier.

In the light of your comments in this House yesterday and the day before with relevance to the position with the Government of Canada, what is the time frame you are giving Mr. Trudeau to come up with the changes in the constitutional package? Is it a month? Is it two months? Is it six months?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, as a practical matter (and I don't want people to misunderstand what I now say), we will have no assurance of what changes are agreed

to by the federal government at least until the parliamentary committee reports back to the House of Commons. It is likely that once the parliamentary committee reports back to the House of Commons the report will be adopted, because it is likely that the majority in the parliament will prevail. However, I have no assurance that there may not be changed to the resolution in the committee. Until we know what that committee is finally going to recommend, we will not know for sure whether our efforts at changing the resolution have been productive. Accordingly, the time frame really involves at least until February 6, until the committee report is out.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Given the tremendous amount of moneys which are not required to leave western Canada as a result of the federal government's recent budget in order to support that inefficient eastern industry, and given the tremendous decline now in the number of drilling rigs in western Canada (it was reported to me today that the largest Canadian-owned drilling company, Peter Bawden Drilling, now has committed one-half of all of its rigs to the United States), will the Premier now admit that there isn't any possibility of compromise with Mr. Trudeau and his group and that it is time that a real fight be put up for our rights in western Canada?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't view, as the hon. member clearly does, the energy dispute as "on all fours" with the constitutional dispute. I agree with the hon. member that, with respect to attempting to get changes in the energy package, the time is indeed here to attempt to get those changes and to work with our fellow western provinces in order to see whether or not we can't get changes, particularly with respect to a more rapid rate of increase in the price of conventional oil. Others may disagree with this, but I believe that is probably the single item which is militating more against drilling activity than any other part of the package.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier attempting to tell this Assembly that somehow he believes that resources (the energy package, if you like, which is in fact the resources in effect) are not part of the constitutional discussions which are ongoing? He himself said in this legislature not two days ago that that to him was the key issue facing the province of Saskatchewan — the resource question as it relates to the constitution. And here is the federal government taking away money from western Canada which could be used for western Canadian development and he says that's not part of the whole package.

I ask the Premier: will he not now admit that because of this immediate concern, because of the concern of the loss of jobs in western Canada which is going to be extant within six months because of this budget, the time is now to fight Ottawa and not sit back complacently and say that we'll just negotiate?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, with respect to matters revolving around the energy package, I agree with the hon. member. If he believes that any discussion with respect to the constitutional resolution which is now before the House of Commons and the Senate directly bears on the energy package.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I do.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I do not see the connection, other than the fact that the protagonists are the same. Accordingly, I think it is entirely possible to pursue an improved constitutional resolution and, at the same time, to pursue a policy of attempting to get the federal government to change its energy package.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I'll take one more question.

### **Tabling of Constitutional Documents**

**MR. LANE:** — Today the Government of Manitoba commenced court action challenging the position of the federal government. This indicates that what you said earlier (that you are supporting the other western premiers) is not accurate or correct. Would you today be prepared to give us the brief that you said would be ready early this week (the brief which you are giving to the constitutional committee) and would you be prepared tomorrow to table all the constitutional positions which you have taken (which you have offered to do on numerous occasions)? I think we will find that you have more constitutional positions than the Kama Sutra.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks two questions. One, would we be prepared to table the brief which we were going to give to the parliamentary committee tomorrow? I think the answer is no. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle persists in interjecting and in making allegations which are totally false. The facts are that there has been no commitment to table, prior to its presentation to the parliamentary committee, the brief which we are going to give to the parliamentary committee and no such commitment will be found on the records of this House.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

#### **ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Nelson for an address in reply and the proposed amendments thereto by Mr. Collver.

**MR. PEPPER:** — Mr. Speaker, as I stated when I adjourned the debate yesterday, I had not intended to enter this debate. But after listening to previous speakers on both sides of the House one does get the urge to take part. I believe this is a special occasion, this the 75th birthday of our province. I think all of us should take part on this occasion to help promote and celebrate the birthday of our province — a province of which we are all very proud.

As the Lieutenant-Governor told us one week ago when he read the Speech from the Throne, this is the third session of the nineteenth legislature.

I have been taking part in throne speech debates since the first session of the fifteenth legislature. During those years it has been my honour to represent the good people of the Weyburn constituency. As I stand here at my desk on the government side of the House and think about the years that I have spent in the New Democratic Party, about the record of the Blakeney government in office and about the people of the Weyburn constituency, I can honestly say there is no position in public life that I would be prouder to occupy.

Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the mover and the seconder. I do this not because it is a tradition of the Assembly or a ritual which I feel bound by, but rather because I have had a good number of movers and seconders to the address in reply and I believe the member for Yorkton and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg performed that task as well this year as I have ever heard before. I would like to say to the people of Yorkton



and to those in the Assiniboia-Gravelbourg area who are listening today that they have every right to be very proud of their elected representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to extend a warm welcome to the three new members elected in the recent by-elections and who took their seats in this Assembly for the first time this past week. The member for Estevan, Mr. Jack Chapman, has had a long and outstanding record of public service to the people of Estevan. As one of the many who campaigned on his behalf, I can testify to the solid reputation that this man has in his home community. He will, I know, represent the people of the Estevan constituency very well and I predict for many years to come.

David Miner, who won the by-election in The Battlefords, had already established himself as one of the most reliable civil servants in the provincial government. His grasp of issue and his hard-driving enthusiasm make him a welcome addition to the Blakeney government.

I would like to congratulate the new member for Kelsey-Tisdale. Although he was elected in a close election, I happen to subscribe to the belief (and I'm sure that the member for Estevan and the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake would agree) that close elections often produce an above-average MLA.

Mr. Speaker, just before I address a few remarks to the announcements in the throne speech, I want to say a few words about those members who have retired since the spring sitting of the legislature.

The Hon. Eiling Kramer represented The Battlefords constituency for 28 consecutive years. He was a politician in the best sense of the word. He never told people what they wanted to hear simply to get votes. No, that wasn't Eiling. He told them what he honestly stood for and if they wanted to support him that was fine. If they didn't, that was fine, too, but his record of electoral success demonstrates to me that he is one of the most popular and respected politicians Saskatchewan has ever known.

The Hon. Jack Messer also retired recently after almost a decade of service as a minister of government. Jack was never one to shy away from a challenge. His career in public life certainly demonstrates that. Some of the most progressive legislation that our province has in the areas of agriculture and resource development was put in place during his time in those ministries. It is my opinion, and I'm sure that others will agree, that Jack Messer served the people of Saskatchewan well.

Another minister who retired from the cabinet this past year was the Hon. Ned Shillington. Mr. Shillington has had the responsibility for the departments of co-operatives, consumer affairs, government services and culture and youth. He played a major role in policy development in those areas. While I regret his decision to resign from cabinet, I am pleased and commend him for his decision to retain his seat as an MLA in conjunction with his law practice. I'm sure that I'm speaking for all of us when I say we wish Mr. Shillington well also.

The former member for Estevan, Mr. Bob Larter, also retired this year. I know Mr. Larter probably as well as I know any member across the floor — even better! The credibility and the esteem in which he is held in his community speaks for itself. I am sure that I am speaking for all of us when I say on his retirement that we all wish him health and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne this year has a number of announcements which I wholeheartedly endorse. I'd like to direct a few remarks to some of those announcements.

I was pleased to hear the speech mention The Celebrate Saskatchewan ceremonies across our province which marked our 75th anniversary as a province in the Dominion of Canada. Scarcely a weekend went by all summer long without a parade, a homecoming, a barbecue, a picnic, or some other event going on somewhere in the Weyburn constituency as in all other areas of the province. As I understand over 3,000 separate events were held throughout the province and close to 900 cities, towns, villages and hamlets took part. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is a good sign for the future of Canada. It says something when our citizens will turn out by the thousands to celebrate the anniversary of our province becoming part of Canada.

Saskatchewan people are as staunch supporters of the concept of Canada as can be found anywhere. They will not tolerate for long any pandering by politicians to western separatism. So, I say that is why the stand taken by Premier Blakeney and the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow, has found favour among the public. A stand which is a moderate, reasonable position on a new constitution or energy pricing is more likely to bring Canada to the consensus we are seeking than the rigid, unbending opposition to Ottawa which some are advocating.

Mr. Speaker, in the limited time I have today, I cannot do more than mention this issue. But I do want to say this. As someone who has called Saskatchewan his home for over 65 years, I cannot recall when I have felt more pride than while watching the Premier, Allan Blakeney, and Mr. Roy Romanow, as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, represent our province at the constitutional meetings this past year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — This leadership in negotiations between governments which this New Democratic Party has been demonstrating has not been limited to the national scene either, Mr. Speaker. My own constituency of Weyburn is a good example of the excellent relationship which exists between the Blakeney government and local governments. On Wednesday, March 27 a new shopping mall known as Weyburn Square was opened in Weyburn. This mall also encompassed a new provincial office building. The *Weyburn Review* reported that 33,412 people passed through the doors of the mall on the day of the grand opening — an indication, I say, of what a shot in the arm the new complex will be for the Weyburn area.

Weyburn Square was a joint venture involving the provincial government, the city of Weyburn and Oxford Shopping Centres. The mall has meant the addition of 27 new stores and services located in downtown Weyburn. It has certainly revitalized the business district. Weyburn Square has an attractive cobblestone courtyard just in front of the main entrance and it was dedicated on July 17, 1980. This courtyard was named after Mayor Isabelle Butters for the many hours of hard work she put into the project. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is an extremely appropriate honour for the hard-working mayor of Weyburn.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Mr. Speaker, the office building of the Weyburn Square bears my

name, an honour which I have done too little to deserve. At the same time, I cannot find words to adequately express my deep-felt appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, another area where provincial government activity has been important to the Weyburn area is in highway construction. Highway 13 is being upgraded throughout its entire length. The plan is to make a third transprovincial route to link all the communities between Govenlock near the western border of the province and Redvers on the eastern border.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the hard work of the member for Shaunavon and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg in co-operation with the chambers of commerce, the boards of trade, the mayors and the municipal councils along this route, along with the highways minister, Eiling Kramer, they have made the Highway 13 project a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to mention a number of other announcements in the throne speech but time does not permit. I will only add that the throne speech of this third session of the nineteenth legislature sets out a realistic and common-sense blueprint for the future of Saskatchewan. It is another demonstration that the Blakeney government is in control of events, rather than letting events control it, Mr. Speaker. I am sure you will recognize from my address that I will be supporting the motion and opposing the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LONG:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say what a pleasure it is to speak in this debate in support of the Blakeney government's throne speech indicating further progress and prosperity in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I must say they addressed their duties with confidence and finesse.

I would also like to congratulate the three new members of this Assembly. I wish them well and hope they will find great satisfaction in representing their respective constituencies.

We are drawing near to the end of a very special year in Saskatchewan. In Cut Knife-Lloydminster, as in other parts of the province, people really did celebrate Saskatchewan. There were home comings and special functions in all communities, large and small. Parades were organized. Even in the small communities, threshing demonstrations, rope making and the skills of the old-time blacksmith were exhibited. Others were busy demonstrating the abilities of the pioneer homemaker, such as running spinning wheels, quilting and making homemade ice cream.

