

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Eighteenth Legislature**

**November 29, 1977.**

**EVENING SESSION**

**THRONE SPEECH DEBATE CONTINUED**

**MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):** — Thank you fellows. You must have had another good dinner Elwood.

Mr. Speaker, as I was relating to members opposite before I was so rudely interrupted by the clock, I was trying to point out how the Throne Speech, and certainly the lack of content in the Throne Speech was an indication to the people of this province that the government opposite lacked a good deal of confidence in their own ability to put programs before the people of Saskatchewan that those people would readily accept. I was trying to make two specific examples. The first one, relatively large in scope, was the question of DNS and the government's inability to deal with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan in a meaningful way. In fact, their own answer was to pour millions and millions of dollars in money and hundreds of civil servants into the North in the hope that something could be accomplished in the way of positive direction for the people of northern Saskatchewan.

I was also in the process, having completed my discussion about DNS, of giving another example, not nearly so large in scope, but one which is certainly just as clearly an indication of this government's lack of ability to understand problems and to deal with them properly, and that was the question of proposed STC bus service in the west central part of Saskatchewan. I know it is difficult at the best of times to get the attention of members opposite, but I would hope that some of you would pay some attention to what I have to say to you, because it should be something — "Thank you, Mr. Minister of Industry and Commerce." — although some would argue your attentions would better be directed toward SEDCO than toward what I have to say, but I am sure you will be much better off for my comments.

One of your cabinet ministers has directed his department or the corporation that he is responsible for in such a manner that I think it should give all members on that side of the House some considerable concern. I was trying to point out how this government, in the absence of any private operators to provide bus service in an area that they had been servicing, had made a commitment to the people in these communities to provide community transportation service. The government had gone so far as to submit an application to the Highway Traffic Board to get permission to provide the non-profit community transportation service that they had promised these people. At the last minute, however, the government submitted, along with its application for CTS service, a condition that they tacked on the end of their application, which stated that the application go in as one package and that they would provide CTS service to these communities if they were allowed to withdraw service one day a week from Unity. I pointed out as well that the Highway Traffic Board and its chairman, Peter Glendenning, rightly chose to view this application as two separate applications. One, to provide CTS service to these communities that the STC had committed itself to; the other as an application to withdraw service from an entirely unrelated community. The Highway Traffic Board readily agreed that it would be a good thing for STC to provide the CTS service to the communities they had applied for. However, after a public hearing in Unity, a hearing which was well attended and briefs were presented in a thorough and

detailed manner, the Highway Traffic Board decided not to allow STC to withdraw on day a week service. Now the two are really connected because STC and the minister responsible said that if they were allowed to withdraw the one day a week to Unity, they would go ahead with CTS. The magnitude of the decision by the Highway Traffic Board, not to allow STC to withdraw from the Unity run one day a week, meant a total amount of money of \$8,000 a year in lost revenues or a further loss to STC. I asked the minister responsible, sitting behind the rail here, if they had been allowed to withdraw their service from Unity would they have gone ahead with the CTS run, and he said that yes we would have. One can only assume then that the minister of the Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation decided not to go ahead with the community transportation service run on the basis of an \$8,000 a year loss in Unity — \$8,000. For that they were prepared to deny the people along this run bus service, not bus service by a private line but bus service by a publicly-owned corporation which apparently has as its primary goal service to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some members opposite say that \$8,000 is a lot of money. It is a lot of money to some people in Saskatchewan. It is not a lot of money to a government that has a \$1.5 billion budget annually. It is not a lot of money to a government that will build office space in Saskatchewan to house civil servants that it doesn't need and that the public doesn't appreciate — office space costing \$100 a square foot. Your government is prepared to do that and yet they are not prepared to spend an additional \$8,000 a year to provide bus service.

Now what eventually happened was the STC, even the minister responsible for STC couldn't justify in his own pious mind that these communities should be denied bus service by STC, went ahead and they came back with another proposal that they haven't yet applied to the Highway Traffic Board for, to provide service on a reduced route from the initial CTS route they were to serve. By doing this they will pick up about three-quarters of the communities they had originally intended to serve. Left, however, without bus service are four communities, probably 30 businesses, certainly a population of 1,000 people that very badly want and need bus service, bus service that they are being denied for \$8,000 a year by the government.

Now I heard the other day an interesting thing and I'm given to understand that the government is planning to do this. The information I received was from a fairly reliable source; that is that this provincial government and the Cabinet have ordered a new government aircraft to service Saskatchewan with Cabinet ministers, I suspect to haul you back and forth for tea parties in Davidson or whatever. The cost of the aircraft is in the neighborhood of \$700,000. I looked back at some of the speeches that were made and some of the arguments that were made during the 1971 election by the then opposition leader in Saskatchewan, Allan Blakeney, great speeches and arguments about service to people, not profits, but people, get back to creating programs that don't cater to big business but cater to people. Let's institute programs that reflect the real needs of people, not programs that curry to big business or those that are wealthy in our society. There were great arguments about a Premier who felt that the government aircraft that were being used were extravagant; a Premier, who to this day, is so bound by the words of his own speeches that he still drives his 1973 Chrysler New Yorker rather than get a new car because when he drives up and down Elphinstone at 40 or 41 or 42 miles an hour he doesn't want people to think that he is extravagant. Yet, this same government has apparently just ordered a new Navajo aircraft worth in the neighborhood of \$700,000 to haul the Cabinet around. It's bad enough that your government be hypocritical about the way the government should travel in Saskatchewan and the way the government used to travel and the way we travel now in

our 1973 Chrysler, it is bad enough you should be hypocritical about that, but that you are prepared to spend \$700,000 on a new government aircraft for your Cabinet and are not prepared to spend \$8,000 on a bus run for 1,000 people and 30 businesses, is shameful indeed.

I also heard the other day that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is considering building a \$2 million airplane hanger in La Ronge to house government aircraft, again, a government that's so prepared to pour money into the Department of Northern Saskatchewan in a futile attempt to make some reasonable progress up there so prepared to spend \$2 million up there to house your own government aircraft, yet totally unprepared to spend \$8,000 a year to serve these four communities. I said when I began my remarks that I felt your government had no confidence. I still say that's the truth, that was displayed by your lack of confidence or a lack of material in your Throne Speech. I said you were shaky. You have no confidence in the ability of your Cabinet ministers to make rational decisions and if this question of an \$8,000 bus route doesn't prove that, then nothing does.

Your government had the opportunity to display with this Throne Speech that you willingly and readily understand and accept your responsibilities to the people of Saskatchewan. You had the opportunity to prove to people that you are well aware what the serious problems are, the economic problems and the social problems. You had the opportunity to prove to people that you really were concerned about the kind of great commitment you made in 1970 and 1971 when you campaigned for office, the great commitment you made to people. You had the opportunity stop and look back at where you've come in the past six or seven years. Look where you are today, totally unable to deal with the relatively basic problem in northern Saskatchewan. Your only answer is to spend \$60 million up there this year in the hope that some good will come of it. A government that has the lack of ability to control its own affairs to the point where it would leave an \$8,000 car sitting in the service station in Chaplin for lord no knows many months yet is totally unable to find itself \$8,000 to spend on people who desperately need a bus route.

I have given the one large example of where I think you people are missing the boat. I have given a small example which related specifically to your Minister of Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation who is apparently unable to understand how he can find \$8,000 in his program to service 30 people in business, yet sits here sanctimoniously and condones everything you people do in the way of extravagance, bureaucratic growth and administration nightmares.

It would be difficult for us, sitting on this side of the House given our political background in the kind of work we had to do in this legislature in the past two years, to try and make some improvements in legislation. It is difficult enough for us to understand how you people can operate the way you do. Unfortunately, it is much more difficult for the people of Saskatchewan to understand. Think back about the speeches you made about government extravagance in 1970 and 1971 and stop and think what the people of Saskatchewan are going to say about your new \$700,000 government aircraft. Think back to the speeches your present Premier made about government aircraft in 1971 and rationalize that with your inability find \$8,000 to serve 1,000 people in your province. I think that you'll find if you will take an honest look at the approach you have to problem solving in Saskatchewan today, you will find yourselves that you do indeed lack confidence in your own abilities. At the same time accepting the fact that you people aren't prepared to take major steps to deal with problems, in fact lack that confidence in yourself, it's no surprise that those of us who have to sit here day

in and day out and watch you perform have no confidence in you either. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, an opposition party could not give this Legislature and certainly the government opposite a vote of confidence on a Throne Speech that they in fact have no confidence in themselves. I will be supporting the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and will not be supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to take part in this 1977 Throne Speech Debate and in many ways, I suppose, it is somewhat of a maiden speech, similar to the ones that we've all faced with some trepidation during our initial days in this Assembly. Initially, I would like to send my congratulations to the newly elected member for Pelly and I trust that he will find his days, numbered though they may be, rewarding in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the last few days in this Assembly have been totally and completely dominated by the Supreme Court ruling. You know it really isn't often that a government loses a court case, usually by the time a government spends its unlimited funds on a case, private individuals and companies have little chance. When one looks at the number of judgments that are handed down in this country, it is rather obvious that there is a very heavy preponderance of judgments favorable to a government whether it be federal or provincial. In straight English, it's darn tough to beat the government, any government, in court. Mr. Speaker, this decision was not exactly a split decision by any stretch of the imagination. It was not a five to four vote but rather in complete contrast it was a highly decisive seven to two decision. You know, Mr. Speaker, I notice that 'eight to seven' comment coming from one whom we may have to turn to be our Attorney General in the upcoming weeks and that kind of arithmetic does concern me. Mr. Speaker, this judgment in itself has to be considered surprising and unquestionably it is an indictment of the competency and the capability of the government across the way. And frankly, Mr. Speaker, if the judgment was not so terrifying in terms of its ramifications towards this country, it would be one that citizens and individuals could really relish in because finally someone in authority has said to this little group of power hungry dictators across the street that you've gone too far and enough is enough; get your hands out of our affairs. In almost any other case, Mr. Speaker, we could take great consolation from that, regrettably not so from this case.

Mr. Speaker, the past few days the Attorney General has been under a great deal of attack and I think justifiably so. This has certainly not been the first of shoddily written legislation to appear before this Assembly and we have yet to see the ramifications of some of the subsequent legislation since the very infamous Bill 42. Obviously, Bill 42 was not written by his very high priced law firm of Davis, Ward and Beke, who wrote the rapidly becoming famous potash expropriation legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who does deserve complete and utter condemnation for allowing the situation to reach this point must unquestionably be the man at the top, the man who makes the final decision, and the place where the buck must ultimately stop and that, of course, being the Premier.