Mr. Speaker, the most important single ingredient in Celebrate Saskatchewan was the people of Saskatchewan. They made the difference. Their enthusiasm, hard work and spirit of co-operation made our Diamond Jubilee successful. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the government had the good sense to realize this. We started our plans early, provincial committees were organized and then, of course, those very important people, the local Celebrate Saskatchewan committees. No, Mr. Speaker, we didn't pour many millions of dollars into our Diamond Jubilee. We supplied some seed moneys. The people took it from there and made it a resounding success, not only in Cut Knife-Lloydminster but throughout the province. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate those who served on the Celebrate Saskatchewan committees for a job very well done.

Mr. Speaker, I earlier congratulated the new members of this House and I would just like to turn to those by-elections for a moment.

One of the things I find amusing about the Tory mentality is the ease with which they accept contradiction — contradiction, Mr. Speaker, in their policies, campaign style and indeed their political philosophy.

During the recent by-election in The Battlefords, the Tories made a great noise about the NDP candidate's being a parachute — this, in spite of the fact that he was born and raised at Speers just out of North Battleford, in spite of the fact that he lived and worked in North Battleford, in spite of the fact that he was a long-time member of the NDP executive at a time when The Battlefords included his farm at Speers, in spite of all of these facts, Mr. Speaker, the Tories clung to this phony issue because it was the only one they had. To no avail, Mr. Speaker, as we all know the results on election night.

But, Mr. Speaker, now for the contradiction. About 450 miles southeast of The Battlefords lies the constituency of Estevan where another by-election was taking place. This, Mr. Speaker, was a contest of convenience (so the Tories thought), a safe seat with a large majority, given up by a popular MLA so his leader might finally enter this legislature and take his seat. But in Tory logic, this was not a case of parachuting their leader into a safe seat. It was a case of getting their leader into the legislature — no matter, Mr. Speaker, if the Tory leader had absolutely no connection or interest in Estevan other than a safe seat in this Assembly. With typical Tory incompetence, their leader's parachute was not properly packed. The chute didn't open and the Tories and their leader are still reeling from the resulting crash. They learned the hard way that it's not the fall but the sudden stop which does the damage.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LONG:** — The people of Estevan saw through the Conservative charade and that constituency is now represented on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, another example of Tory contradictions occurred this past summer when the Conservative leader, Mr. Devine, visited Lloydminster. Speaking to a meeting of 12 people, including the press, he vigorously attacked the local MLA (yours truly, Mr. Speaker) for supporting Bill 109, a bill amending the farm ownership act. Members will recall the bill which lowered the amount of land owned by non-residents to 10 acres, making possible the purchase of land by non-residents along the province's borders through an exemption by the farm ownership board and clearly exempting any farmers in Alberta who has owned land in Saskatchewan prior to the implementation of the amendment.

As I said earlier, the Conservative leader, in his exuberance, attacked me for supporting the bill, saying I was discriminating against my Alberta neighbours. Mr. Speaker, the fact the gentleman had either forgotten, or was not aware of, was that his total caucus had supported Bill 109 in the House. Rest assured I was very quick to point this out to the press and Mr. Devine's credibility suffered greatly in Lloydminster and area.

A constituent of mine asked a very pertinent question that I want members opposite to take notice of. How, he inquired, can a man run a province if he doesn't know what his own caucus is doing? That's a very pertinent question.

Yes, there are many contradictions on the Conservative logic. Witness the marketing of commodities in Canada. Let's be specific. Let's take a look at the marketing of two commodities such as oil and agricultural products. Mr. Speaker, by far the most effective method of marketing agricultural products is by the orderly marketing system. Marketing boards give the agricultural producers of this country some of the kinds of bargaining power that other participants in the economy have. Organized labor, through their bargaining units, have a say in how they do in the economy. Bit corporations do well because they control their markets and produce to meet the demand.

Marketing boards and commissions work well in our economic system. They work well because they bring a large number of sellers together in a common goal—to stabilize production and maximise the price of the product they produce. Marketing boards will continue to play an important role in the Canadian food industry. Marketing boards can no longer be regarded only as means of raising farm incomes. It is important to recognize that marketing boards have broader objectives in the open market system.

The open market system, which marketing boards replace, is based on a system of conflict between sellers and buyers. This situation does not exist in other sectors of the economy. Canada cannot afford the idle resources and inefficiencies generated under an open market. A marketing board can evaluate the objectives of all sectors of the food industry and implement programs based on co-operation rather than conflict.

Orderly marketing for agriculture has evolved as a solution to the instability of the open market. Marketing boards have introduced a stability which encourages a rational development for all sectors of the food industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee and the advisory committee of the Canadian Livestock Board have recently recommended that the Canadian Wheat Board once more be given complete control of the marketing of feed grains.

Producers continue to support the wheat board but in recent years numerous changes have been made which have reduced the board's control over the marketing of feed gains. These changes have cost western Canadian producers of feed grains \$143 million between the years 1976 and 1979.

Opposition to the wheat board's handling of feed grains has come from the private grain trade, feed-grain merchants in both eastern and western Canada, along with the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange. The campaign against the board has also been supported by the Conservative governments of the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba and by the official opposition, the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to note the Conservative Party's opposition to orderly marketing of feed grains in western Canada. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, they oppose any form of orderly marketing for agriculture, believing in the dog-eat-dog system of the open market.

But now, once again, Mr. Speaker, comes the Conservative contradiction. Just to the west of us lies the brightest jewel in the Tory crown, the province of Alberta. Alberta, Mr. Speaker, is the home of unfettered, free enterprise, the energy-rich province with tremendous reserves of oil and natural gas. Alberta is the shining example our friends

opposite hold up to us as the way things should be. So let's take a few minutes to see how formerly the Social Credit and now the Conservative governments of Alberta have dealt with the oil and gas industry.

In the early days of Alberta development of the oil and gas resources there was a scramble among the oil companies to produce as much as possible. Oil and gas are migratory resources which will flow up to the surface to whatever wells happen to be drilled in the field. Where ownership and production rights were divided among many producers of a common pool, all were of necessity placed in furious competition with each other. Each was, in effect, trying to rob his neighbour before his neighbour robbed him. These conditions resulted in an excessive rate of depletion, wasteful use of labor, capital, land and in lowering the net value of the resource.

In the interest of conservation and to stabilize the production and thus the markets for oil, the then Social Credit government formed the energy resources conservation board. Now the Conservative government of Alberta recently formed the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of these agencies officially is to prevent waste and ensure that all operators on a given pool have a right to produce. But their fundamental, underlying objective is supply management — supply management and orderly marketing for the oil companies, Mr. Speaker. That's what Alberta Conservatives, whom members opposite admire so much, believe in.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative contradiction. If supply management is good enough for the oil companies, why isn't it good enough for the farmers? If the Tories can support a marketing agency for oil companies, why don't they believe in it for agriculture? Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on in this manner, pointing out the inconsistencies of members opposite. Their record, Mr. Speaker, is an outstanding one, probably worth gracing the pages of *Ripley's Believe it or Not*.

In closing I must say that I am pleased to be part of a government that is consistent in its policies, part of a government the people of Saskatchewan look to for sure and steady leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I recognize the member for Regina Centre.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to begin on a couple of congratulatory notes. I want to begin by congratulating the member for Yorkton and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg for the excellent presentations they made in moving and seconding the speech. I agree with the member for Webyburn that their constituents have every right to be very proud of them.

I want to begin, as well, with the by-elections and perhaps work clockwise around the province beginning with The Battlefords. I want to congratulate the new member for The Battlefords on his election. I have worked with the new member for many years, both in government and out. I have found him to be able, dedicated and sincere, and I congratulate the people of The Battlefords on their choice of MLA.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I also want to express a fond farewell to the retired member for The Battlefords. He is one of the great characters I have met, of a sort that doesn't often enter politics. I never ceased to admire his colourful and creative use of the English language. He had his own unique style of expressing himself with a sense of humour that has very few parallels. But his powerful character, Mr. Speaker, only masks a very shrewd political judgment. He was a tireless supporter of the things he believed in, and the people of Saskatchewan will be poorer on his retirement.

I want to extend a welcome to the new member for Kelsey-Tisdale. I gather he is probably to follow me. Although much that is said in this House is partisan, much that goes on behind the scenes is co-operative in nature, and I look forward to co-operating with the member for Kelsey-Tisdale. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I do not envy the member for Kelsey-Tisdale. He has a very large pair of shoes to fill. The present member is only the third member to represent that riding in 42 years. It's a fair statement that, of the various people who have entered public life in Saskatchewan, two of the finest are J.H. Brockelbank and John Messer. J.H. Brockelbank, of course, being the father of the present Speaker. Mr. Brockelbank served in the Douglas government, the opposition when the Patterson Liberal government was in power, and the opposition when the Liberal government of Ross Thatcher was in power — for 29 years. Mr. Messer carved his name in Canadian history books with 13 years in the opposition and in government. Mr. Brockelbank served for 29 years, Mr. Messer for 13 years. That's a fair track record for Mr. Hardy to try and equal.

During the by-election, I spent several days in Estevan. I was assigned by the campaign manger to poll 12. Those who worked in Estevan will recognize poll 12 as containing among other municipal addresses, the address of 410 - 2nd Street, the address of the present member. I canvassed in Jack Chapman's home poll. And that's not a first. I've had to do that before. It's not always pleasant, Mr. Speaker. In a candidate's home poll there can be no mystique, no imagery; they know him too well. They see him with his arts and his faults. But against this background, canvassing in poll 12 was a positive joy. No cosmetics were necessary or expected. Nobody in that poll thought the present member needed to be improved on. I spoke to nearly every member of poll 12 once, and most several times. Not a disparaging word was heard against the NDP candidate. Most of the people in the poll voted for him, some against him but everybody liked him. The member for Weyburn, in the speech just preceding, mentioned the present member for Estevan and his long period of service to the public in Estevan. that's very true. But that wasn't what I saw in poll 12. What I saw in poll 12 was a portrait of a very fine human being, that his friends and neighbours generally liked.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My father used to say that if you can say of a man that the better you know him the more you like him you can't pay him a finer tribute, and I think that can be said of the present member. Indeed, I met one old gentleman who was going to vote for Jack Chapman but thought about it because he was afraid that politics might change him. We talked about it for a while and parted just simply hoping it didn't. We won Estevan four times before, but we've never won it twice consecutively. This time I think we've elected the man who will win it next time and as many times thereafter as he chooses to run.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Speaker, one almost has to feel sorry for the leader of the Tories. One was just called him the newly elected member for the gallery. I almost said the late leader of the Tories. I would have almost been correct. I was tempted to feel sorry for Mr. Devine because everybody seems to deserve a chance, and Mr. Devine may not have one. He was only newly elected leader of the Progressive Conservatives and already people are writing his obituary. Mr. Devine seems to be destined to be the Joe Clark of Saskatchewan provincial politics. Members on this side of the House will be relieved to know that I was able to exercise some restraint in the sympathy I felt for Mr. Devine. Part of the reasons for this had to do with the approach that he and the Progressive Conservative Party have taken on the constitution. Robert Elson once described Canada as follows:

Canada is a triumph of politics over geography and economics and sometimes it seems a triumph over common sense.

Canada has always needed men with breadth of vision. This country cries out for men who realize that the whole of the country is greater than the sum of its parts. What we need are leaders who approach the question by asking not what is best for me and mine but what is best for the whole country. If everyone approaches Canada's problems with the attitude that his sole responsibility is to look out for himself and his province, and fight for a tiger for them and none other, and no one sees it as his responsibility to take a larger Canadian view of the question, then, Mr. Speaker, we are doomed.