It has been very interesting that in the past few days the Premier has been quite content to allow the Attorney General to take the shots from the members of the opposition. Now that is not particularly a unique situation. This is generally true because the Premier is usually very content to sit there and allow someone to take the flack while he jumps to his feet and tears like a greyhound out the door, where the Minister of

Highways (Mr. Kramer) is just going now. He is quite content to let the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) take it or the Attorney General or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) but not very often does the Premier get involved.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a situation such as what the Attorney General has been in of late was described in the Watergate hearings by one John Erlichman, when referring to the testimony of the then director of the FBI, one Patrick L. Gray. When under scrutiny, Mr. Erlichman described Mr. Gray's situation as allowing him to hang and twist and turn slowly in the breeze. That's how we have proceeded the last day or two in this Assembly. We have watched the Attorney General twist and turn in the breeze while the Premier sat there and casually watched him.

Mr. Speaker, unquestionably the Premier has blown this one and he has brought on a constitutional crisis that has potential and horrendous repercussions in the country and no matter what he may do, no matter what he may say, the people of Saskatchewan are not going to forget that this one was bungled by the man at the top.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately or unfortunately the CIGOL affairs has diverted attention away from what was previously the most important issue facing this province and that being, very simply, the bungling and the total mismanagement of our provincial economy. We have had some very buoyant years in this province during the 1970s. In fact these years were probably unprecedented in provincial history. We have seen in the '70s record farm incomes, record agricultural prices, record construction, record housing starts, record prices for our natural resources and the list goes on and on. In that period of time with the rapidly expanding provincial revenues, the government was able to proceed on rapidly expanding governmental programs as though these times were here to stay forever.

Never was there any thought to the possibility that things would eventually tighten up. There was never any thought that the price of grain could go down. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, in this province whatever else might ultimately happen our economic well-being has been, still is, and will continue to be based on the economic well-being of our grain industry. Only the business geniuses that sit across the floor could not be aware that things are not well in the grain industry at this point in time.

Last March, at the time of the delivering of the 1977 Budget, the Minister of Finance shocked the province by announcing that he had been unable to balance the books for the 1976 fiscal year, a year that was a record in almost every category in this province and yet still his ledger pulled up with red ink. At that time he predicted a deficit of some \$45 million. Ultimately that deficit, in reality, turned out to be only \$22 million.

**MR. MESSER:** — Tell us about Ontario.

**MR. THATCHER:** — I'll tell you about Manitoba very shortly, Mr. Minister. Ultimately that \$45 million deficit, in reality, turned out to be only \$22 million. I can still recall the Minister of Finance chuckling on television as he announced that he had been able to cut the size of the projected deficit in half. Tragically, I think he was even proud of himself. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what else I can say other than at that particular moment that I viewed him on television I truly felt sorry for him because I think at that moment he really thought he had done a job. I think at that moment he really felt that he had made a contribution to this province, when he had had more going for him, more

going for him than any other provincial treasurer or Minister of Finance in the history of this province, and still he couldn't balance the books. That not being enough, he then proceeded to budget for a deficit of some \$40 to \$50 million for fiscal 1977.

Mr. Speaker, about the same time as this 1977 Budget was brought down, there was a similar budget coming down in the province of Manitoba, roughly the same month, and they budgeted for a similar deficit, in the neighborhood of \$32 to \$40 million. However, in the intervening period in Manitoba, they had a provincial election in which the people of Manitoba passed judgment and they pitched out the NDP government, something very similar to what the people in this province are on the verge of doing in some 18 to 20 months.

Mr. Speaker, when the new government had a chance to look into the financial situation in that province, knowing full well in advance that it was going to be rough, they were stunned to find that the \$40 million projected deficit was in reality approaching something in the neighborhood of \$225 million — eight times as great — \$225 million. They are still reeling in shock after that one.

Mr. Speaker, our friends across the floor will have to excuse those of us on this side of the House who look at your \$40 to \$45 million projected deficit with a slightly jaundiced eye, particularly in view of comments by both the Premier and the Minister of Finance, that revenues are down substantially from fiscal '76. How much they are down has never been precisely indicated and exactly what they, in reality, are facing in terms of a projected deficit for 1977 can only be speculated upon. However, when the Premier begins to talk about bringing down a 1978 deficit six months in the advance of that budget coming down, it does raise just a little bit of suspicion in one's mind as to just how big is the deficit for 1977.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, who I regret isn't in the House tonight, has responded in his limited predictable fashion by casting the blame upon the federal government in Ottawa. You know, Mr. Speaker, I think he has just about worn that one out, not only in this Assembly, but to the people who sit above the Speaker, to the people that sit above the Speaker.

Last March the Minister of Finance imposed the highest provincial income tax rate in this country, an incredible rate of 58.5 per cent. Mr. Speaker, contrast that with our neighbors next door, the province of Alberta, where we have a provincial income tax rate of 38.6, 38.6 versus 58.5. Mr. Speaker, percentages don't mean an awful lot but what do they mean in terms of dollars? Let's take a taxpayer at random. If there are no objections Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a hypothetical taxpayer who has a wife and two children under the age of 16, giving him the basic exemptions of \$2,270 for himself, \$1,990 for his wife and \$430 each for his children. Deduct his medical of \$100, employment exemption of 3 per cent of earnings up to the maximum of \$150 and assume that the provisions of Bill C37 are in effect. Mr. Speaker, at a gross income of \$10,000 this taxpayer in the province of Alberta would pay a provincial income tax, provincial income tax of \$279. However, if he is living in Saskatchewan and has these same identical deductions he's going to pay a net provincial income tax of \$303. (My it's gotten quiet across the way all of sudden.) Mr. Speaker, it has cost that particular taxpayer \$24 for a year for the privilege of living in this socialist utopia.

Now, let's elevate this hypothetical taxpayer to \$15,000 with the same deductions, the

same provisions (interjection of jeers) — I am glad you people still have some life I was worried about you for a few moments there. In Alberta he would pay a net provincial tax at \$15,000 income of \$666, living in Saskatchewan he would pay a provincial income tax of \$889, a premium of \$223 to live in this socialist haven.

Now let's move him up to \$20,000, Mr. Speaker. At \$20,000 in Alberta he would pay a provincial income tax of \$1,122, contrast that to here in Saskatchewan where he would pay a tax of \$1,580. You are getting quiet again over there. Mr. Speaker, at the income level of \$20,000 a taxpayer, this taxpayer, (I invite you to check my figures) pays a premium of \$458 to live in Saskatchewan. At \$25,000, provincial income tax in Alberta would be \$1,651 — in Saskatchewan \$2,381; he's now paying \$730 to live in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, if he happens to be fortunate enough to earn \$30,000 in Alberta the tax he would be paying would be \$2,266; if he lives in Saskatchewan it would be \$3,312, to live in Saskatchewan a premium of \$1,046, just on your provincial income tax.

Mr. Speaker, you can go on and on, you can take different situations, different levels and it all comes out the same. It is unquestionably a crunching blow that our residents must suffer paying this terrible premium on their provincial income tax to live under a government of incompetency, Mr. Speaker. The final straw is that they must also watch their neighbors to the West with no sales tax. Mr. Speaker, the lack of (your getting quiet over there incidentally) a 5 per cent sales tax means an awful lot in dollars to a lot of people. Take that \$8,000 car which, you know, really isn't a very big car anymore, put that 5 per cent on to that, what have you got? You have \$400. Take 5 per cent of everything they must buy in this province and contrast that to our neighbors in Alberta and it adds up to an awful lot of dollars. In fact what it does add up to, Mr. Speaker, is that Albertans, when you consider the provincial income tax rate, the lack of a sales tax and a difference in municipal rates, pay 40 per cent less tax than does a resident of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the silence over there is throwing me off key a little bit, do you suppose you could rev them up so I could find my place again?

Mr. Speaker, when the economy begins to slip and when things start tightening up as they have done in this country in the past six to eight months, exactly what did this government across the way do? Mr. Speaker, they did nothing, unless you call crying to Ottawa something constructive. Mr. Speaker, the government and the Minister of Finance did nothing to stimulate our economy, they did nothing to stimulate revenues and to make economies wherever possible within the framework of government itself. They sat there immobilized, frozen by the events that they have led this province to, the chaos which they have taken us into. Mr. Speaker, there was no attempt on the part of this government to reduce the sales tax, as a means of directly leaving more dollars in consumers pockets, in the hope that it would spur badly needed retail sales. There was no move on the part of this government to reduce the income tax level, again in the hopes of spurring additional retail sales.

Mr. Speaker, the Economic Council of Canada is an organization that makes a fairly broad general commentary each year about this time on the economy. This year they took quite an about-face when they came out with their yearly report and specifically and pointedly asked the provinces to reduce their sales tax as a means of encouraging retail sales. The federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Chretien, immediately offered to reimburse the provinces for half of the lost revenue if and when the sales taxes were reduced. The member for Saskatoon says hogwash. I suggest you ask that of your Minister of Finance and your caucus or your question period. Obviously you just don't know whether you were born or poured!

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance immediately offered to reimburse the provinces for half of the lost revenue if the sales tax was reduced. There were no takers, certainly not on the part of this government. Mr. Speaker, when it came to matters of the economy, this government, the Premier, the Minister of Finance, have been clumsy, unimaginative and completely unprepared to deal with realities staring them in the face.

Mr. Speaker, in short, this government has sat there totally bankrupt of ideas on how to manage the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to very briefly point to the province of Manitoba and very briefly explain and comment on some of the procedures that the new government in Manitoba has instituted. The new government in Manitoba faces just some horrendous decisions. We don't know just how big a deficit we're facing in this province, but in Manitoba as I mentioned earlier, they're facing \$225 million in deficit. The Premier of Manitoba announced that he would restrain spending and introduce tax cuts to stimulate private business in an effort to reduce an anticipated deficit of nearly \$225 million.

Every program of government will be cruelly examined by a task force set up for this purpose, because no government, be it federal or provincial, can carry on with these kinds of deficits. The Premier went on to say:

We believe that the job of government is not to create jobs, but rather to make sure the atmosphere is such that the private sector will expand production and employment, and in this connection, we feel that we will have to stimulate the economy by way of tax cuts to ensure that we are competitive with other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, such common sense and logic and obvious economic policy is lost on what we have sitting across the floor.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech, our economy was virtually ignored. Raising the minimum wage will simply increase the cost of retail products; the cost of goods and services throughout this province will be raised to pay for the added cost, but by no means will inject any new dollars into the economy, beneficial though it may be to some people.