I'm saddened to say that by their approach to the constitutional issue, Mr. Devine and the Progressive Conservative Party have done their level best to fan the flames of regional distrust and bitterness. I have listened to Mr. Devine utter thousands of words on the constitution; I have never heard Mr. Devine discuss the question in a Canadian context.

Someone needs to tell Mr. Devine something that the member for Regina Elphinstone understands instinctively, and that is that the essence of leadership is not the ability to appeal to people's basest emotions. The essence of leadership is the ability to inspire people to rise above their own narrow personal concerns and interest themselves in the larger problems of their community and their country.

Tommy Douglas once approached the attitude of the Conservatives by likening it to a man who prays and says, "Lord God, bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife, plus four and no more." Mr. Devine's approach contrasts so sharply with the statesmanlike approach of Allan Blakeney. And speaking of Mr. Blakeney, it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, how often he is referred to as a statesman. It was Bob Edwards, editor of the *Calgary Eye Opener*, who defined a statesman in the following language. He said, "Now I know what a statesman is — he's a dead politician, and we need a lot more statesmen."

Bob Edwards was right. A statesman is generally a retired politician, and he's right that we need a lot more of them. But there are some very rare exceptions. I'm very proud that the leader of the political party to which I belong, and the government of which I am a member, is one of that rarefied breed, a practising politician who so consistently acts like a statesman that he is commonly thought of as one — a very rare occurrence indeed, Mr. Speaker.



**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The Premier of Saskatchewan and the Attorney General have defined Saskatchewan interests, and they have put the Saskatchewan position forward at every level of the constitutional talks, and they have put those interest forward with such effectiveness that they have gained the respect of friend and enemy alike. But the Premier of this province has always done so with a view not just to Saskatchewan's best interests, but also to the best interests of Canada as a whole. He has proceeded with a vision of the larger needs of his community and his country, and if the results of the Estevan by-election are any indication, he has inspired and uplifted the people of Saskatchewan to that lofty vision — truly, Mr. Speaker, a great leader.

I want to touch for just a moment on the affirmative action program for natives. It is said that a civilization can be judged by the way it treats its minorities. I hope that Canada is not judged by the way we have treated Indian and native people. Among Indians, Metis and natives, the rates of alcoholism, unemployment and incarceration in our jails are abysmally high, and the level of education, the per capita income and opportunity are abysmally low. The problems have long been obvious; the solutions have not. Lesser governments have ignored the issue, lacking the courage to attack such insoluble problems.

William Lyon Mackenzie defined politics as a science that teaches people to care for each other. J.S. Woodsworth expressed the same sentiments half a century later when he said, "What we want for ourselves, we desire for all." It was this spirit that launched us on a broadly based program to assist native people to better themselves.

We have attacked on a number of fronts. The Minister of Urban Affairs, with great vigour has launched an affirmative action program to increase the employment of natives in the public service and Crown corporations and it is beginning to show results. The Minister of Education has initiated programs to help more native students continue further in our elementary and secondary schools. The Minister of the Environment has led this government in an unrelenting struggle with the federal government to see that Indian land claims are recognized in a fair and just fashion. The Minister of Agriculture has provided money to the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians to research their treaty rights and the Minister of Urban Affairs has given similar moneys to the Metis.

Mr. Speaker, I am pretty proud to be part of a government which has shown the courage and the basic human decency to attack a problem from which has shown the courage and the basic human decency to attack a problem from which all other governments have fled.

I am gong to refer to a number of programs which have directly improved the lives of the people of Saskatchewan. In illustrating what I mean, I will confine myself to the boundaries of Regina Centre, but these are programs which are in effect throughout Saskatchewan and benefiting people throughout Saskatchewan.

The Government of Saskatchewan is transforming downtown Regina with the Cornwall Centre. While the downtown cores of other cities are being abandoned, the downtown area of Regina is one that businesses and people are clamouring to get into. The \$100 million Cornwall Centre, Mr. Speaker, will not just bring more offices, retail outlets and people into Regina, more fundamentally it will at as a catalyst in breathing vitality and vigour into the inner core. This feeling of vitality is having a spin-off effect. I could mention many buildings and activities which have started since the Cornwall Centre was begun, perhaps the Royal Bank Building is the best example.

Another example of a program which is taking place in my riding and is directly improving the lives of the citizens and their inner-city community is the infill housing program by the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. This housing program administered by SHC (Saskatchewan Housing Corporation) has had as its goal the renovation and upgrading of the housing stock in the Cathedral district of Regina. A large number of homes have been purchased; some will be renovated, others will be torn down. The total effect is nothing less than the regeneration of the housing in the Cathedral area of Regina.

Another project which I find very exciting, which is in Regina Centre and holds immense promise in the conversion of the Union Station into a multimodal transportation centre. I guess I could say of this project that it is conceived but not yet born and is still in a period of gestation, so to speak. The project has not been assisted by the federal government which has been both dilatory and vacillating. I am optimistic, though, that we will overcome this and that we will have a multimodal centre in Regina, one that will not only make a rational use of transportation facilities but will preserve an historic building . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The member for Regina South wants to know when? I say it will come very soon.

Mr. Speaker, forgive me if I mention, just for a moment, a project which is not in Regina Centre but one which will benefit all of Regina, and that is the announced plan to convert the SPC power station into a museum and research centre. Many groups and people in Regina have been suggesting this every since it was closed down two or three years ago. It renews faith in the processes of government to see the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the government responding in this fashion.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the Minister of Education on bringing forth the ward system for the election of school trustees.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I am sure whatever the views of the media and the members opposite, the Minister of Education recognized when he brought this forward that it would be controversial and I know the opposition will oppose it hammer and claw. Mr. Speaker, it matters not whether one refer to the potash takeover, or Bill 42 on the taxation of oil and gas companies, or the ward system — a common principle runs through them, and that is putting more power in the hands of the people. And the Tories can be expected, Mr. Speaker, to oppose that, and that will be the result of the ward system. It will strengthen democracy at the local level.

The existing electoral system for school trustees is just becoming unmanageable in the city of Regina and, I suspect, in the city of Saskatoon. I recall, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the last election, going into the ballot booth with a very long ballot. It was about the size of a city newspaper. There were close to 40 names on it. I left the ballot booth a few moments later with the feeling that I had not really done justice to the democratic system. I think I knew the candidates as well as most. It came as no surprise to me the next day to learn that of the ten trustees elected, nine were among the first ten listed on the ballot. Evidently, most people had shared my feeling of frustration and many had simply voted for the first nine out of the first ten names on the ballot. What an eloquent indictment of the existing system.

The Greek philosopher Plato said, "The direction in which education starts a man will determine his future life." Most parents understand this. Most parents want to control their children's future. Thus, they want to control the education system. The introduction of a ward system in Regina will make this possible. I will take a prediction, Mr. Speaker, that it will be a matter of great controversy for six months, but nobody who runs against me in the next election is going to make the ward system an issue. I will make that prediction. In the next elections, nobody will make the ward system an issue. It will be as popular as the ward system has been for the election of alderman.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying, I will be supporting the throne speech and opposing the amendment to it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, fellow members of the Legislative Assembly, it is with a deep sense of honour that I rise in this historic Chamber this afternoon to speak for the first time as a new member for the constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale. I am very proud and very pleased to join in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. These are exciting times in the history of Saskatchewan and part of that history was made on November 26 when the people of Kelsey-Tisdale broke a 40-year tradition when they elected me as their new MLA.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to say how thankful I am to the people of Kelsey-Tisdale constituency. I would like to extend to them my heartfelt appreciation for giving me their trust. I want to put on record my appreciation to all the people who worked so hard so that I might be here with you in this Assembly today. As long as I live, I shall never forget the faith and the hard work of all who worked in the by-election campaign. On the night of November 26, after all the votes had been counted, Mr. Speaker, I fully realized the trust the voters of Kelsey-Tisdale had bestowed on me. It is a sacred one and one which I will never let down.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate my fellow rookies, as we have been described on winning our respective seats in this legislature. To the hon. member for Estevan and to the hon. member for The Battlefords, I would like to extend my best wishes as they embark on their new ventures, as I do.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale has a long tradition of being represented by individuals who knew and respected the needs of the riding. This afternoon I would like to pay tribute to two former MLAs who once represented the seat which I now hold. First of all, I would like to say that Mr. Brockelbank, who held the seat until 1967, was one of the finest men you could ever have met. He was one of the finest and most distinguished gentlemen I have ever known.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Messer, Jack, whom I have known personally for many years, who has done so much for Kelsey-Tisdale over the last 13 years, is the other former MLA. I would like to pay tribute to him today. I wish Mr. Messer the very best in his endeavours in

the future.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — On behalf of the people of Kelsey-Tisdale, I would also like to say thank you for all the work they have done in our constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to state for the record that now that the by-election is over and I have been entrusted to represent Kelsey-Tisdale, it is my intention to represent all the people, regardless of how they voted, to the very best of my ability.

During the by-election campaign there were heated political debates, but it was a good, clean, hard-fought campaign. I would also like at this time to acknowledge the gentlemanly way in which my opponents, Mr. Bracken and Mr. Russell, conducted their campaigns. It is my belief that now that the ballots have been tallied we must work together in a sense of community. It is my goal to make Kelsey-Tisdale a better place to live, to make Saskatchewan a better place to live, and indeed, out of it all, make us better Canadians.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, the people of Kelsey-Tisdale are proud to be Canadians. We are proud of Canada, but we want to make it work in a very positive way. We reject extreme positions. We reject separatism just as much as we reject the power grabbing of the central forces in Ottawa. The type of Canada we want for future generations is one where your children and mine can stand tall in a strong Saskatchewan as an equal partner in a strong nation — a nation where we can say proudly, “I am a Canadian.”

I am very proud of our province of Saskatchewan and even more proud of the constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale. I grew up there as a boy. My parents are there, and four generations of my family are there. I have come to know the hopes and goals of my friends and neighbours. I have come to know the needs of the riding. In my service as a member of this legislature, I shall bring these concerns to you in this Chamber.

The people of Kelsey-Tisdale are hard-working people — honest people who make their living from the land. They live in an area richly blessed with prime forest land and agriculture. All the way from the industrial operations in Hudson Bay to the farms in Archerwill, the people of my constituency are the kind of folks who make this a great province.

Kelsey-Tisdale is situated in the northeast corner of the province, with Hudson Bay to the east, and relies mainly on wood industries (MacMillan Bloedel, Simpson Timber, and Saskatchewan Forest Products), which employ approximately 1,000 people.

Hudson Bay is in a valley between the Pasquia Hills and the Porcupine Hills. In 1979 it was named the forest capital of Canada, and indeed, it is the moose capital of the world. Over on the other side of Kelsey-Tisdale, 70 miles to the west, is the agriculture-oriented town of Tisdale. It thrives from the surrounding farming areas and has a very active business section, industrial and commercial plants, such as Trail-rite, seed cleaning plants, and honey processing plants. Indeed, if I may say so, it is known as the land of rape and honey.

Between Tisdale and Hudson Bay we have some of the finest farming areas in this

province, with some of the most productive farmland. A great deal of rapeseed is grown in this area.

We are very rich in natural resources — many undeveloped as yet, especially minerals, which could make Kelsey-Tisdale one of the richest parts of Saskatchewan to live in.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I want to share with this Assembly some ideas on how we can make Kelsey-Tisdale an ever better constituency. They are ideas and concerns that people have shared with me in my travels throughout the riding. They are concerns which I hope the government will take a serious look at.

In Kelsey-Tisdale we have many small towns that are literally dying because of a lack of jobs to support younger people. Let's take for instance a small community such as Bjorkdale. During the by-election I found in Bjorkdale a small community that could use and does need an industrial plant, such as a peat moss plant or something similar. Take a look at a town like Mistatim which could use some type of agriculture-related processing plant, whether it be a sugar beet factory or a limited feed processing plant or a mineral-related plant such as a sulphur plant.

I am proud to say that the party which I represent has been listening to the needs of those who live in small communities. I have listened to the people tell me how worried they are about the decline of smaller communities. That is why I would urge this government to support a rural community development program as part of a plan to bring our young people home, as part of a plan to revitalize Saskatchewan's small towns and villages.

I know it is easier to run a few large corporations than to establish large numbers of small enterprises. But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, we believe that large numbers of small firms create a lot more employment than do one or two large ones.

Again I say, let's revitalize our communities. Let us make Saskatchewan grow. Let us keep our young people here in Saskatchewan, even more important, let's bring them back home.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, in listening to the people, many senior citizens have told me they are worried. They worry they might be forced to give away their life savings to cover the cost of fees in the care homes. That's not right, Mr. Speaker, and it's not fair. I suggest it is about time the Government of Saskatchewan stops to think for just a moment and realizes that the elderly people who pioneer our land worked and saved all their lives, only to find themselves in an inflationary situation where the money they saved does very little toward meeting everyday needs. I ask everyone in this Assembly if they do not think it is time to take level 2 and level 3 care and put it in medicare so that the senior citizens can be proud citizens and have a sense of dignity?

We must remember, Mr. Speaker, when we speak of senior citizens that we are speaking about our people. I say let us move forward. Let us improve the quality of life. Let us make our medicare system better. We may not be the first to do this but let's not be the last.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the legislature some of the concerns of the rural areas of my riding. Take for example the area surrounding Archerwill or McKague. In those areas they have a few main grid roads but the balance of the roads could almost be called cattle trails. These people need and deserve better roads. I am sure that during the by-election many MLAs travelled these roads and realize what I mean. In this day and age certainly that is not much for the taxpayers to ask of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to people in the riding tell me that they want rail line retention, and so do I. I do not say that just because of political reasons; I say that as a farmer and businessman. I know the value of retaining our rail line. I have made a pledge to my constituents to support rail line retention in every possible way. I hope the government will do the same.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, agriculture is very crucial to Kelsey-Tisdale. The farmers in my area are a vital part of the economic health of our community. They have told me they want to support a positive program for agriculture, such as the six-point program my party advocates. I listened to young potential farmers tell me how great it would be if the government would bring about a Saskatchewan family-farm purchasing program to assist young people in getting started in farming. I had many farmers tell me what a great thing for Saskatchewan it would be if we had a gas distribution system to provide our rural communities and especially farms with access to lower priced energy for home heating and grain dryers and livestock and heating facilities. But most important of all is a rural community development program. In each case, Mr. Speaker, these are positive programs for the future, because people do believe in the future of Saskatchewan. My election in Kelsey-Tisdale is proof positive that we can and will build a better Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — Earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that the riding of Kelsey-Tisdale has been richly blessed with abundant natural resources, including wildlife such as moose, deer and elk. Indeed as I stated earlier, Hudson Bay has been and continues to call itself the moose capital of the world. These past few weeks, sportsmen from all over have come to Kelsey-Tisdale to hunt. That is all right. I would encourage an avid outdoorsman to come and enjoy the hunting in that magnificent part of our province. But, Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and disgusted at those absolutely irresponsible and careless people who go out and slaughter wildlife for no reason at all, and who leave parts of the carcasses to rot. This is disgusting.

I contend our hunting regulations must be amended to curtail such practices. As one who strongly believes in preserving our environment and wildlife for future generations, I believe we must take strong measures to prevent our wildlife from being wiped out. Environment protection and conservation are not just words to those who live in my riding. To the people of Kelsey-Tisdale they are the key to our future. The natural beauty of the wildlife, the lakes and the streams must be protected. It is a great place and we want to keep it that way.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak in this legislature in favour of changes in the hunting regulations and for wildlife protection. It is important to all of Saskatchewan.

There are other concerns that I wish to raise this afternoon — concerns that I promised my constituents. I would raise in Hudson Bay there is serious need for a hospital. We have an 18-bed capacity now, but that is by no means adequate. It should be expanded to 35 beds. I bring that to the attention of the government; it is a necessary thing, Mr. Speaker.

In my experience as the reeve of the municipality of Hudson Bay, I came to be very concerned about revenue-sharing grants. In my travels, I found in some the grants were so low they were of little assistance and mill rates were extremely high. Some municipalities are hardly able to keep their roads up, let alone improve or build new ones. A positive step would be to increase revenue sharing to where it should be.

Speaking of roads, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Highways that during the by-election campaign promises were made by people representing the government to take into the highway program the grid system connecting Highway 3 to 23 from Porcupine Plains to Mistatim. I would like to commend the government on this action. My only concern is that this promise not be put off for years and that construction on this highway start next year.

Mr. Speaker, it means a great deal to me to have been elected to this legislature in our 75th year as a province. I took to the past to see what kind of pioneer spirit our parents had. As one who has always believed in working for the best, I am confident that we can make Saskatchewan an even better place. I do not say that lightly. I say it because the potential is there and the opportunities are there.

I am especially proud to belong to the Conservative caucus. The party to which I belong is the part of the new Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDY:** — It's a party that believes in the cause of a fair and lasting prosperity for all. These are not words that I felt I should say just because I have become a newly elected MLA in the political arena. That is the way I feel. I have spent a lifetime doing what I feel is right and I felt it was right to join a cause that works for the betterment of our province. I speak out of a deep trust in our capacity to proceed with boldness and a common vision that will make us proud to stand up and be counted.

Last Friday, I took an oath — a sacred oath — in becoming a member for the constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale. It was the beginning of a new venture for not only me but for the people of Kelsey-Tisdale. They, in electing me, said that they too believe that there are an amazing number of things that can be done to make Saskatchewan better.

Mr. Speaker, today marks my first speech in the Legislative Assembly. I stand here and I am excited about the future of Saskatchewan. I am fully aware that these are not ordinary times in the history of Canada and Saskatchewan. There will be setbacks and there will be sacrifices in the years ahead, but I remain convinced that the people want the positive march forward.

It would have been easy for me to stand here today and shoot political shots at our natural political opponents who sit on the other side of the Chamber, but I sense that many, many people want their elected representatives to rise above such practices. I sense that the people of Kelsey-Tisdale, and all over Saskatchewan, want the real issues discussed. It is my hope that in my own way I shall be able to help bring about a sense of

purpose and direction in our actions and debates as elected representatives of the people.

I will not hesitate to speak out against the government when necessary and I shall do it in the strongest terms.

Mr. Speaker, there will be many opportunities for me to speak again and again, in and out of this legislature, about the kind of Saskatchewan I and thousands of others dream of. In my travels throughout Kelsey-Tisdale I went into many homes, into many neighbourhoods, into many halls and stores and shared a cup of coffee with my friends. I listened, and when I think of all the miles and all the memories of that campaign, I think of what a great place we can make for Saskatchewan.

I listened to farmers, to woodworkers, to young people, to pensioners, to school teachers and housewives. I sensed a yearning for a new hope with everyone I spoke with. They shared with me their hopes and their dreams and I felt it in their handshakes.

Today, in their name, Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak for them, the people of Kelsey-Tisdale. For their sake, on their behalf, I will work for the future greatness of Saskatchewan.

We have the raw materials; we have the people; we have the natural resources. And what we need is a government that can continue the pioneer spirit of our forefathers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude with a pledge I made to the people of Kelsey-Tisdale: the trust of the voters is one I will never let down. I gave my word, and my word is good.

Mr. Speaker, it was an honour to participate in this debate. I assure every member of this House that the member for Kelsey-Tisdale will be participating in many more.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, I too am honoured by this opportunity to speak in reply to the Speech from the Throne — honoured, because I know I am speaking in support of a motion so ably moved by the member for Yorkton and seconded by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. I congratulate them for a job well-done.

I am honoured as well because I know I am speaking in support of a government working not only for the good of Saskatchewan people but working also in the interests of all Canadians; a government with strong leadership, the leadership of Premier Allan Blakeney.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — This is a government, as the throne speech so clearly states, working to make a positive response to realities. Unlike the members opposite this is a government not mystified by events in Saskatchewan and Canada. Here in Saskatchewan the New Democratic Party government of Allan Blakeney has a clear vision of reality, and a strong, sure idea of what should be done about the promise and the problems facing our people. This is a government which sees things as they are and



thoughtfully and vigorously approaches the tremendous challenges facing our province and our nation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — This government is not walking away from the issues. We are not prepared to desert our heritage and we will not aid and abet those who treat lightly the bonds between Canadians and who flirt with separatism in the hope of short-term political gain.

Neither will this government back down in its belief that any new constitution must reflect both regional and national interests.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people know their government has never forgotten and will never forget the nobler things which brought Canada into being and which light her path — the path entered into 113 years ago.

Some people may believe that Canada is finished. Conservatives and Liberals, while they may not say they believe Canada has had it, are doing their level best to hasten her demise.

Conservative and Liberal imagination about the future of Canada resembles the wings of an ostrich. It enables them to run but they never quite get off the ground.

Today, as always, the New Democratic Party government of Saskatchewan will continue to press hard for positive changes in our constitutional relationship.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — We will continue to make imaginative and realistic proposals. We will take a different path, a harder path, and guided by our reason and compassion we will help to give new strength to the bonds between Canadians.

I wish to make a few comments with regard to some of our formal colleagues. This session will be different because we won't be sharing it with Eiling Kramer and Jack Messer; men who by their actions showed all of us what it means to stand up for Saskatchewan and for Canada. Both of them represented a part of what we are in Saskatchewan and both of them represented the best that is in us in their own unique ways. I pay tribute to their work and dedication.

I include in my tribute a farewell to Bob Larter, the former member for Estevan — a good and honest man who represented the people of Estevan well.

As we welcome Jack Chapman, Dave Miner and Neal Hardy, I am reminded they represent proud traditions in their constituencies and I wish them well in the days ahead. I congratulate all three on their recent victories and on their maiden speeches in this House. The member for the Battlefords and the member for Estevan, particularly, demonstrated that their constituents showed great wisdom in their selection of representatives.

Mr. Speaker, never in the history of our province have we faced a more promising future, yet never have the challenges facing us been greater. Our task is a difficult one as we charge a course for the future during a period of national recession, new

constitutional relationships and continuing social change.

On the one hand we have a federal Liberal government determined to act alone in constitutional matters — a tired government long-since bankrupt of ideas and ideals. The job's just too much for them. And on the other hand we have the new prophets of the "me" generation — the Conservatives, tugging every which way, tearing the fabric of confederation apart, pouring fuel on the fires of separatism on the one hand and claiming to be the fire department on the other; the Conservative leaders, whose moral flabbiness is so evident in their short-term political interpretation of matters related to the constitution.

Our government, Mr. Speaker, knows there's a third way, a more difficult way to be sure — the way of searching for consensus, not mindless confrontation for confrontation's sake, the way of tough negotiation, not separation. This government stands alone in working for real and specific changes in the position of the federal government, standing apart from the rigid, not-so-lightly-veiled threats that mark the Conservative position.

Federal Liberal attitudes about the constitution only divide us. Conservative tactics can only demoralize and destroy our nation, set neighbour against neighbour, and fuel thoughtless rhetoric.