I want to go into another wonderful thing that this government came up with. In the first part of October they removed controls from the public sector in this province and at the same time they were let down in the private sector by the federal government. Mr. Speaker, with that move, anybody who can make any economic sense out of that deserves to sit with that group across the floor. Ultimately however, Mr. Speaker, all of these numbers will come out in the wash. The people of Saskatchewan will become very painfully aware of exactly what sort of a mess is staring them in the face. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is one time when not even the fuzzy accounting procedures of the NDP government can make the picture appear bright, when in true reality it may be very well something more than chaotic.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has come due and the time has come when governments simply cannot allow eight, nine and ten per cent to be taken out of the economy every year



when productivity is only going up two and three per cent. The bill has unquestionably become due. It has become due on governments that are making massive borrowings abroad and in the United States, regardless of the currency being borrowed. In the case of this province the dollars borrowed have been placed primarily in the utilities which dispense and build their services in Canadian dollars, so that whatever advantage is obtained by borrowing the higher valued currency is immediately lost when the service being produced by the borrowing utility is sold in Canadian dollars. In other words, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that a procedure such as this may very well ultimately cost the taxpayers of this province up to 18 per cent on recent loans. I'll leave that for the business geniuses across the floor to figure that one out. I'll elaborate on that one in the upcoming budget speech sometime next spring.

Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of pleasure, I will joining 62 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan in voting against this government and support the amendment.

**MR. B.M. DYCK (Saskatoon-Mayfair):** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this Throne Speech debate, and I would like to, at the outset, congratulate the mover of the main motion, the new member for Pelly, and the member for Meadow Lake, on the excellent way in which they performed in this House. I want to welcome him through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the new member for Pelly to this Legislature, and I know that he will make a valuable contribution, not only to this Assembly, but to his own constituency. And contrary to the remarks of the member for Thunder Creek, that his days would be numbered, I think the people opposite said the same thing to Tommy Douglas and his colleagues in 1944.

You know, the member for Pelly fought a hard and tough campaign and it demonstrates his capabilities and his determination. Mr. Speaker, the member for Pelly will be around for a long time, and I am sure he will do a creditable job in filling the shoes of his predecessor, the late Leonard Larson.

The people of Saskatchewan were shocked by the recent decision of the Supreme Court, and I don't blame them for being shocked. Two courts in Saskatchewan, the Court of Queen's Bench, and the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal, upheld the legislation. The Supreme Court of Canada did not, and the people of Saskatchewan are wondering why. It was always their belief, and rightfully so, that the resources of the province belong to the people of this province, and that benefits from the development of these resources, in a fair share with other provinces, should accrue to the people of Saskatchewan. And the people don't understand this decision of the Supreme Court. They are wondering, they are wondering — does, in fact, the province of Saskatchewan have the right to direct the development of our natural resources. And that question certainly seems to be at this date, without an adequate answer.

But there is another question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps more pertinent and more immediate. Does the \$500 million belong to the oil companies or does the \$500 million rightfully belong to the people of Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker, that is the immediate question. And I wonder where the parties opposite will stand on this issue. Our record is clear, it's irrefutable. We stand on the side of the people. And one need only look at our record since 1944 to demonstrate this fact. But what is the record of the parties opposite, in Saskatchewan, in other provinces, and in the federal government? Their record does not indicate that they have always sided with the people. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, their record demonstrates the contrary. If they

are forced between a decision between the people and the large corporate empires they invariably side with the latter. And we, on this side of the House, can understand this because the parties opposite are owned by these enterprises. We have to understand not only from the record, but from their speeches in this Legislature, but we also want the people of Saskatchewan to understand it. And I believe the people of Saskatchewan will understand it. They will understand it so well that they are going to soundly defeat the parties opposite in the next provincial election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to our own tax policy, the other major step that we have taken was the purchase, the acquisition of a number of potash mines in the province. And we now own and operate three. And this was an acquisition, not a takeover as is so commonly referred to in the press and media. It was an outright purchase, Mr. Speaker — an outright purchase at a fair market value. And I want to emphasize that this is a long term policy and we don't expect this province to reap immediate benefits. But I also want to emphasize that the revenue from potash will help to pay for education and health care costs for decades and decades into the future. Education and health care costs are rising dramatically. By acquiring ownership of a portion of the potash industry, profits would be out of the province had these mines been owned privately, will now stay in the province and help to ensure that our children and their children will have health care and education provided to them in the way that we have come to know it. And again, Mr. Speaker, we have no doubts about this issue. It is a big issue and will be fighting it right up until 1979. But I want to say as one member of this Legislature that I am proud and pleased to be a part of that fight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. DYCK:** — Well, the old line parties will not let up. They feel this is an invasion into the private sanctum, into the private domain, always held to be the domain set aside for corporate enterprise. Mr. Speaker, that's what the parties opposite believe now and what they will always believe. We disagree. We want the benefits from resource development to stay right here at home, right here in the province of Saskatchewan. It has been a tough job for Allan Blakeney, Allan Blakeney and his colleagues of the New Democratic Party. It is no easy job to take on these very powerful forces in the form of a large corporate enterprise situated here, in the United States and elsewhere. It is no easy task, no easy job to take on the press and the media and I think it took great courage on behalf of our Premier, Allan Blakeney and I hope and I believe that this is something that he will be remembered for for many years to come. It will be, without a doubt, one of his greatest achievements, Mr. Speaker. There have been a number of effects from these two policies. While the Trudeau government in Ottawa has done little to curb inflation from spiralling costs, the Blakeney government of Saskatchewan has taken every measure possible to ease the financial burden on the people of this province.

One need only look at the large increases in grants to the various urban and municipal administrations and to the various school boards across the province to understand this. Without these large grants property taxes would have risen dramatically and certainly to an impartial person looking at property taxes today, they have not risen in the same proportion as other costs like rent and food and clothing and other consumer goods.

The member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) was talking about the high level of taxation in the province of Saskatchewan and I would like to enlighten the member for Thunder Creek. I would like to take an average family of four with an income of \$15,000

a year. Income tax in Saskatchewan \$717; in Alberta \$531; in Ontario highest \$623 for the Health premiums - in Saskatchewan zero; in Alberta \$169 and it's going up; in Ontario \$384. Sales tax - \$240 in Saskatchewan; Alberta zero and the member for Thunder Creek did not mention the 7 per cent sales tax in the province of Ontario and that would cost the average family \$336 per year. Gasoline tax - in Saskatchewan \$98; in Alberta \$65 and in Ontario \$124. Car insurance - \$228 in Saskatchewan; \$453 in Alberta; \$444 in Ontario. Various tax rebate incentives - \$200 in Saskatchewan; \$260 in Ontario; zero in Alberta. But the total tax bill when you look at the whole spectrum of taxes, all of the taxes, the total tax bill for a family of four earning \$15,000, Saskatchewan would be \$1,083 per year; in Conservative Alberta it would be \$1,218 per year; in Conservative Ontario it would \$1,695 a year.

You know, in addition to that Saskatchewan Auto Insurance is the best and the cheapest in all of North America. Saskatchewan has the most progressive labor legislation anywhere and the member for Thunder Creek was making some comments and the member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) was making some comments about the civil service in Saskatchewan. The civil servants of Saskatchewan are becoming very much aware of the type of legislation that the Alberta Conservative government are passing in regard to the political activities of those people employed by the public service.

Saskatchewan leads the nation in providing good roads for citizens. Saskatchewan has the best health care in all of North America. Let us look at some of the aspects of health care. The prescription drug program in Saskatchewan — (Interjection) yes, Conservative Alberta and Conservative Ontario - no. Children's Dental Care Plan - Saskatchewan yes. Conservative Ontario and Conservative Alberta no. Aids to independent living to provide wheel chairs, etc., Saskatchewan - yes, Conservative Alberta and Conservative Ontario - no. Hearing aid program, Saskatchewan - yes, Conservative Ontario and Conservative Alberta - no. Premiums for health care, Saskatchewan - none. Conservative Ontario \$384 per family; Conservative Alberta \$169 per family and as I was saying it is going up.

Now a lot of thee things we sometimes take for granted, Mr. Speaker, but I want to warn the people of Saskatchewan that these programs that we tend to take for granted are not guaranteed. There is absolutely no guarantee that these programs that we know so well today will be here tomorrow. And each time, Mr. Speaker, I look at those parties opposite and I hear what they have to say in this Legislature, and I have heard what they have had to say in the last few years, my hope for these programs in the future diminishes, particularly if they were ever given the reins of power in this province. But there is much hope left and that hope is based on the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan can guarantee that we will stay in the vanguard of social programs for the residents of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. DYCK:** — Let me substantiate what I mean when I say these programs could be in serious jeopardy, if by some tragic turn of events the parties opposite were elected to govern this province. In the Regina Leader Post October 8th, 1974, "Dr. Ivan Dot, Progressive Conservative candidate for Yorkton, cites the Liberal Premier Ross Thatcher for bravery in introducing deterrent fees, deterrent fees on the sick." The Star-Phoenix, March 16th, 1977, Progressive Conservative MLA Roy Bailey says, "People in Saskatchewan would pay \$10 a day to get into the hospital." Hansard in the Legislature . . .

**MR. LARTER:** — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Would you repeat that again and say that he said that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! In order for a point of order to exist the member must have abridged some rule or practice of the House. Would you care to state . . . Order! (Interjection) I think that if the member wishes to get on his feet and say that I will be on my feet again too.

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Speaker, it is an untruth, it is a misrepresentation of what the statement in Hansard has said.

**MR. DYCK:** — Star-Phoenix, March 16th, 1977 . . .

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**MR. DYCK:** — . . . Progressive Conservative MLA, Roy Bailey, he said, "People in Saskatchewan would pay \$10 per day to get into a hospital."

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, I do have a point of order, okay. If the member speaking would not mind please just backing up a few paragraphs and starting over and just slow down a little. This is a legitimate point of order. I have not been able to make out the hon. member clearly and if what he is saying is worthwhile then I should be honored in hearing what he has to say. Would he mind just repeating . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think it is in the order of a personal request. I am not having any trouble hearing the member.

**MR. DYCK:** — And I want to continue, Mr. Speaker, in Hansard in the Legislature, Liberal MLA Glen Penner says that the children's dental program, prescription drug plan, the hearing aid plan are unnecessary frills. I would like him to ask our senior people in Saskatoon Mayfair, are these programs unnecessary frills? I know the senior people of the Mayfair constituency would be very interested in hearing the member for Saskatoon Eastview and his comment.

Speaking in Manitoba in July, Joe Clark said, a Progressive Conservative government would introduce what he called a sunset law. If a government agency wasn't producing, the sun would set on it. He wouldn't try to improve the program, he would simply close it down. Vancouver Sun, September 23, 1976, Progressive Conservative Leader, Joe Clark says, "visit to the doctor and hospital should be considered taxable benefits." In other words, if you incurred hospital and medical care bills of \$1500.00 per year, you would be taxed as income on that amount that you paid as a tax on the sick.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate and I want to emphasize to the people of this province, that these programs could be in jeopardy. They could be in real serious danger if there is ever a change of government in Saskatchewan. But there is hope and that is the hope that I have and the faith that I have in the people of Saskatchewan, to ensure that this would not and could not happen in our province of Saskatchewan.