Our way is based on the trust of the Saskatchewan people in their parliamentary institutions and traditions — a trust rooted in the progressive experience of Saskatchewan people with successive CCF-NDP governments. It's time for all Saskatchewan citizens, who are also Canadian citizens to stand up with our Premier as he fights to bring reason and logic to the constitutional debate and to walk the difficult path of negotiation, securing a stronger position for Saskatchewan people within a united Canada. And I for one am proud to count myself among those who stand with him in that fight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Turn now for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the constituency that I have the honour to represent — the constituency of Prince Albert-Duck Lake. The people in that constituency come from many different backgrounds. The constituency itself is such that it can accurately be called a microcosm of Saskatchewan. It is composed of both urban and rural areas, two Indian reserves, a substantial urban native population, a significant Francophone population and people descended from a wide variety of European and other backgrounds. The people of Prince Albert-Duck Lake have an understandable pride in the part they have taken in the development of Saskatchewan, particularly northern Saskatchewan. And these people tell me that they are proud of their provincial government, and they tell me they are proud of the relationship that has developed between their local governments and institutions and this New Democratic Party government. They tell me that they would like to see a federal government that could deal with provinces in the same way our provincial government deals with their municipal government, with an attitude of trust and co-operation so that all citizens benefit.

There are many examples of that trust and co-operation that I could refer to in the Prince Albert-Duck Lake constituency. I'd like to refer briefly to only one — an obvious and recent example that's important to the people I represent. I refer to the tremendous downtown revitalization program taking place in Prince Albert. It's an excellent

example of what can be done when two levels of government are ready and willing to work together for solutions. The project is a huge task in anybody's terms, encompassing an area of 14.5 acres in downtown Prince Albert. The estimated cost of the total project will be \$30 million, but the result is a major step in Prince Albert enhancing its right place as the primary service and retail centre for north-central Saskatchewan.

To make it possible to get the project off the ground, the provincial government agreed to pick up 75 per cent of the shortfall of revenues during the debenture period and will, if required, purchase 100 per cent of the \$9 million debenture issue. From the beginning the two governments have worked closely in site selection, negotiations with the developer and many other aspects of this huge project. As Prince Albert mayor Dick Spencer said in his press release of July 14, 1980, and I quote:

The agreement we have signed today will be seen as a major turning point in the history of the development of the city of Prince Albert. The partnership the city has entered into with the province is a milestone.

That's one example, Mr. Speaker, of what can be accomplished where there is a will to seek solutions. This is another reason why the people of Prince Albert-Duck Lake have confidence in the intent and actions of their provincial government. Whether it is in the area of the economy, co-operation with municipal officials during drought conditions, the new community schools program introduced this year in Prince Albert, the native career development program, or the way in which people in communities all over Saskatchewan responded to our celebration year, this government has acted openly, honestly and positively and the results have been rewarding.

I quote Mayor Dick Spencer again:

Never, in my view, has the relationship between the Prince Albert municipal government and the provincial government been more open and co-operative.

I use this example, Mr. Speaker, to point out some facts about our province and our country. Nothing of value comes easy. The proposal for downtown core redevelopment in Prince Albert, made in 1979 by this government, was not greeted without hesitation. Many proposals had come before the city council from other sources in years past and none had reached fruition. Yet there as a willingness, a commitment to finding the best solution on both sides and, as I have said, an openness and a spirit of co-operation so that people could benefit.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — In stark contrast to the example I have just related stands the approach of the federal Liberal government to the provinces. One need look no further than the federal Liberal budget of October 28 last. In this budget can be seen some of the reasons for the strains within confederation. Mr. Speaker, I refer in particular to those matters raised in the federal budget to do with energy and transfer payments from the federal government.

As the Saskatchewan throne speech states, "The outlook for the development of our

energy resources has been severely clouded by the measures announced by the federal government related to energy." The energy policies in that budget clearly discriminate against Saskatchewan. First, the federal government plans to take, in total, over 30 per cent of the revenues generated from Saskatchewan's oil and gas production over the next three years. Compare this to only 24 per cent for the nation as a whole. Then they propose an 8 per cent petroleum and natural gas revenue tax. This will cut into Saskatchewan's royalties and taxes and cut producer's profits. Yet, it will still leave marketing and refining profits untouched at high levels. But they don't stop there. No, Mr. Speaker, the federal government wants even more. They want to apply that 8 per cent tax to our provincial Crown corporations. That would include Sask Power and SaskOil. And what does this mean to Saskatchewan? It means household consumers get to pay more while those provinces who choose to export natural gas pay less.

But there is more to this new 8 per cent tax. We in the Saskatchewan government believe it to be unconstitutional and we will fight this latest federal grab for control of Saskatchewan's resources. We will fight it because it is a direct threat to the right of Saskatchewan to manage and control its own oil and gas industry. And, Mr. Speaker, this same federal government, in the same way as the previous Conservative government, continues to tax oil exports, most of which come from Saskatchewan. Why just oil exports? Why don't they also tax exports of natural gas and electricity? But they don't — just oil. Members opposite, who pretend to defend Saskatchewan resources, were strangely silent when the Clark government pursued the same policies.

Mr. MacEachern said, in his budget, the federal government intends to cut back on money for social programs and services. This could have serious implications for Saskatchewan because our province has always been a leader in developing the most comprehensive package of social programs in Canada. We expect the result of the federal budget could mean a reduction in the transfer of federal money for such things as hospital insurance, medicare, post-secondary education, extended health care, and social services. The federal minister, in his wisdom, calls this a tax savings, but it's bad news for provincial taxpayers. It will be them who have to pick up the tab for these necessary programs and services.

What a contrast, Mr. Speaker, in the way in which successive Liberal and Conservative governments have dealt with provincial counterparts, and the way in which this government supports and builds on the strength of local municipal government here in Saskatchewan. While the federal government increases the tax burden on our non-renewable resources in Saskatchewan with one hand, they use the other hand to close the door on provincial requests for a fair share of that tax money in the form of transfer payments.

How amazing it is, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the controversies plaguing our nation, that the federal government should expect immediate unanimity of opinion on difficult constitutional questions. The history of government is also a history of dealing with disagreements. When we deal with questions related to the Canadian constitution and their application, we don't suddenly rise into a stratosphere of icy certainty. There needs to be an atmosphere of give and take, a willingness to honestly negotiate on both sides. This government is ready and willing to negotiate. I'm not so sure about the federal government after reviewing that October budget.

Mr. Speaker, equally distressing to the people of Saskatchewan is the behaviour and

attitude of Conservative leaders across Canada in this time of uncertainty. This distress is even more poignant for the people of Prince Albert-Duck Lake, a seat lying within the boundaries of the federal constituency represented for so long by John Diefenbaker, a man who we all know fought long and hard for a united Canada. The people of my constituency knew John Diefenbaker and they knew that he stood for, above all things, one Canada. It must be hard, for those who knew him, to understand how the federal Conservative leader, Joe Clark and the Alberta Premier, Peter Lougheed, could stand together on a podium in Edmonton just last week — could stand there while a separatist rally took place on the other side of the city and not condemn those separatists. They didn't say a word, not a thing. What one commentator said must have been true, that 90 per cent of those attending the separatist rally probably voted Conservative in the last election. I understand, also, that the separatist rally outdrew the Conservative meeting by about 2 to 1. The November 26 issue of the *Star-Phoenix* reported this strange occurrence in an article entitled, Lougheed Mum on Separatism. The article says, in part, “. . . Doug Christie, head of the Western Canada Concept (separatists), said in his address that if Premier Lougheed wanted a mandate to negotiate separatism we'll give it to him.” It goes on to say, and I quote, “This provided a clear opportunity for the Alberta government to deny interest in separatism.” But Premier Lougheed didn't — didn't deny interest or condemn the movement.

I said earlier the sight of the national Conservative leader and the Premier of Alberta, wordless about a threat to our nation's future must have been particularly distressing to the people of my constituency, and it was. They know, as do all thinking people, that whatever inequities we in the West have had to endure over the years from central Canada, the fact that we are entering a new period of prosperity is no excuse to pay lip service to extremists. It is time to pull together and fight for our future. They know well the maxim that two wrongs don't make a right.

It is interesting also, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative opposition in this House saw fit to leave it to the separatist leader, the member for Arizona, to move the amendment to the motion on the address in reply. It is further evidence that he remains the real leader of that party, speaking for all members opposite. It will be interesting to see how the Tories vote on that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to reply to the throne speech, a pleasure to join with the voices of reason, co-operation and principle on this side of the House. I have said this government is acting for Saskatchewan people and in the interests of all Canadians. I have talked about how a frank, positive partnership between different levels of government can result in good solutions for people. And I contrasted this government's approach to that taken by the Liberal government in its budget. Finally, I indicated the disarray of the Conservative opposition and their apparent support for the idea of splitting this country apart.

This New Democratic Party government stands foursquare behind our Canadian confederation. We are confident of our people. This throne speech demonstrates that confidence. It shows that leadership is more than confrontation and is more than fanatical certainty. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of this government, proud to be a citizen of Saskatchewan and proud to be a Canadian.

I will be opposing the Conservative amendment and supporting the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — I just wish to comment briefly, Mr. Speaker, on the address in reply. In a traditional way and as a member interested in reform in this House, I would like to welcome the three new members to this Assembly. The member for The Battlefords — I think a lot of members have stated (and rightly so) that he follows the tradition of a man who has been in this Assembly for 28 years. I think people from all sides of the House, regardless of their political faith, acknowledge longevity in politics, acknowledge that it takes a certain kind of man with a certain kind of dedication to the function of government to say in government for 28 years. I welcome the new member for The Battlefords and wish him well in his stay in the legislature.

I likewise would welcome the member for Estevan. He replaces a good friend and colleague of ours, one of the characters, one of the nice guys in the Legislative Assembly, I suppose. I think all sides will agree with me that Bob Larter, in his six odd years in this Assembly, contributed to the life of Saskatchewan politics.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — Thirdly, I would like to welcome the new member to our caucus, Mr. Hardy, from Kelsey-Tisdale. I think his speech today was a tribute to the man — a man not trained in government, a man not trained in the art of politics, but a man representing his people. He stood up and, I thought, did a commendable job in his speech today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — I think he did a commendable job the way he posed questions in the question period. I welcome that type of member to this Assembly from any side.

I would also like to say a word about the former member for Kelsey-Tisdale, Mr. Messer. I suppose if members on this side of the Assembly had to see one member of that side leave, Jack Messer would not have been the top priority. Because Jack Messer did not stand for the blind following of the socialist doctrine that the government can do everything better. Jack Messer did have a better understanding, as far as that side of the Assembly goes, of the proper place of private enterprise; that private enterprise in fact does have a place in our economic system in this country, particularly in the field of energy. Without that private initiative and that private sector in the energy field, we are going to fall sadly short of oil self-sufficiency in this country — not only by the end of this decade, but by the end of this century.

It gives me pleasure as well, Mr. Speaker, to follow the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake in his comments today. His logic is that we stand, in energy, the most important thing in western Canada, four-square with the other premiers, and together the West must stand up against the grab by Ottawa. That's what his message was on energy — followed by a five-minute diatribe and attack on Peter Lougheed, the man who is standing up for western Canada, the man who is standing up for energy in this particular field.