Let me touch on a few other areas, Mr. Speaker. For the last three months, Saskatchewan has enjoyed, contrary to the comments of the member for Thunder Creek, the last three months Saskatchewan has enjoyed the lowest unemployment in Canada and the economy is buoyant. A lot of things determine if a province will have

nearly full employment and one of them is wise government planning. In that regard the Blakeney government has done its part. The Trudeau government has not. Unemployment is a Trudeau Liberal Policy and if Joe Clark were the Prime Minister, it would be a Joe Clark Conservative policy. Unemployment costs Canadians \$9 billion a year; 850,000 people out work. You know the corporate free enterprise system hasn't worked better since the 1930s. This, Mr. Speaker, in my view is a bigger threat to national unity than language and cultural rights ever was. In my view, the biggest threat to national unity in this province is rooted in the economic system that we adhere to and the inequities and the regional and individual that are caused by this outdated economic system that we follow and I am afraid that the reason for the Supreme Court decision will not enhance that national unity.

I would like, at this point, to turn to a few myths, propagated, Mr. Speaker, by the members opposite. You know the Liberal and Conservatives in our province would like to have us believe that we have big governments, that we have big bureaucracies, that we have enormous unnecessary public service. Well here are the facts. In Alberta, a province that represents itself as the heart and soul of Conservative thoughts, and Alberta's 2.4 per cent of the total population is employed by the government of that province. In Saskatchewan, 1.8 per cent of the total population is employed by the government service. The overall average in Canada is 3.3 per cent of the population employed in the public service. So when they use this argument, Mr. Speaker, they are not fooling the people of Saskatchewan, because the people of Saskatchewan will know the facts. And these figures incidentally, do not come from me, they come from Statistics Canada, a federal organization.

Another myth the members opposite have been developing around this country is the number of people receiving social assistance. They say our government, and they would have us believe, that we are too easy on welfare. This argument has been flogged to death ever since the 1940s. You know there are 26 per cent fewer recipients of social assistance now than there were in 1971, under the Thatcher regime, under the Thatcher government. And when people talk about expenditure on social assistance, you should ask where that money is spent, Mr. Speaker. Fifty-eight per cent of total expenditures in this area goes to the elderly, the disabled and the mentally retarded; 18 per cent goes to widows, widowers, deserted wives and separated parents; 22 per cent goes to people with psychological emotional problems and problems with alcohol. Mr. Speaker, these are the facts and the people of Saskatchewan are aware of them. The next time the opposition members try to win votes by attacking the disadvantaged, because that's what they are doing when they are attacking the NDP social assistance policies, we should keep in mind that these are the same people who have placed taxes on the sick in the form of deterrent fees.

Now I would like, Mr. Speaker, to turn to some other recent events. When we look at the election in Manitoba and when we look at the election results in British Columbia, we can come to only one conclusion. The old line parties are doing a gang-up job on the New Democratic Party. They are ganging up on us in a futile attempt, a futile attempt to destroy democratic socialism as we know it. They would like to destroy and to defeat our party so that they can return to the good old days when a corporate capitalist could operate in a free-wheeling way that we have known them to operate, before our party came into being. You know, they will make it all their own way and when you look who is sitting in the Conservative government in British Columbia, although they call themselves Social Credit, is a kind of interesting pot-pourri of parties. But it does demonstrate to what length they will go to fight our party and I suggest that these attempts are futile and sheer folly because the New Democratic Party is strong, it is a

grass roots party, it has resiliency, strength and tremendous fight-back power demonstrated ever since 1933.

You know, in British Columbia, Conservatives are sitting with Social Credits, Liberals are sitting with Social Credits, Liberals and Conservatives will sit with Social Credits or anyone else for that matter, providing that everyone else was against the New Democratic Party; and they sit there as one happy corporate family, administering the affairs of state. And let's look at some of the examples of what has happened in British Columbia. Pat McGeer, Garde Gardom and Allan Williams approached Bill Bennett, the Leader of the Social Credit Party, just prior to the December, 1975 provincial election, when Bennett formed the government. Whom did he choose to fill the three of the most important Cabinet posts? That's right, his Attorney General, his Minister of Labour, the Minister of Education are all three former Liberals. Fortunately, they are not lonely in the Social Credit Cabinet. Jack Davis, the former federal Liberal, worked out the same kind of a deal with Bennett and he too is in the Cabinet. You know, the Liberals were not alone in compromising themselves. A number of well known Conservatives lined up to sell what little principles they had as well. In fact, Peter Hyndman a former President of the British Columbia Progressive Party, and a candidate for the PCs in 1972, is now President of the Social Credit in British Columbia. Political games by the right wing parties are not known only to British Columbia. Mr. Horner, the former Conservative MP is now sitting on the Liberal front benches in Ottawa. In Saskatchewan, in order to pave the way for the Conservatives, Liberal MLAs cannot get out of their party fast enough to join the PCs. The member for Qu'Appelle, the member for Thunder Creek have just joined the old line Conservative regime. This is the most blatant example of political opportunism that I have witnessed in my political career. However, the people of Saskatchewan are learning the truth, Mr. Speaker, about the Conservative Party over there. I am sure that the hon. members will live to regret the day when they decided to cross over to that worn out Tory machine. However, I can understand a Thatcher joining the Conservatives — changing political parties kind of runs in that family.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the overriding issue of this Legislature. Does the \$500 million of tax revenue belong to the oil companies or does it belong to the people of Saskatchewan? Our party stands firmly on the side of the people of Saskatchewan and they know it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. DYCK:** — We know that the parties opposite stand firmly with the oil companies and the people know it; they have to because the companies along with the banks own those political parties. We want the people of Saskatchewan to know where the parties opposite stand and they will know, Mr. Speaker. I submit this will defeat them, the people of Saskatchewan will defeat them as they have done so many times in the past. Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing the amendment and supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, after all the bluster, bombast and brimstone of the last hour, perhaps it's time for some quiet reason. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to follow the member for Thunder Creek and I assure members I am not about to follow him too far — I am sure they are pleased with that. I found out this evening one thing about the member for Thunder Creek, despite the parting of the ways between him and me as to political parties, we still agree on two things: one, is the incompetence of the government opposite and the other is the incompetence of the member for Nipawin and that we continue to share sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, in the last several days we have heard a good deal of early debate in respect of the CIGOL situation. The contribution of many members, not all, but many members of the other side of the House have, in my view, been pretty dismal. The only two persons on that side of the House to really address themselves to the genuine issues that face us in respect of this situation have been the Premier and the Attorney General, although only briefly. May I say to the member for Quill Lakes who was kind enough to make some kind remark about me, I listened with a good deal of enjoyment to his own speech and he did in fact address himself to one of the questions that arises here as the last speaker and that is, to whom now does this money really belong, the people of Saskatchewan as he indicated or whether it belongs in fact elsewhere. In due course in my remarks I'll come back to that point.

I'm sorry that the Attorney General is not in the House tonight. Yesterday on behalf of my colleagues and our caucus, I called for his resignation for what we thought was good reason. I want to address some comment to that and I wish he was here as a matter of fact to hear the comment because I am reluctant to make it in his absence. But, I think at the same time it is incumbent upon me to make the comments because this is the first opportunity that I have had to explain on behalf of my caucus why we did in fact ask for his resignation.

Mr. Speaker, there are clearly several questions in respect of the CIGOL decision that ought to be debated, they ought to be debated well because there are some very real issues of principle involved in that decision and there is room for some very legitimate difference of opinion in respect of that. Let's just review, if I may briefly, some of the facts which have become so distorted with respect along the way. This much is beyond any reasonable argument I put to members opposite. The government proposed Bill 42 in December of 1973 to tax more heavily the production of oil in Saskatchewan and in the process, if you look at the record, assured the Legislature that that measure was constitutionally sound. That assurance here was given by your former Minister of Mineral Resources on the advice of the Attorney General, Kim Thorson. He gave that assurance to the members of the Legislature, in that he and your government were

mistaken — no question about that.

The second hard, tough fact that you can't avoid is that you had two clear warnings in respect of the constitutional validity of that Bill 42. One came in the clearest terms and again if you look at the record, you see it from my predecessor in Regina South, Mr. Justice Ken McLeod, who indicated to you — well the member laughs — do you have no sense of any regard for members opposite in the Legislature who take their responsibility seriously, who research questions, who apply their expertise to them, even in opposition and give you some advice? The fact of the matter is, again you can't hide from the fact, the fact is he gave the advice, if you look at the record it was there, you ignored it. He indicated to the Attorney General in clear terms that it was his view that the act was likely to be proven unconstitutional.

The second clear warning you had was one from the national government who clearly told your Premier and your Attorney General in the face of their proposal that it likely was unconstitutional; again, facts that members cannot dismiss. There is no argument about those, those are a matter of clear record, that you did in fact have two clear warnings from those two clear sources about the unconstitutional aspects of that legislation.

Then on the third point, the fact you now know is that the act has in fact proven to have been passed without constitutional authority, as a consequence the tax has gone down, the mineral income tax and the royalty surcharge tax, accounting in full for something in excess of \$500 million, which members know \$100 million of that, in excess of \$100 million, has gone into general revenues in the three years since and the other \$300 and some odd million was used to purchase a potash company — another fact. The tax as you know, despite the fact that it was collected and spent, is now declared unconstitutional. Now what leads from that is again an unarguable point and that is that the province now faces, in fact, and no amount of hiding from the fact will erode it, we face now the possibility, as a relatively small provincial government in this nation, of having to repay a tax that we collected to the extent of \$500 million. The Minister of Labour says, "No bloody way." I tell you, I hope in many respects you are right. But I tell you that the road ahead is not as clear as what you would hope it would be. Just as sure as my predecessor in this Assembly warned in 1973 about the constitutional hazards of Bill 42, I tell you that you've got serious hazards ahead, of retroactively trying to legislate a solution. I'm taking no delight in that, I tell the Minister of Mineral Resources, no delight. I tell you that I wish that we had never got into this bind. That's my wish as a citizen of the province. You're my government as much as you're the government of every other citizen. You've got me in jeopardy in the same way as you have the other 900,000 people in this province in jeopardy, and I take no delight in that.