The members over there are good at saying that we're western separatists over here, but I harken back to a phrase of Ted Kennedy's, "Democracy is not a quiet enterprise." I think that is very true, and I wish to have put on the record the position I stand for and the position our party stands for with regard to this country, and it is not different from the position that was taken by John Diefenbaker. I reject the people whose answers and whose visions of this nation are found in what I regards as their Armageddon manifesto

— the member for Nipawin and other members of this country as well, I reject those people.

Those people are the apostles of pessimism, and I reject the apostles of pessimism. No one has courage if he faces the challenge by opting out, so we must not yield, as members of this Assembly and as member of this country.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — If the member for Kindersley would be willing to give up his time, the member for Qu'Appelle seems to have something of urgency which the House should deal with at this time.

**MR. ANDREW:** — So I make it very clear to the members of this Assembly, and I don't say this in a political way. I say that I'm every bit as good a Canadian as the member for Regina North-West, and I will be all my life. So you don't have to talk about me being a separatist, or standing for separatism. I don't know how much clearer one has to make it. But democracy does not run quiet, while I reject separatism, I also reject the status quo.

The questions we face in this country are a constitution here and a resource policy there — you can't put one here and one there because the central issue is, where are the resource revenues going to go, Mr. Speaker? Are they going to be used to build a more diverse, stronger economy in this country, or are they going to be used to protect the system we have had for the past 100 years? That's what the people are saying in western Canada — where will the resource revenues that are now in western Canada be spent? In another decade or two they could be somewhere else. Are they going to be used to improve transportation. Are they going to be used to increase food production, or to address the question of the high technologies or new technologies, or are they going to go where they have gone for the last 100 years? Is it going to go to Quebec to prop up the obsolete textile industry? Is that the way we want to spend our money from our resource dollars in western Canada? Do we want our dollars to go to the Massey-Fergusons or the Chryslers, or to protect an obsolete automobile industry that is falling behind on productivity? Unfortunately that is where the money is going to go to a greater degree. I say that we have to have that money going here and being spent here. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You tell it to Bill Davis, too.

Put in a rather simplistic way, Mr. Speaker, I think what sets out in capsule form what I am saying is: are we going to continue in this country to operate overpriced vehicles with underpriced gasoline? That really tells me exactly where the money is going to be spent. So, Mr. Speaker, I think there are a lot of things that are going to come up in this session. The only one thing that I do wish to address at this time is that I think that all members, as I've said before in this Chamber, have to look at ourselves as well. I think it is part of the constitutional debate now as well. We have to look at the reform of our electoral system, particularly in Canada. When we hear people are unhappy in western Canada, I think we're foolish to simply say that people in western Canada are not unhappy. They are, and that's a fact. One of the reasons they are unhappy, Mr. Speaker, is they feel they don't have a voice in the central government. We must address that question as legislators.

We must look at ways in which we can improve or reform our system so that the voice of the people is better heard, whether it's in the forum in Ottawa or the forum in any provincial government or any provincial parliament system. I think parliamentary reform is absolutely crucial if we are going to continue on in a system of responsible

and representative government in this country. That is a problem that perhaps doesn't have to be a partisan one. I think what happens is the advocates of reform tend to be the academic community, the opposition, and various pressure groups. And the force against parliamentary reform is the people who sit in government. Quite frankly, most of the governments in this country happen to be of the same party that I'm from, and I criticize them, Mr. Speaker, every bit as much as I criticize the members opposite. And I say to you that parliamentary reform is important and is going to become increasingly important as time goes on. Thank you very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride and pleasure that I rise to participate in debate on the Speech from the Throne in the third session of the nineteenth legislature. I am proud to represent the constituency of Bengough-Milestone at this time when we are celebrating our Diamond Jubilee as a province. It is a pleasure to represent Bengough-Milestone at this time because during the past summer I had the wonderful opportunity to attend many homecomings and other Celebrate Saskatchewan events and without a doubt the people of Bengough-Milestone are the finest people anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my best wishes to the representative of Her Majesty the Queen, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, C. Irwin McIntosh. He is an able representative of the monarch and I am sure all members of the Assembly will agree with me.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PICKERING:** — At this time I should like to welcome to this Chamber the new members: the hon. members from Estevan, The Battlefords, and my new colleague for Kelsey-Tisdale. I won't offer you any advice, suffice to say that we all welcome you here and wish you well.

The throne speech for this session is certainly a sad way for the government to end our 75th anniversary as a province. It was called Celebrate Saskatchewan, but the people of this province had nothing to celebrate when one closely examines the contents of the throne speech. Instead of initiating exciting and positive programs, I see a throne speech that is just as bare as Old Mother Hubbard's cupboard. Certainly that is not the type of leadership people are looking for in 1980. When I look across the floor at the members opposite, they look like rose bushes in July, the flowers have fallen off and all that remains is the thorns.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said the other day he thought the speech by the Leader of the Opposition qualified for the Governor General's award in fiction. I disagree. I mean, how could anybody do better than that great piece of fiction which the Premier delivered in the Assembly. The Premier would make an excellent fiction writer but I want to remind him that you can fool some of the people some of the time but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

The government makes claim to be providing good government to the people of Saskatchewan. A good government is supposed to listen to the wishes and needs of the people. I should like to take a few moments and bring to the attention of the government the needs and concerns of Bengough-Milestone. On several occasions, I have made representations for bus service to the Radville-Ceylon area and it would appear that



this will not be brought about until just prior to the next general election in Saskatchewan, for the benefit of the next NDP candidate in Bengough-Milestone.

I have served notice that the people of Bengough-Milestone don't want our area to be the dumping ground for the PCBs or any other dangerous substances. Has the government listened? Only time will tell. And then the Premier has made the claim that no Conservative members attended rail line abandonment meetings. I serve notice that I went to all of them in my riding. I also attended meetings with wheat pool committees and officials. How many on the other side can say the same? If the truth were known, I'll bet very few. And so, Mr. Speaker, it astounds me when I see such exaggerated claims coming from the government and especially our Premier.

This afternoon I want to bring before this House the real record of this government. Agriculture is so important to our future and you know what the Minister of Agriculture said in the *Financial Post* on February 12, 1980. I quote:

If the Saskatchewan farmers hope to cash in on a growing, profitable world grain market, the changeover to straight grain farming is necessary. The Saskatchewan economy is diversified enough to take the strain of a large crop failure.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP advocated a return to straight grain farming for Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan Progressive Conservative Party believes this proposal is wrong-headed and retrogressive and clearly demonstrates the lack of understanding of agriculture by the current NDP administration.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Speaker, we only have one major hog processing plant left in our province, yet we export 100,000 hogs annually to Alberta. In addition we import hamburger, milk and chickens to supply our restaurants. We have lost over 8,000 family farms in Saskatchewan since the creation of land bank and I challenge the government to prove otherwise. Saskatchewan farmers have experienced the largest decline in net income in the prairie provinces.

The Premier has stated he will negotiate to trade away the crowrate for oil price concessions with the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, 85 per cent of the farms in Alberta have natural gas, 90 per cent of the farms in Saskatchewan have not. What is the government doing for rural Saskatchewan?

Saskatchewan has 40 per cent of the prime agricultural land in Canada; Alberta has 15 per cent. For the first time every, total farm income in Alberta was equal to that of Saskatchewan in 1979. Since the NDP has been in power the net farm income of farmers has increased only 5 per cent.

Why was it necessary for the Meewasin Valley Authority to have the power to expropriate 160,000 acres of prime farmland?

The land bank, which now has over 1 million acres, and restrictions on farm size are designed to make the farmer totally dependent on government for survival.

Central Canada wanted to buy our oil at half price this spring. Did Ontario or Quebec offer to sell feed to drought-stricken Saskatchewan at half price? No.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative six-point program for the 1980s consists of: (1) Saskatchewan family farm purchase program — a once-in-a-lifetime \$350,000 loan to young people to get started farming; (2) a rural gas distribution system — to provide Saskatchewan rural communities, and particularly farms, with access to low-price energy for home heating, grain dryers, irrigation pumps and livestock-feeding facilities; (3) a Saskatchewan irrigation capital grant program — to provide family farms with the economic incentive to fully capture the benefits of irrigation, which we certainly lack in Saskatchewan; (4) Saskatchewan agriculture and food processing programs (capital and tax incentives) — to enable Saskatchewan families to participate in the benefits of the growing food market; (5) increased financial aid to educational and research institutions working in agriculture and veterinary medicine, and (6) a rural community development program to revitalize Saskatchewan's towns and villages.

I want to talk about gasohol production. The Progressive Conservative Party supports the production and practical use of gasohol as an economic fuel for Saskatchewan farmers. A great deal of extra farmland could be put to practical use in growing crops for gasohol production.

On the subject of drought relief — the Progressive Conservative government in Manitoba began spotting and buying Ontario feed in April of 1980, because of last year's dry conditions and the start of a 20-year cycle. The PC government in Manitoba went ahead with a drought assistance program without a commitment by the federal government. In Saskatchewan the PCs led the fight for a drought relief package and for a debt moratorium which would not put all the burden on local implement dealers as happened during a 1971 NDP program. The NDP in Saskatchewan sat by idly and insisted on federal participating in times of need. The provincial government should have surplus funds to assist Saskatchewan citizens. While Ottawa helps Chrysler, Saskatchewan farmer suffer.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Premier what he said about resources on March 1, 1972 in this very Assembly. And I quote:

We believe that very soon our resources will be attractive enough that we can develop them without massive public subsidy. We will offer support for development, but we don't believe that such development warrants massive ongoing public subsidies. We don't believe that it is necessary to pour millions of dollars of taxpayers' money every year into the development of our resources.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, did you know that the heritage fund subsidizes the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, SaskOil, Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation?

Speaking of the heritage fund — there should be fundamental changes in the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund to provide maximum economic benefit for present and future generations in Saskatchewan. The reason the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund should be changed is that presently it is used to operate the government and subsidize Crown corporations at no interest rate. Last year the heritage fund collected \$600

million and only \$400 million was left in cash. Instead of loaning money to other government agencies the heritage fund should be used for things of lasting benefit such as irrigation projects.

Heritage fund assets should be increased by allocating 30 cents of every non-renewable resource dollar collected through royalties and taxes to the fund. Mr. Speaker, 20 per cent of all heritage fund moneys should be used to assist in such things as gas lines in rural Saskatchewan, grain-processing facilities, research, industrial and social projects, and the development of farm fuel supplies from renewable resources.

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan wants a true heritage fund that will provide continuous present and future benefits to the citizens of this province, that will spread these benefits fairly through time, and will leave some of the financial benefits of our non-renewable resources to our children and grandchildren who may not be able to directly benefit from the resources themselves.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the record of this government, you wonder if they practise what they preach. Take a look at the present Attorney General and what he said in this House on February 26, 1971:

If it weren't for Crown corporations this government would be flat broke. If it weren't for corporations and the surplus from their revenues this government would be broke. I oppose this form of activity because it is a form of taxation. These corporations, if they are making profits, are there to provide a service at the least possible expense to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, if the mandate of the utility companies is to provide service at the least possible cost to the consumer, how can the exorbitant profits — Sask Tel, \$25.5 million; Sask Power, \$40 million — be justified?

I want to put on record this afternoon that the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan would establish a public utilities review committee . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PICKERING:** — . . . which would review utility policies and price increases in the province. It would guarantee that the public would receive service at the least possible cost. Mr. Speaker, the theory behind the idea of a public utilities review board is that the government agencies which furnish telephones, electricity, natural gas and insurance are offering vital public services which must be regulated in such a manner as to provide the best possible service at the most reasonable costs to the people of the province. I do not believe that is the case in Saskatchewan today. That is why we need a public utilities review board.