There are another couple of points that are very clear. The members will say to me, why dwell, why dwell on the error and the extent of the error. The members will say we don't like to admit it; we'd like to kind of hide it; we'd like to kind of blame others, but the fact is, we made a mistake. Why dwell on that? Okay, let's go on to the solution. That's maybe more important. Well, is the former Minister of Mineral Resources still persisting in the argument that you didn't make a mistake? You proposed that legislation. You brought a measure before this House when you had good reason to believe it was unconstitutional and it has proved to be wrong. It doesn't matter what the opinions were along the way. The fact is, that it is now unconstitutional. The consequence of that is, much as you want to muddy the water, the consequence of that I tell you, in law, is as though we never had a Bill 42. We don't have a law today by which we can



collect that tax, and we have not, in effect, had a law in the last four years under which we can collect that tax. I tell you that your Attorney General and the member for Quill Lakes, know that that's the effect of the law. A judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada speaks from the day rendered. Now, the members opposite — it's interesting that it took them three days to change their tense in reference to Bill 42. For the first three days they were saying, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 42 is valid. It took them three days for the point to sink in that there is no Bill 42. Your legislation is gone. It is as though you had never had that statute. That's the law — that's the law. Now face that fact. You keep telling us that the Judge of Queen's Bench has ruled in your favor, and that's a fact. The Court of Appeal ruled in your favor — another fact — a good argument to put to me in terms of whether or not the Attorney General should have foreseen the result. I agree with that. But in terms of whether you made a mistake or did not make a mistake, it is as though you are saying that because you are a touch-down ahead after the second quarter, you've somehow won the football game when you've lost it after the fourth.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, that it is important to reflect occasionally upon the enormity of the mistake and how it came about is for two legitimate reasons. One is that we don't compound, as legislators in this province, the 61 of us, the mistake that was made in the past. The second is to remind members, all of us, that no government, and no man, and no one can escape the consequences of your act. In the end I know that you don't want to admit it. In the end you want to put up the rhetoric to try to mask the enormity of the problem — that's the natural inclination. You want to blame Ottawa, and in some cases, Otto. In other cases you want to blame the Supreme Court, or you want to blame the oil companies. But my friends, you can't escape the fact that the mistake is yours. You are the people that made it. You are the people that created the situation, and you are the people, with our assistance, who are going to try to retrieve that situation. You can't escape that and no one can escape that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's turn momentarily to look, just briefly, at some history of Bill 42. I don't argue with you people, and I didn't in 1973 despite the fact that I was then in the employ of the federal government, with your desire on behalf of your province to derive some additional revenue from the profits that accrued in an artificial way, to the oil companies, when the price rose from \$3 to \$11 — a perfectly legitimate sympathy that you have. As a matter of fact, that was one decision that, in terms of the people of the province, you made, which was a reasonably good one — to attempt to gain for the public revenue, some portion of that increase in price that went to the oil companies. But what you did in doing it was to fail to look adequately at the law; failed to heed the warnings that were coming to you from quarters that should have been respected, and I think you passed Bill 42 in the face of all of that! Well motivated, a well motivated decision. Nobody quarrels with that. But a decision that was founded on error — that is now clear.

The fact then was, and again, the member for Quill Lake will know this better than some of his colleagues, the fact was and the fact still is, that we only have the powers here which the BNA Act gives us — we don't have additional powers. We can't tax in an indirect way. The constitution reserves the power to tax indirectly with the national government; it doesn't give it to us. Secondly, the constitution does not give the provinces the right to control the price of a commodity which passes boundaries of a province. Thirdly, the constitution says that you cannot interfere with trade and commerce in the nation. Now, you may want otherwise. You may want to have some of those powers which are reserved to the national government, and that's another argument for another time, but the fact is, you don't have them. Much as you may want to have them, you don't, and that's a fact you've got to face and all of us have got to face. We didn't have the power, we don't have the power — that's clear. Now, after the

passage of Bill 42, members will recall that a couple of things happened. One is that the federal government immediately disallowed royalty to be expensed on income in calculating income tax for oil companies. The result of that was in itself a kind of minor tragedy along the way as well. At this point in time we don't know that Bill 42 is unconstitutional. But it was, because it meant for some oil producers that they were paying more in taxes than what they were deriving in revenue with a combination of the Bill 42 taxes, and the disallowance of oil royalties from being expensed in calculating income for tax purposes nationally. That happened as well. Now again, what's clear from history, and so clear, is that in consequence the oil companies withdrew. They backed off. They cut back on production. That was their response, and the industry began to wither to some extent in the province under the burden of a tax; a combination of the two taxes. And members opposite will know, that in 1975, effective in 1976, they had to back off that and they acknowledged that that was the first error that they acknowledged. They backed off that one, reduced the royalties to give back to those oil companies, and listen to this, and if you don't like that, I'll prove it, you gave back to those oil companies \$30 million in royalties that you previously had been charging. I ask the Minister of Mineral Resources to challenge that figure, if he can prove otherwise. I say that your royalty charges in 1975, effective for the 1976, resulted in a \$30 million dollar transfer to those oil companies that you keep condemning all the while. The second thing you did along the way, and I ask you to observe this too, oil production in 1971 was about 90 million barrels, is what we produced that year. By 1976, or '75 it had dropped off to 58 million barrels, which means to say, that in those years between '71 and '76, we were dropping down to where we were 32 million barrels less, in production from the year before that I say, but it's arguable, was a direct consequence of the combination of Bill 42 and the federal government's disallowance of royalty. Now what did that mean for the province? It meant that we were collecting revenue on 32 million fewer barrels of oil than we had been in each of the two or three or four years earlier; we lost the revenue on the oil that wasn't produced. At the rates that apply under Bill 42, we lost in those terms some \$300 or \$400 million in revenue with otherwise would have been ours. This was another consequence. And again, one needs all kinds of facts for that, and once again I asked the Minister of Mineral Resources, if he differs with my figures, to challenge them and put some different figures before the House because mine come from your own records. Thirty-two million barrels fewer were produced in 1975, therefore, we had the loss of revenue that we would otherwise have had from those 32 million barrels.

Now to go on, Mr. Speaker, of course it's shortly after Bill 42, in May of 1974 (and members will recall it was proclaimed in January of 1974) just a few short months later, CIGOL — as it seems the whole world anticipated someone would do except the Premier and the Attorney General, if you can believe what they told us — challenged the constitutional validity of the act. The whole industry and the whole profession and the whole of the city of Regina and the whole of the Department of Mineral Resources were expecting it to come. They didn't know quite when — it came in May, 1974 by CIGOL. May I say in passing, for the edification of members opposite, CIGOL was a 100 per cent Canadian owned company. Just like — sure, just like your Co-op oil company — you see the trucks are 100 per cent Canadian owned — but some nasty multinational corporation — what happened was in May of 1974, they sued. Members know that if you sue in that way, it leads to a cumbersome trial and all the pre-trial cumbersome procedures — examinations for discovery, pleadings, exchange of documents, fixing trial dates — often takes a year or a year and a half to get to trial. Then when you go to trial and it's a lengthy trial, you need a transcript, a written transcript to go to the Court of Appeal. I had a case not recent but long ago that took two years to get the transcript from the Queen's Bench of the Court of Appeal — it's a lengthy, lengthy, procedure when you're going

through a trial. Then eventually on to the Supreme Court and that process, as members know, took almost four years to get to the Supreme Court. After that four years, now we get the decision saying that the act is unconstitutional.

Well, I say to members that in that little brief history a couple of things emerged clearly. One is that when you assured the Legislature that the tax law was valid, you were wrong. Is that an understandable mistake? I will concede you some ground there that it was in view particularly of the decision that came later, although you couldn't have anticipated those when you gave us the assurance but I'll concede you something there, that these are complex questions with some subjective element attached to them. Members will know that. But the second mistake you made, one that in my view is not understandable, is completely inexplicable, is why, knowing as you did, that Bill 42 had some constitutional difficulties attached to it, that it was going to be challenged in the courts, why didn't you move under The Constitutional Questions Act to have the issue determined quickly and speedily by the Court of Appeal and then on to the Supreme Court?

Now let me take a minute to explain to the members who aren't familiar with that law, what it is and what its purpose is. Sometime ago, in this province, this Legislature passed a bill which is now called and was then called The Constitutional Questions Act. It gives to every government of Saskatchewan the right to refer any measure, that it proposes and whose constitutional validity it wonders about directly to the Court of Appeal and avoid a trial and all the delays that go with a trial. You simply take the measure, walk over to the Court of Appeal, give it to them and say, is this constitutionally sound? If you're not satisfied with the response, or any affected party is not satisfied, it has a right under that act to take an immediate appeal to the Supreme Court. Had you followed that course, you would have saved a minimum of two years or two and a half years of collection of tax under the act that was proved ultimately to be unconstitutional. You could have had your decision by the middle of 1975, instead of having it at the end of 1977. Now members, if they're fair, can see the consequence of that. The consequence is you exposed the province to two and a half to three years of additional liability; tax being collected under a scheme which was troublesome constitutionally. What is that two or two and a half years of revenue that we collected during that interim period? That's some \$200 to \$300 million. That's the extent by which the risk grew greater by not referring Bill 42 to the Court of Appeal. The question is, why wasn't that done? I asked the Premier that question one day and I asked the Premier, I think, in the House last session the same question because it baffled me and it was baffling others why the government didn't, given the fact that this was a troublesome bill, refer it and I never got the reason or a reasonable response from him.

Now members know that the Premier, and I give him credit, has a very good mind and it is visible always. Secondly, by nature he is forthright in answering questions when the reasons are clear to him why he has done something or why he's refrained from doing something, that's why it always baffled us here, given those two characteristics, that strength of mind and that willingness generally to answer questions, why we could never get a good response from him on why you didn't refer the legislation to the Court of Appeal directly. The answer lies in the fact that there is no logic to it, no logic to why you didn't it wasn't a sound administrative practice, not to refer. All the reason and all the compelling argument and all the logic and all the sound administrative consideration said to take that bill to the Court of Appeal in January of 1974 and you didn't do it. That's why we have never been able to get a good response from the Premier at all, which leads you to conclude and it leads any reasonable mind to conclude that the reason you didn't do that was out of political consideration because

you had passed Bill 42, 18 months before you knew there was going to be a general election. The Liberal Party had opposed the passage of Bill 42, you knew that you had a good wicket, accordingly, because you had the easy side of the argument having reduced it, as you do every day now, to your being on the side of the people and the Liberals because they opposed Bill 42 being on the side of the oil company — a nice easy position to take to the people, an easy one to argue. The contrary arguments are complex and difficult to make so you had the easiest political position. Given that background, it's little wonder you didn't want to refer Bill 42 to the Court of Appeal because you were afraid that in the 18 months between January 1, 1974 and June, 1975 if you had referred the bill to the Court of Appeal, you may have got a judgment against you and you may have found that your Bill 42 was unconstitutional which would have destroyed the argument you wanted to take the electorate in 1975 about your resource policy. That, clearly, is what you did.

Now let me ask you, and let me ask the member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) in particular. What sort of judgment here came into play on behalf of the Attorney General? It was his decision ultimately as the chief advisor to the government in respect of the law as to whether or not that bill should go to the Court of Appeal. That was a legal decision which he was called upon to make. The decision that was ultimately made was a political strategy decision. Therefore, the clear result of that was that the Attorney General allowed his legal judgment to be surrendered in favor of a political judgment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — And by long tradition in this province and elsewhere the Attorney General being some steps removed from the hurly burly of politics for that very reason, the Attorney General was, I say, in breach of his oath of office. That's why yesterday we called for his resignation, that, combined with the fact that we now have lost confidence in his capacity to give cool legal advice in respect of any problem that isn't going to be shaded by some political considerations along the way. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, politics being what it is, that the judgement in respect of the allegation I have just made against the Attorney General will come soon. In fact it may never indeed come from the people for a long time because of the barriers that we all have in communicating complex positions to the people, so that we may not see a quick judgement in that respect for the people. I don't imagine that that's an aspect that troubles the Attorney General very much because that in the end is not what he fears. What he fears is that there will one day be a reckoning, a reckoning in respect of his fulfilment as the Attorney General of Saskatchewan when he was the Attorney General in this crucial period and that reckoning will come from the historians of the province, from the universities and from the Attorney General's profession, because in time they will look dispassionately at these events and their consequences and the judgement of the Attorney General in respect of it.

I say to members opposite in a very serious way that for the Attorney General in personal terms that is a difficult proposition for him. It is. He is a sensitive, decent human being. He wants very much, as all professionals do, to succeed in respect of a high professional office. He will be judged there, in part, not by his political successes or lack of them, but dispassionately by his judgments in respect of the law. That's how the judgment will be made about his capacity in the future. That's what troubles me in personal terms too about the way in which this Premier has treated this Attorney General. It is because you have put before him, always, a series of political decisions to

make as against sound legal decision and the Premier puts before him the choice so often of making a sound legal decision on the one hand and a political, strategical decision on the other and often they are conflicting. And then you ask the poor man to make a decision of that kind and if he opts for the political side, which he did in respect of not referring Bill 42 to the Court of Appeal, which was a political decision, it was in turn an unsound legal decision. That will be seen in time and he will be judged on that. That's what is unfair to your Attorney General and the way in which you have treated him in that respect. It's not for me to make a brief on his behalf, but I tell you, those of you who don't understand what professionalism means to a professional in high office, I tell you that that's what is happening to him; that he will be judged in due course by his profession and by the historians as having made political decisions when he should have made legal decisions.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — And the two don't often mix. Yeh! And the trouble is you guys know it.

Now there is another fundamental question, another fundamental question is the way in which you have thrown my good friend and colleague and classmate and long-time warm-hearted friend to the wolves (which your Premier does all the time) and someone has to account — now he has to account for his error because your Premier refuses to do it, now you put it on the shoulders of the Attorney General to do it. He has to account for the error that you people led him to make in 1974 when he didn't refer the bill to the Court of Appeal.

Another fundamental question, Mr. Speaker, which some members have begun to address themselves to but in my estimation not very thoroughly and that's the question: is the money that you collected from CIGOL (and let's limit it to CIGOL for the time being), that money that you collected and now hold, is it yours, or is it CIGOL's? Well let's ask ourselves that question in seriousness because that is one of the principal questions at heart in respect of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, there is none, none but a simple ethical standard that applies to that question. The same moral rules that govern in respect of the transactions among individuals must also govern its government. There is not one standard of private morality and another of public morality. I say that I wouldn't want (and I know members opposite wouldn't want) their government to be doing, on their behalf and in their name, something which would be essentially immoral which they themselves would be ashamed of to do in their private lives. That's the rule that applies. There isn't one standard of ethics for government and another for the individual. The same standard of morality and ethic applies to both. The rule, of course, in simple terms I tell you is this: what is adjudged yours you retain; what is adjudged the next man's you yield to him. I ask you, which one of you can argue with that simple moral proposition? And yet for some reason you can come to the conclusion so easily (and if you can address some argument to me you could perhaps persuade us to a different conclusion), how can you come so readily to the conclusion that that money is yours to retain? I am talking about CIGOL. How can it be the people's money? How can it be the people's money I ask?

Let me ask you, my friend . . . the people have a right to a certain amount of money which its government can lawfully collect with authority. In this case its government, its agent, collected money which it had no right to collect. That's what the Supreme Court judgment means. You had no authority, you had no right, you had not statute under

which you could collect that money. You had collected the money without right. That's what the judgement amounts to. Well, the minister shakes his head. The minister shakes his head.

I tell you that that is a clear proposition in law, it's a clear proposition in morality, it's a clear proposition in common sense and maybe that's why you had such trouble understanding it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's right, it's the common sense part, he hasn't got any.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Highest court in the land, the highest court in the land has said the government had no right to collect the money it collected from CIGOL.

Now I ask you in view of that decision, again, to whom does that money belong? Well the minister keeps saying - the people of Saskatchewan. I ask you in fairness, I ask the Premier and some of you in the Cabinet, which you please direct some argument to us in respect of that question. Instead of making that in easy assumption in the face of a moral rule that says, that which is adjudged yours you retain, that which is adjudged another man's you yield.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Who do you say should write the laws?

**MR. CAMERON:** — I ask you to direct some argument to us in that respect.

**MR. ROLFES:** — . . . in this country . . .

**MR. CAMERON:** — Surely to goodness at the heart of this matter politics and partisanship and the easy side of arguments aside, can you not address yourselves to that principle because there is an issue here of principle, it surely is an issue of principle. Well, I despair, Mr. Speaker, I despair, if members opposite cannot even see an element of principle involved, in what they are saying. If you can't see it, I despair and I assure you I shall direct no additional argument.

Another question arises too another clear question arises and that is, is there any different standard that we can apply to the other oil companies than we apply to CIGOL. CIGOL established its right. At the moment, under the law, it is entitled to be repaid its money and that's the law. The question now is, can we distinguish between the CIGOL situation and the situation of other companies. Again, again I ask you if you'll open your minds to some reason because you have got to make some big decisions here and set aside the easy political side. That isn't always going to sustain you because sooner or later you are in one form or another going to have to account for whether what you do is right or wrong, apart from whether it is politically sound or popular among the people.

The second question, tell me how you distinguish the position of CIGOL from the oil companies who haven't sued and who haven't yet established their rights to have their money come back. Well, maybe there is an argument to made in that respect and again is it too much to ask the Premier to direct some argument to that question. And I tell you for those of you who can't see that question over there you ought to open your minds to something, instead of being read by this simplistic, emotional, two plus two kind of rhetoric that we so often hear from you people.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Your two plus twos make three.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Mr. Speaker, there is another serious question. I don't ask you fairly to have addressed your minds as a government to this one as yet because maybe it is premature, but you are going to have to ask yourselves and advise the House sooner or later, how you can do in trying to retrieve this situation indirectly constitutionally what you can't do directly. Again, the old rule of law is and it was applied in respect to one of your own cases, which was the AMAX case, and I asked the minister to look it up and read the case. The Supreme Court said that you cannot, you cannot retain money that was collected under a taxing statute that was unlawful, unconstitutional. You said in the AMAX case, but look we have another statute which allows us to keep the money. The Supreme Court said that if you are wrong in respect to your taxing statute you can't pass another statute to keep the money because that would be a terrible attempt to deceit your unconstitutional act.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — We've got the key . . .

**MR. CAMERON:** — Well, are you above the law? Your minds are closed, which you will not open not even the least crack to look at some genuine questions that arise in respect of these initial decisions. So I ask you then, I ask you as a government and I ask those of you who still have some modicum of reason and responsibility left in you, to ask yourselves these tough questions too. How do you accomplish indirectly constitutionally what you have failed to do directly? I tell you that is another serious question.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say with some seriousness too that I have frankly been ashamed to be part of an institution these last several days that has seen some of the comments that members opposite have made about the Supreme Court of Canada. What kind of misguided, foolish zeal have members opposite got who have made the kinds of scurrilous comments they made about the Supreme Court of Canada, that kind of misguided zeal which has led so many in history to such a sad consequence. Because I tell you it's that kind of attitude would lead to anarchy. What kind of democracy would you have in this country, if you were permitted in that way to erode the Supreme Court of its powers and its authority, to erode the respect that that institution has in this country.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Had . . . .

**MR. CAMERON:** — Has, the member says 'had'. Now that is an interesting comment. You are a Minister of the Crown of the government of Saskatchewan that says the Supreme Court of Canada 'had' respect as an institution and no longer has. Well, I wonder if the Premier would endorse your comment. I wonder if the Attorney General would endorse your comment that you no longer have any respect for the Supreme Court of Canada.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I didn't say . . .

**MR. CAMERON:** — That's what you said you said 'had'.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You certainly did, are you going to back out already?

**MR. CAMERON:** — Well, I want to remind the minister that his comment will appear on the record. I say that you said to me across the aisle when I said the Supreme Court of Canada is an institution that has respect, you corrected my tense by saying 'had'. If you say the Supreme Court 'had' respect you are now precluding that they presently haven't any respect. Well, I tell you what kind of controverted logic is yours if you try and

weasel your way out of that one.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Can you get some kind of social insurance or something, you're going to need it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I know there are a lot of members want to get into the debate, however, there is a formal way to do it. You have to stand up on your feet when no one else is. There will be plenty of opportunity for members to get into the debate after the member for Regina South is done.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Those members opposite who still retain some independence and judgment and that member is not one of them, who retain some sense of reason and responsibility about them. That member I question as one of those, I ask you to address yourselves seriously to those several basic questions that I put before you in respect of your deliberations with regard to CIGOL because there are some very, very troublesome aspects not only in law but in principle. Let us, none of us, get so taken with our political zeal and wanting to be on the right side politically as to set aside those other considerations that may be on the side of right.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Mineral Resources in one of his two speeches, and incidentally the first one the first night was the best, when he rose in his place and said, "Now I want to speak, Mr. Speaker, in this debate and I don't know what to say," I tell you that was a powerful message as in fact compared to the one you made the following day you had a sterling effort the night before. What we have seen, of course, in all of this is the Minister of Municipal Affairs blaming this mess that we are in on the federal government and Otto Lang; the Minister of Mineral Resources blaming it on the oil companies; the member over here and the minister over there blaming it on the Supreme Court of Canada.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No, the blame is yours.