Mr. Speaker, the public wants a public utilities review board. Editorial support in the newspapers is very positive. Let me quote the *News Optimist* of August 11, 1980, in an editorial titled Utility Rates:

The Saskatchewan Progressive Conservatives, the official opposition have called for the setting up of a public utilities review committee to approve proposed rate increases by the utility corporations. Such a watchdog, we suggest, would be in the best interests of the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial of the Regina *Leader-Post* of July 24, 1980, supports the PC idea:

A recent flurry of utility rate increases for Saskatchewan consumers has again raised the repeated call for an independent public utilities review board by members of the provincial Progressive Conservative opposition. When the upping of rates for power, telephone and auto insurance is viewed in the context of the financial statements of each Crown corporation, then a review committee to approve rate changes is not a bad idea.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in this legislature that I am proud to be a Canadian. The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan feels that Saskatchewan deserves a better deal within confederation. The PCs recognize the feelings of frustration and alienation throughout western Canada, but recognition is not enough. The have-not syndrome which has plagued Saskatchewan for generations, despite our wealth, must stop. We expect more from confederation but we will not receive it if we, as Westerners, continue to fight among ourselves and compromise our resources to eastern Canada.

The current Premier of Saskatchewan is not defending Saskatchewan and western Canada strongly enough. I believe that rather than confronting the other western premiers (as our Premier does), western leaders should establish a vehicle and the lines of communication to build on the strength of western Canada, to bring about an option of opportunity.

All of us want Canada to work — but at the expense of compromising the resources of Saskatchewan and western Canada, no. The option for opportunity for western Canada is an option for unity of spirit in western Canada. We in the West must work together so that the alienation will turn into positive goals and so that we are truly strong in confederation. Such a spirit would make us proud to be Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1980 Grant Devine, Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan said, “It is time to get on with the job of modifying the constitution and reshaping this federation to make it reflect the Canadian identity.” The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan feels that the results of the Quebec referendum gave Canada a second chance and we must now move quickly to develop a new constitution.

The Progressive Conservative constitutional position is that the West must begin working together before bargaining with Ottawa. The NDP spends more time attacking Tory Alberta and Tory Manitoba than attacking the federal government.

A statement by a B.C. cabinet minister was that Saskatchewan and Ottawa had teamed up to isolate B.C. and Alberta in oil pricing negotiations. It would appear that the Saskatchewan government has once again abandoned its obligations to defend and advocate the needs and interests of western Canada, and chosen instead to stand with the Trudeau Liberals in Ottawa against the other western premiers.

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan knows that the western provinces must stick together to get the best deal for the West.

Mr. Speaker, those on the other side of the House know full well who really stands for a strong Saskatchewan. The members across the floor used every political device known

to mankind in their ruthless vendetta to defeat the leader of my party in Estevan. Although in that riding their tactics succeeded, I am confident that the people of Saskatchewan are beginning to realize what a good and decent man Grant Devine is. He is the man who will be the next premier of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, those on the other side can take no refuge in the results of the by-election. In the riding of Kelsey-Tisdale, a riding that has been in the CCF-NDP camp since 1937, I point to the new Progressive Conservative MLA, a clear proof that the people are saying it's time for a change in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks this afternoon, I can say with a sense of pride that the Progressive Conservative alternatives are clear, and just for the record I would like to state that we believe in:

1. Redirecting government revenue to create long-term sustained job opportunities for the people of Saskatchewan.
2. Creation of employment by stimulating and expanding the renewable resource industries like agriculture.
3. Creation of a feeling of confidence in Saskatchewan which comes from the growth of economic opportunities and not growth of bureaucracy.
4. Recognize the importance of family businesses to the Saskatchewan economy and increase measures to enhance the economic climate for small businesses in the province.
5. Sensible and sensitive taxation policies which respect both the needs of the government for revenues to provide necessary programs and services for the people of Saskatchewan and the right of the taxpayer to enjoy a high standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, only a Progressive Conservative government can make a strong and new Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with pleasure that I again take my place in the Assembly on this the third session of the nineteenth legislature to reply to the throne speech.

As far as the Minister of Tourism is concerned regarding his comments; stand up. I suggest we have these little boxes here which you set on your desk. He uses his to stand on.

Mr. Speaker, obviously and as is always the case, these members can have a short and fairly concise speech from me addressing the concerns which I have representing the Moosomin constituency as it relates to the throne speech, or they could have a rather long, drawn-out speech that will be very tormenting and agonizing to those members themselves.

At this point in time I would certainly like to proceed. If a few of the members opposite could just relax a little and let me proceed, I am sure I wouldn't mind. What I want to do is congratulate the three new members to the House. I would like to congratulate firstly

the member for Estevan . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I am sure that the member for Estevan will do a worthy job of representing the people of Estevan. He certainly is going to have to work a little harder at it than most members as he only has two years to prove himself. The next election could be rather disastrous if he doesn't make very efficient use of the next two years.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I would like to congratulate the member for The Battlefords. AS one member in the opposition, I will find it much easier to deal with the new member for The Battlefords than the former member. Not to say the former member wasn't an honourable and most worthy individual in terms of representing his constituents, but that member, I am sure it must be agreed upon from an opposition point of view, was very difficult to handle. I suppose from a government point of view, it makes them all-the-more powerful. I suppose for that sake he was a very strong individual and a strong minister of your government.

I, of course, think of the hon. members opposite in different terms. I look across and I see the two new members, the member for The Battlefords and the member for Estevan, sitting together and I can't help but think of David and Goliath. I think it's obvious which one is David. But I'm sure they're gong to make a very worthy contribution to the House. I look forward to dealing with them from an opposition point of view.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate our new member for Kelsey-Tisdale. Certainly, the new member for Kelsey-Tisdale signifies something that is very important, not just to the opposition, but to Progressive Conservatives all over Saskatchewan. Very simply, what it signifies is that the myth that ridings like Athabasca, Cumberland, Prince Albert, Kelvington-Wadena, Kinistino, Quill Lakes, Canora, Pelly, Yorkton, Shellbrook, which were formerly thought to be strong NDP ridings that could never be changed, not by any kind of a candidate under a Liberal or Conservative banner, or a Unionest for that matter, has been destroyed by one single individual and his people, "the Hardy boys."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — That myth, Mr. Speaker, is gone and gone forever and I tell you our people are excited. In those ridings which I named, right now at this very moment, they are running around organizing and getting ready to knock off another NDP riding.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — No, they are not looking around. I see the hon. member there responsible for government services. I believe — not too much service but a lot of government. He's making a few comments there and he's commenting about being too busy looking around. I tell you, if you're referring to the question of whether Devine is dead, I'll tell you Devine's not dead. He's very alive and he's right on your tail.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said I would like to move along. I just would like to make a few observations with respect to the by-elections. I have congratulated all three members and all three members (and I say this very, very honestly, sincerely) are worthy of their victories in their respective ridings. They had to have something to get

elected and they did, each and every one of them, as did each and every member in this House, even including the Minister of Government Services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to just point out to the Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan, in particular to this government, what those three by-elections tell us. They seem, at least by your indications, to tell you that it was a great victory for your people. But by my analysis of those three particular by-elections, I don't see any great victory for your people. But by my analysis of those three particular by-elections, I don't see any great victory for the NDP at all. When I look at The Battlefords, I see that there is 52 per cent opposed to the NDP in The Battlefords riding — 52 per cent. You look at Kelsey-Tisdale, there's 54 per cent. You look at Estevan and you have 64 per cent opposed to the NDP. And, Mr. Speaker, that's the encouragement that the opposition and the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan has — to look at that large segment of vote upon which we capitalize. And looking at the NDP record in all three by-elections and averaging it out over 61 which I have done, you have exactly the average percentage of vote which you've been getting for the last 10 years. You're not getting any better; in fact you are getting worse. I see a decline here in your support all the way down with the exception of Estevan — there you had a plus of 3 per cent. You had a decline of 8 per cent in The Battlefords; you had a decline of 4 per cent in Kelsey-Tisdale and you had a marginal plus 3 per cent increase in Estevan.

So, Mr. Speaker, what this tells me and should tell the members of this House and subsequently the people of Saskatchewan, is that the NDP support is gradually declining and that the number of people who are eligible for the opposition to capitalize on is slowly increasing. Now that brings a lot of hoots and hollers and jabs from the government because they don't like that. They know that those are the facts. And, Mr. Speaker, that's the encouraging thing out of the three by-elections. So when I take the three by-elections and I roll them all up like that into one. I'm very optimistic because we come out of there the big winners in no uncertain terms.

I tell you that you had better be concerned and you had better do your job and as for those government hacks who were out there during that by-election, you had better keep them out there. Don't let them come back here to try and do their job or earn their living, because I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the member for Estevan, that I sure wouldn't want to be running out there in the next election with the thought — just the thought — of Grant Devine on my tail. Oh, and look at the excitement it creates! Isn't it wonderful! They don't like that, do they?

Well, we've won two points so far in my speech and I don't know whether you guys will catch up to me or not. We're way ahead of you so far — way ahead. I see the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg talking back there and I recall him one time (think it was him) out speaking to a meeting where he was telling the people that “all I know now and what I have been, and what I ever will be, I owe to my mother.” And somebody said, “Well, why don't you send her 30 cents and square the account.”

Now let's see if we can get down to the business of the House. We'll get down to the business of the House now. Mr. Speaker, and I want to reflect on Moosomin constituency. Moosomin constituency was very much like the riding of Kelsey-Tisdale. The riding of Kelsey-Tisdale was NDP-CCF, or CCF-NDP — there is not a great deal of difference except that the NDP was worse than the CCF. And it was, I believe, some forty years of reign while my riding had a Liberal reign for some forty years. That has changed. Oh yes, that has changed — very much so. But Mr. Speaker, what I want to tell you and the House is what has changed significantly in not just my riding, but in every

one of the Conservative ridings in this province today. And that is the kind of representation we give our people. I suspect very strongly there are a number of you that represent your riding in the same way. I would reflect on a former member of this House, a Mr. Thibault. He did a very good job in representing this constituents. He spent more money buying his students lunches than I've spent on travelling the last 10 years. He really addressed himself to the needs of his constituents, and that's what we're doing in the Moosomin riding — we are addressing ourselves to every need of the Moosomin constituents.

These people are people who are not about to accept the kinds of things that this government throws at them. If my support was strong there in '75 or in '78 I tell you it's a lot stronger now, and not so much because of the great improvements in me but because of the deterioration of this government — the rot and rhetoric that we have to experience from this government each and every session in this House. We're going to get around to what some of that rot and rhetoric is in a few moments. Very simply, Mr. Speaker, Moosomin constituency is being represented in a most efficient way, as are all Conservative ridings in the province of Saskatchewan.

I'm glad to see the member responsible for SGI here. I hope that he'll stay here for a while too, because I have a few things to speak about there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here before me just a few notes for my speech, and I have "defence of previous speakers." Now what is that supposed to mean? That means that I was going to get up and defend the member for Kelsey-Tisdale, the member for Bengough-Milestone, and the member for Kindersley from those awful barbs that you people had shot across at them. But this government is so old and tired, I haven't got a thing — not a thing; look at that. There's not a thing because there's nothing coming from that side of the House — absolutely nothing. Now the only benefit of that is it shortened my speech, because I have to turn the page now. (. . . inaudible interjection . . .) you just be careful; remember your mother.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to touch on right now, the minister responsible for revenue, I suppose, would be concerned about. I know that I am. Very recently the Manitoba government changed its vendors' commission allowance, and I was just wondering if it would not be appropriate for Saskatchewan. I throw it out as a suggestion.