**MR. CAMERON:** — No, it's as though you were in a poker game somehow and you lost the game and who do you blame - the people who made the cards, it must be their fault because they didn't give you enough or something; or else you blame your opponent because he played his ace when he should have played his deuce or something and beat you; or else you blame the umpire or the stake holder when you have lost the game, anybody but yourself. I know the Minister of Mineral Resources some nights goes home and no doubt has those kinds of excuses shall we say to psalm in respect of some of his losses, but he knows at the core what he loses he loses by reason of his own action. What he gains he gains by reason of those actions too. The fact is, again, you blundered, no one else; you erred, you created the mess that we are now in. What you really did, of course, along the way is, you went out to do battle with the oil companies and you failed and lost and fell flat on your faces again as you have done so often. You couldn't govern sensibly the potash industry and that led finally to the ultimate weapon in anger to take it over and nationalize it, which you did out of a failure to be able to govern it; you have bungled the job of governing the oil companies that is so event; you botched the job, and you still do, of trying to govern the trucking companies. Every time you face an opponent of some size you come away fleeced and you ask us to accept your government as a solid one administratively.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



**MR. CAMERON:** — With all the powers that you command as a government every time you go in to do battle with one of these companies you come away with your tail between your legs, fleeced, as I say, to the hilt and looking around to blame everybody in sight but yourselves for having lost again.

Mr. Speaker, your Premier has floated your political party these last three or four years on his own reputation as an able administrator, as a man who came from government and is interested in government almost as an exercise in itself. That's his reputation, a man of keen mind, an able administrator. Well now, I tell you that the public perception of your Premier who has sustained your party these last several years on that perception is now badly eroding in the face of some of the errors that are now becoming so evident. So that what has sustained you in the past is no longer going to be able to sustain you. So I say to some of you, you had better brush up on some of your arguments if you want to stay alive. Because he isn't going to be there my friends to sustain you much longer. His reputation out in the province now is one of very questionable administration. A very questionable administrator. A guy who couldn't govern the potash companies in any sensible fashion, the guy who always gets pounded by the trucking companies and the CN and the CP, the guy who blundered and made the biggest blunder in the history of the administration of this province when he went to battle with the oil companies — you tell me how in the face of all that he is going to preserve a reputation as being an able administrator? That's why I say to you that that reputation that your Premier has had (and I use had) is no longer going to be able in the future to sustain you as these errors pile one on the other to be seen by everybody.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:** — Now I want to make some small comment about what we can expect in the next several days by way of legislation. I suspect, but I will hold some final judgment until I see what the Premier proposes with his legislation, but I rather suspect that he and his Cabinet at the moment knowing the difficulties of trying to retrieve by some indirect fashion what you have lost directly, in respect of the constitutional question, knowing the difficulties of trying to do that and in many ways the impossibility of that, will bring legislation before the House and I rather suspect in many ways that legislation will be designed not to legislate a solution, because that is so elusive and so difficult, it will be designed rather for two other ends. The first will be to shore up your position in the public mind, to try to mask the mistake you made, to try to arm you out with the people with some arguments again that you are not going to let those dirty oil companies get away with this money. That's what you need at the moment, you need some simplistic arguments again, you need some position so you can go out and you can shore it up and bamboozle the people again that you didn't make a great mistake, that will be the number one purpose of the legislation, knowing, I suspect the Premier will, that the legislation is likely if it is in one of many forms to be unconstitutional. Maybe the Premier at that stage won't care, because it will be designed to shore up his flagging position in the country.

The second thing is that the Premier now faces another round with the oil companies, having lost his shirt and been fleeced in the first one and what has he got in the way of cards in his hands? He's pulled all his aces, he's got rid of his face cards, the trumps are all gone. You know what he's got left, he's got a pair of deuces. Now he's going to start another poker game with the oil companies with nothing left in his hand but a pair of deuces. I tell you that's the position he's in now. What troubles us so much is, despite the fact that he lost his shirt so badly in round one, despite the fact that he has nothing

left in the way of cards at the moment, he still for some reason is kind of in a double or nothing frame of mind. The second reason for the legislation will be to arm your government at least with the appearance of some additional cards. I think we can look for legislation which is going to sting the industry pretty badly so that you again have another bargaining tool to go out there and go to work and try to retrieve the situation. I am not saying that's a bad strategy necessarily, although it's going to be interesting the kind of bind that that may put the Attorney General in, having made the mistakes I have already alluded to, in having to choose as he so often has between politics on the one side and sound law on the other. It will be interesting to see what position the Attorney General is going to take in that, as to whether he can give the assurances that we will seek that the bill is constitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks which have already been too long, by making a last plea to members opposite, to the Premier and to the Attorney General in particular, to address themselves and to address this House to those questions, not only of substance in respect of the bill that's gone down and the bill that will come before the House, and not only in respect of the political arguments which we hear so often and which are fair enough but can we get some argument by our leaders in this province (he's my Premier for better or worse as much as he's yours), can he give me some clear cogent thought in respect of the issues and principles that we face here, the several I have referred to. I say if we don't get that from the Premier and the Attorney General they will have failed us, all of us, as people and as members of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, it is beyond any question that I will not support the motion and will support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. A. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, at the outset I would like to congratulate the member for Pelly for his decisive election to this House. I wish him well and I wish his presence here in this Assembly for many years to come. I also want to congratulate him as a mover in replying to the Speech from the Throne and the seconder, the member for Meadow Lake for a job well done. Mr. Speaker, their individual perception of the Throne Speech was positive and their contribution to this debate was indeed significant. I had expected the opposition to respond more positively and offer some real policy positions in their aspirations as the alternative to this most progressive government in Canada. However, it is obvious that my expectations were too great.

The member for Regina South who just sat down was attempting to pass judgment on the Premier and the Attorney General. I want to tell the hon. member and the House that the Premier and the Attorney General are going to go down in history as one of top Premiers and Attorney Generals this province has ever had.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — It is easy to criticize and members opposite are masters at the art. However, the people of Saskatchewan expect and in fact demand more. They are asking us what you are going to do. What are your policies, what alternatives do you propose? Mr. Speaker, when these questions arrive members opposite turn a deaf ear. They know deep down that they do not have alternative policies. They know they cannot provide the people of Saskatchewan with positive answers so they continue to preach doom and gloom rather than joining us on the high road, a road which is leading us to a better Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly distressed with the arrogance and lack of sensitivity displayed by the members of the Conservative Party. Could it be because they polarized the free enterprise vote and manoeuvred a couple of seats from the Liberals? Could it be because it is the traditional image of the Conservative Party - arrogant and insensitive. Leadership plays a significant role in the image of a party. After close to two years of federal Tory leadership the Tories are no longer saying, "Joe who?" but rather, "Why Joe?" Here in Saskatchewan before too long with the lack of credible performance and the appearance of news headlines questioning Conservative Opposition Leader's business activities, the Tories will no longer say, "Dick who?" but rather, "Why Dick?" Can we trust his leadership?

So far, however, we have seen very little if anything to convince us that the Leader of the Conservative Opposition has the credibility, the trust and the leadership necessary to guide this great province of ours.

As far as the Liberals are concerned, Mr. Speaker, well the writing is on the wall. Their demise is predictable. A party unable and unwilling to accept or to adapt itself to the 20th century can certainly not expect to enjoy any meaningful support from the people of this province. We must, however, be charitable. There have been problems facing the member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) which are certainly not of his making. I believe the Liberal leader displays sincerity, and is making a strong effort, but there is no question he is having great difficulty in motivating his own troops.

Considering the problem he has had in terms of motivating opportunists like the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) and the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher), who would probably run for the Social Credit if it looked like they had a better chance. And then there is the problem of the member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) who feels confident that he and Otto can save Canada. It is obvious that the Liberal Party is finding it difficult to remain optimistic in relationship to their future.

The Conservatives, and their recycled Liberals, however, should not get too comfortable. Some call their rise a phenomenon, others call it a fluke. Perhaps the word 'mirage' best suits the situation because what we see across the way is difficult to make out - once they're this, another they're that, and at no time are they real and sure.

In 1975, the free enterprise vote in this province took a chance. They saw an ailing Liberal Party, a party which was going nowhere. Then onto the horizon emerged a magnificent genius from Saskatoon who didn't say much but at least he said it with a smile. They took a chance and elected a few of them to replace some of the Liberal warriors who had sat across the way for many years. But what has happened since then? Can the people of Saskatchewan now say, "Well at least there is an alternative?" Hardly, Mr. Speaker, the public is as confused as ever. The Tories run around the province saying anything to anybody if they think it will get them a vote.

All the Conservative Leader is interested in is power regardless of how he attains it - whether it's by double talk, or by dishonesty or by having to resort to unparliamentary tactics. This has been clearly demonstrated by him in and out of this Assembly.

We have heard of double talk on seat belts; we've heard double talk on many of our government's social programs Health, Land Bank and resource development; we've also heard double talk on decorum and respect for the parliamentary institution.

At the last session a year ago the member for Nipawin and his Conservative members attacked the government by making serious allegations of filthy hospitals. The charges made were a slam on hospital boards and administrators. It was a reflection that hospital boards and administrators were not doing their job. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this was not going to go unchallenged. Testimony in the Legislature proved that the statements made by the Conservative member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane), and supported by the Conservative Leader (Mr. Collver) and his members, on hospitals being filthy were unfounded and untrue - a glaring instance of dishonesty.

Just only a week ago, a Conservative caucus letter to you, Sir, implicated you with the NDP and the Liberal members making a deal regarding seating arrangement in the House. The Conservatives ought to know that it is the Office of the Speaker that establishes seating arrangements through rules of the Assembly and by tradition. I personally believe that you, Sir, were fair and just in your decision. I must say that it was very childish for the Conservatives to attempt to argue on the point of where one sits. It is not important where one sits, but what is important is what one does and says wherever he might sit.

It is very obvious that the Conservative Opposition Leader's lust for power and desire for recognition drove him to tactics of disrespect for the Speaker's Chair and the whole institution of Parliament. He was hopeful the Legislature would succumb to recognizing the Conservatives as the official opposition.

In one breath the member for Nipawin speaks of decorum and respect for the democratic parliamentary institution, and then in the next breath he uses tactics to tear down and destroy the institution to meet his greed for power. Why? This is hypocrisy of the highest degree. I believe leadership with those kinds of motives is dangerous and cannot be trusted and certainly not deserving of the support of the Saskatchewan people.