The Saskatchewan situation is 5 per cent on the first \$300 with 1 per cent on the balance. Now that's for those reporting monthly and it doesn't vary a great deal for those reporting quarterly or annually. If we take it on \$1,000 or revenue collected by any merchant that would amount to \$22 commission per \$1,000 on the basis of those figures. Now, In Manitoba they changed it to allow 10 per cent on the first \$200, and 1 per cent on the balance. That would allow for a \$28 commission on \$1,000 revenue collected. Therefore we can very easily see there's a \$6 per \$1,000 advantage to small industry in Manitoba as opposed to small industry in Saskatchewan. I know from talking to people in the Moosomin riding, the small-business people there, that they would like to see some changes in the vendors commission to more fairly offset the encumbrances of collecting the sales tax. Of course, we would be much happier if you would just take off the sales tax altogether as they have in Alberta. I see that Manitoba does have a sales tax. Manitoba, as I've just outlined, Mr. Minister, has made some corrections to offset some of the encumbrances of collecting that sales tax.

As far as SGI is concerned, I suppose the hon. member for Regina South would be better qualified as he had the government on the edge of its seat all summer long with



the subject of SGI. I was rather interested today when I noted that the minister, replying to the member for Regina South on a question on SGI, reflected on the varied rate structure in Manitoba. I suggest to the minister that that might be a good idea for Saskatchewan, because that varied rate structure allowed the Manitoba automobile insurance plan to make a \$2 million profit as opposed to the \$40 million that SGI lost in the last 18 months. That's notwithstanding, Mr. Minister, the \$40 million that you borrowed from Saskatchewan Crown Investments Corporation. That's \$80 million. Your own officials, Mr. Minister have stated that it will be another three years before they get out of this mess. What are you doing? You're sticking billboards and ads up all over the province — like in Moosomin — great big ads (and I don't know how much they cost but they must cost a lot) telling the Saskatchewan people what poor drivers they are. I tell you, check in the rural parts of this province. I have. In Moosomin alone, there are two SGI agents and neither one of them has lost money. Throughout rural Saskatchewan, you'll find that. I tell you, simply, the farmers of Saskatchewan, the people in rural Saskatchewan, are paying for the high automobile insurance.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Baloney!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Yes, sir. You just said baloney. You said that one time before in reply to one of my columns and I didn't see your reply come back. I'll stick with the facts. If you can convince the people of rural Saskatchewan that they're not being taxed more heavily because of the losses of SGI than are the urban and city dwellers . . . They're the ones who are causing the accidents. If Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, has a varied rate structure, then so be it and good for them. You should be laying the charges where they gol-darned well belong, and that's on the people who are having accidents. Okay? I tell you, in my riding they're sick and tired of paying high insurance premiums — sick and tired of it!

I can tell you another thing you can do. I can speak to you, Mr. Minister, from experience. When I travel from Moosomin to Regina, I can tell you where every police car sits because I've paid a big price to find out. What I object to is not so much the charge that you get on the road. That's no problem. Look at that, a \$40 fine. Okay. I can handle that. But when I go to get my licence — my goodness, I see they've hit me again. I suggest you either charge us on the road or off the road . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, Mr. Speaker. They're hustling and bustling over there. Well, I tell you, they have it right. That's exactly what I'm giving — I'm giving you a perfect example. If I'm speeding, charge me. Yes, sir. If I'm paying \$155 for my driver's licence — good. That's fine. That's what I'm tell you, Mr. Minister. You start levying that charge on the people who are having accidents. My father is 68 years old. He's had one little wee accident in his whole life. You take a look at those differences between rural Saskatchewan and the urban dwellers.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, have you ever thought of this? I see you're listening and I know you can think of this. In Manitoba you have 500,000 people who are centred in one place. In Saskatchewan we have a population that's evenly dispersed, it's all over — spread right out. I ask myself, how can you have an accident in Saskatchewan? I could give you a classic example but I won't because it's a personal matter and it involves a cabinet minister. I wouldn't want to do that. I didn't have that out in rural Saskatchewan. Oh, no! No, not me. I had it at Northgate Mall where all the cars are bunched in together, just like they are in Winnipeg. I ask myself the question, "How can Manitoba offer just as good an insurance premium, a cheaper insurance premium, and make \$2 million when they have their people all in one place like a fish bowl?" You people are so fortunate. You have all this land spread out out here. It's as safe down

here as it is in the air. And you know, you have these big insurance premiums. I tell you, I don't have to say any more. Mr. Speaker, we're in big trouble with SGI. You admit it. The people of Saskatchewan know it. It's time to straighten it up. We are more than prepared to help you clean that mess up. Whatever it takes (you know, it's just like Percival Mercury says, "Whatever it takes") the opposition is one who is prepared to help you out.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, I can't see him, but I sense it. I can't. Is the Premier here? I sense it. Dale Eisler is here, yes. He knows I have E.S.P. That's what it was. It's E.S.P. working. Well, you came just in time — not Dale Eisler but the Premier. Is he here or isn't he? By golly, he's down there. There he is. There we go. Thank you. I couldn't see him for love nor money.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — It's good to see him for love, that's for sure.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — That's for sure, Mr. Speaker. I want to say a few things with regard to the Premier's reply to the Leader of the Opposition's reply to the throne speech. I thought the Premier's reply was most interesting. I really enjoyed it. I really did. In fact, some day I look forward to giving a speech like that. You get. I hope I'm sitting a little taller when I give it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start out on the statement where the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh well, musical interlude. All right, Mr. Speaker. I want to start out (I now the Premier is listening) with the statement that the Alberta Crown owns 90 per cent of oil and gas, which represents 85 per cent of the oil and gas in Canada. That's true, that is accurate. But I also want to point out (and of course the Premier didn't make mention of it) that in Alberta 99 per cent of the oil exploration and drilling companies are Canadian-owned. I think that is very significant. I would just give you an example. Canadian Hunter Oil, which operates out of Calgary, has moved a lot of its exploration and development south of the line for the very reason that it can't operate efficiently in Alberta because of the energy proposals in the national budget, which I don't see the Premier taking a very hard stand against. Now when you take a look at that, I tell you, Mr. Premier, it is costing Canadian people \$100 million. I see the Leader of the Unionist Party is agreeing with me on that. Now, he would know that. The Premier knows that. But you see, he neglected to speak about that, you know, when he was speaking. You know how he looks up like that. Oh, I can't do it. That's it. But he was replying to the Leader of the Opposition. Well, my co-ordination must be out. I can't do it. But anyway, I think that's very significant, and I know that's just a bit of politics.

The fact of the matter is, Canadians, through the national budget proposals on energy, are being driven out, simply being driven out. I would like to see where either the Premier here in Saskatchewan or the Leader of the New Democratic Party in Ottawa is taking a stand against Pierre Trudeau for those particular moves, in particular because they are always saying, "We have to nationalize; we have to drive those terrible multinationals out of our land and we have to make oil companies all Canadian-owned." We have 90 per cent Canadian-owned in Alberta and they are being driven out.

Now you speak as well, Mr. Premier, of the tax system which we have here. You say, "Well, for those over \$60,000, yes, we have one of the highest taxes in the country here in Saskatchewan." You speak of how these low-income families are not being taxed.

But it is interesting to note that you use different sets of figures, the figures that suit your own political motivation and reasoning. I would like to give you a few figures which are a little different.

Saskatchewan in fact has the third highest provincial income tax rate in Canada, which is 53 per cent with an additional 10 per cent surcharge — only beaten in that field by 58 per cent in Newfoundland and New Brunswick and Manitoba at 54 per cent. Saskatchewan has the second highest corporate tax — 14 per cent. Manitoba is higher at 15 per cent, and Newfoundland is the same at 14 per cent.

Now, I would like to point out to the Premier that in 1976 the average family income (four people) was \$21,060, and the figure which he has used is \$20,000. But when I take a look at the 1980 budget, the Premier was using \$15,000, the 1976 figure, as the average total income for a family of four (to illustrate how advantageous the tax situation was in Saskatchewan). So what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, very simply is that the Premier is using not-necessarily-inaccurate figure, but figures from the wrong era applied to the wrong period in time today to make his point. Very simply, that's what he is doing, and I looked through the answers and checked out his remarks.

I see that I have a note here, and I have three minutes left — that's going to be difficult. Yes, if I were like the Minister of Government Services I would be able to take those three minutes and tell you everything I know, but I can't.

At any rate I will just have to move on very quickly. There are a number of things which I . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, that's right. I'm very modest, and you can handle that, I know.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on at greater length with the Premier here. It is very unfortunate, but I guess what I will have to do is put this together in a package and just send it out to all my constituents. That will have to suffice.

I want to just sum up on this point, and I would like to lay this right on Mr. Blakeney, the Premier — soon to be the prime minister. You know, I can't get him out of my mind as prime minister. I see him going in future years to head the Liberal Party in Ottawa. He'll never become prime minister heading the NDP, so he is looking to that party which is just a little further to the left than he is, and that's the Liberal Party in Canada today.

Now then, I would like to go back to 1971. Can you imagine it? Over here sits the Premier, Mr. Blakeney, and of course the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow, and they were in opposition then, and they were going after that terrible Liberal government for balancing the budget by the use of transfer payments from the Liberal government in Ottawa. Those transfer payments at that time were \$70 million. Now those two individuals sit on the other side in government. We have the same Liberal government in Ottawa, and we are now receiving \$462 million in transfer payments. Then the Premier says we are a "have" province. Now does that make any sense? No it doesn't; it doesn't make any sense in this House and it doesn't make any sense to the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing which I want to make very clear to the Assembly, and clear to the people of Saskatchewan. We saw a Progressive Conservative government in office for six short months, defeated by and large by an 18 cent per gallon excise tax, and here we have an NDP government in Saskatchewan

which hits us on every dollar with 20 cents. Now that's more than 18 cents. When the price of fuel reaches \$2 (and it will get there not too long from now), we're going to see a government here in Saskatchewan taking 40 cents. And will you be taking less from those poor people who are only earning \$15,000 a year, or will you be taking more from those that are earning \$60,000 a year? No, Mr. Speaker, this government has a tax on gasoline. It's this Premier here, an NDP government, a supposedly moral government, that's going to tax each and every Saskatchewan citizen at an even rate of 20 cents on every dollar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that will be the extent of my comments today, not because I don't have a lot more to say, but because of the time frame allotted to me. It's very unfortunate, but not too unfortunate, because I didn't take a great deal of time to put that much together. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot be supporting the throne speech. It does not address the things that I and the people in Moosomin riding are concerned about, nor that growing numbers of people on the opposite side to the NDP in Saskatchewan are concerned about.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. BANDA:** — Mr. Speaker, it's always a pleasure to be able to take part in the throne speech debate. After listening to the circus clown from Moosomin, I think I'll refrain from commenting on what he said. I don't believe that it warrants the time.

I want to take some time tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, to point out to the people of Saskatchewan some of the important facts and figures that, I think, are important to all of us and will show that the resource revenues of this province are certainly benefiting the people of Saskatchewan and the people of my constituency.

I am just wondering, while sitting here, Mr. Speaker, whether you have received an application from the Leader of the Opposition and his House Leader for a lease in the gallery for the coming year or not, as I'm sure that they are going to be there for some time.

Mr. Speaker, because I have a number of things that I want to say on the reply, I'll beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:00 p.m.