We had reports from the last by-election in Pelly where voters told us that the member for Nipawin stood on one doorstep and condemned seat belts because the homeowner didn't like it. Then he went up the street and told a seat belt proponent that seat belts were a good idea. Mr. Speaker, this kind of political double talk is not worthy of any public servant and certainly below any political party leader. When the Leader of the Conservatives spoke on this debate, I was shocked to hear the discriminatory attack he made on the people of the Kamsack community in the Pelly constituency. He said and I quote, "In our multilingual and multicultural province, where people in Kamsack have enough difficulty with English, let alone a second language." This remark, Mr. Speaker, is insulting to the people of Kamsack and the community. What he is really saying, is that the people in Kamsack and area are somehow backward because they have trouble with the English language and that they should not have access to another language, nor perhaps freely have the use of their mother language of Ukrainian, Russian, Indian or whatever language they may use. It would seem to the Conservative Leader that the English language is the most important language and it is a language that should be known and used by all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Conservative Opposition Leader as well as to all Conservative members what your leader said about Kamsack and Pelly constituency people could well apply to my constituency in Canora and to many other constituencies across the province that have people of other than Anglo-Saxon origin. I believe the attack is serious and most downgrading to all non English-speaking and especially to the many pioneers who made sacrifices in building this great province of ours. These

people are of many ethnic origins - Polish, Ukrainian, German, Russian, Scandinavian, French and others. Regardless of the language they use, they communicate very well in their own way and are making their fair share of contribution to our great society.

I suggest to the Conservative Leader, that if he has trouble communicating with people other than English-speaking, then it is he who has language trouble and it is he who needs instruction in other languages and in basic human understanding, if he is to properly communicate with the people of Saskatchewan. Then we hear the Conservative Leader talking about the new Saskatchewan. I can only assume that he is looking to Manitoba where the same line was used and the new Premier there had promised the people nothing but protracted economic restraint.

The member from Nipawin says his party is a party on the move, a party enthused about developing policies and programs for the future; a party which will build a platform to lead them to victory in 1979; a party dedicated to the principles of free speech, free enterprise and individual freedom. He promises that the 'will of the people' will be the rule of thumb, he will follow. But then, Mr. Speaker, he turns around and deliberately sabotages that very principle. If the member for Nipawin is so committed to the principles he espouses, why is it then we witnessed his dictatorial muscle-flexing at the recent Conservative convention?

Mr. Speaker, when our party develops policy, it is the will of the membership which decides the issue. Such, however, is not the case with the Conservatives. The policy they have adopted is this — if the member for Nipawin agrees, fine, if he doesn't, we can't approve it. The member for Nipawin got up at the last convention and told delegates that he would under no circumstances approve a number of resolutions which were on the books for debate. He would not allow them to pass. He was against them, he opposed them and he had the final say. If that, Mr. Speaker, is democracy, Conservative style, rest assured that the people of Saskatchewan will have absolutely nothing to do with it.

Mr. Speaker, it would take weeks to correct and document the contradictions of the member for Nipawin. However, there are a couple of other statements recently made which should not be allowed to go by without some comment.

The Conservatives in Saskatchewan are short on policy but they are certainly long on rhetoric. I am sure most members of this Assembly were as puzzled and amazed as I was when I heard the Leader of the Conservatives on radio a short time ago warning people of Saskatchewan that by 1980, 85 per cent of Saskatchewan will owe their livelihood directly or indirectly to the government and, therefore, it was the province's last chance to defeat the government before such control made it impossible to remove this administration. He said this government is taking more and more control of the daily lives of people and they in turn would not dare to vote against a government to which they had some mystical allegiance. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of rubbish in my day but this takes the cake. Does the member for Nipawin substantiate his allegation? Does he support his claim with fact? Does he make sure that what he is saying bears any resemblance to the truth? Mr. Speaker, he knows full well that what he says is not true, it is fiction and he knows it.

Permit me to take this a step further. The member for Nipawin made it very clear that he feels government has too much involvement in our lives. He says with all the grants and

all the programs and all the employment provided, this automatically ensures allegiance to the government in power. He says that he is against this and a Conservative government would reduce the government involvement at almost every turn. He says for instance that if a small businessman gets a loan and a grant from SEDCO, that person is automatically committed to vote for the government. Quite obviously that assertion is rubbish but what he is really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there should be no SEDCO and a Conservative government would eliminate it. I can only assume that he would abolish the hearing aid program and the children's dental program as well because these are government programs and programs which can be provided by the private sector.

What about Government Insurance - is the Conservative Party of the opinion that all SGIO agents across the province are forced to support the government and, if so, are they committed to ending this alleged support by eliminating Government Insurance and putting it back into the private sector? Mr. Speaker, I ask these questions because they seem logical in the light of the illogical allegations of the Leader of the Conservative Party. If what I have said is not true, I challenge members opposite to get up on their feet and set the record straight. What are you going to do? What programs are you going to eliminate? What services are you going to reduce and what assistance programs will you slash?

Mr. Speaker, a word about Land Bank. Members opposite have made it clear that they would, if given a change, abolish this most positive government initiative. Both parties opposite would sell off all the land and allow the market place to dictate land purchase in the future.

Both parties opposite are opposed to any restriction on ownership of our farm land by those residing outside Saskatchewan. They don't have a program to put in its place but agree only, that they are against Land Bank and would do away with it . . . period. They think, Mr. Speaker, that it is fair that young farmers and older retiring farmers are denied the opportunity to either start an operation or retire in dignity.

Let us suppose a half section of land becomes available in the Sherwood Municipality. A young farmer who operates an adjoining parcel of land needs that land to make his operation viable. But a Toronto doctor feels the land offers some potential for speculation and he wants to buy it. Who should get that land? Members opposite agree that it is right that the Toronto doctor should be given the advantage in this situation because perhaps he has a bigger bank account. Is not the implication of his purchase just as great as that of a doctor who happened to be living in Chicago? Of course it is. Yet members opposite would prefer that doctor on the land rather than a native son. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the issue can be boiled down as easily as that.

In addition, the two recent conventions of member opposite voiced displeasure in relationship to the allocation of leases. They have made what members on this side of the House agree are fundamentally important and serious charges. They have publicly charged political patronage and interference in the allocation process. Mr. Speaker, I challenge any member opposite to prove it. Table documentation in this Legislature that this has indeed happened. Give us the names. Mr. Speaker, those allegations are malicious, they are untrue and they are an affront to the dedicated civil servants who have been charged with the responsibility to implement and administer this very important agricultural program. Members opposite know full well they cannot back up their charges with fact because they know what they say is not true. In many respects, it is regrettable that so much of the time in this Legislature has to be spent setting the

record straight. Yet the issues are so fundamentally important that this process is necessary.

One final point, which I feel illustrates very clearly that the Conservative Party is bent on distorting the facts to suit the situation at the time. In the October 31 edition of the Regina Leader Post, it was reported that a resolution passed at the Conservative convention was . . . and I quote . . .

Delegates endorsed a resolution calling for rigid curtailment of foreign agricultural land ownership, but said the restrictions should not apply to Canadians living in other provinces . . .

Questioned about this for four days later on the CBC program "Insight", the Conservative member for Qu'Appelle said, and I quote his answer:

I think there is an error in reporting because that was definitely not the wishes of the Conservative Party, I can assure you of that.

Perhaps the caller and the listening public were convinced that there had indeed been an error . . . but was there? Resolution No. 41 on page eight of the Conservative resolution book was passed, and what does that resolution say?

Be it resolved . . . While rigid curtailment of foreign ownership of agricultural land is necessary, that such restrictions should not apply to Canadians living in other provinces.

It was passed, Mr. Speaker. The caller's fears were confirmed, yet the member for Qu'Appelle, when confronted publicly, didn't have the courage to tell the truth — another example of Conservative double talk. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the public is getting on to this little game that the Conservatives are bent on playing, and Judgment Day is certainly not too far off.

Mr. Speaker, any Throne Speech debate in the Legislature cannot take place without some comment relative to our number one industry — agriculture. I am confident that all members of this Assembly recognize and support the need to ensure stability within the agricultural economy of this province. The contribution made in the past is immense and the social and economic impact felt when agriculture is involved in a boom or a bust, clearly shows the impact this industry faces in the province.

Why is it then, that the old line parties continually dig in their heels against those progressive and positive programs aimed at providing the stability necessary to ensure that agriculture continues its rightful role in our provincial economy?

Mr. Speaker, the answer is one of loyalties — one of allegiance. I ask this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, where is the Saskatchewan Liberal Party when this government goes to bat month after month for the western farmer, in an attempt to get a better deal in terms of the national transportation policies of the federal Liberal government? Where are provincial Liberals when the big business lobby of central Canada puts pressure on Ottawa to bring in policies which support the 'User Pay' principle?

We all know that air transport is heavily subsidized. The seaway runs monumental deficits. Our ports are all subsidized and truck transport is subsidized by every provincial highway system in Canada, yet Liberals feel the 'User Pay' principle in

relationship to rail transport is sound principle.

With the policy advocated by the Liberals, we can say 'goodbye' to the crowrates, and we all know what this means to Saskatchewan farmers. It has been estimated that abolition of the crowrates would mean a direct loss of over \$180 million to over 70,000 Saskatchewan farmers. Where is the Liberal Party when we tell Otto Lang that this is unacceptable? Where is the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan when the federal government fails to act on those recommendations of the Hall Commission on grain handling which are so important to all Saskatchewan farmers? Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Liberals do not like being reminded of their inability or refusal to stand up for the Saskatchewan farmer. Their policy can best be summed up as nothing more than a strategy to oppose any and all policies of this New Democratic Party government — a government which is doing all it can to offer the necessary stability and assistance to ensure that agriculture continues to play an important role in the province.

The Conservatives, on the other hand, should also come out of the woodwork and tell the people of Saskatchewan where they stand in relation to prairie agriculture. What are their policies? What are they going to do? They say they would get rid of the Land Bank. They say they will end many of the grant programs, so I assume they mean Farm Start, and many of the other assistance programs we administer. What do the Conservatives stand for? We know what they are against, but that is not good enough.

The member for Nipawin likes to talk glowingly about the solidarity which he says exists today in the Conservative Party. He speaks loud and long about the leadership of Mr. Clark. I can only surmise that he agrees with Mr. Clark when it comes to matters of agricultural policy for Canada. I ask, Mr. Speaker, do Conservatives across the way agree with their federal counterparts in relationship to agricultural policy? They can't sit on the fence forever, either they agree or they disagree.

As this debate progresses, Mr. Speaker, it would be my sincere hope that we hear from the Conservatives when it comes to agriculture. Does the Saskatchewan Conservative Party agree with Mr. Clark when he says and I quote from a Carmen newspaper article of October 24, 1977 which quotes Mr. Clark from a meeting in Morden, Manitoba, Clark said, "A Conservative government would seek expansion of the Wheat Board's selling efforts but permission would be given to private organizations to sell grain in competition with the Wheat Board."

Mr. Speaker, that is what he said. Is this consistent with provincial Conservative agricultural policy? People of Saskatchewan have a right to know. Mr. Speaker, I could go on, however, the point is clear. Conservatives and Liberals alike do not have a policy for the good of Saskatchewan agriculture. They do not have a commitment, they know what they are against but they have no idea, or at least they do not dare say what they are for. I would hope the facade ends soon so that all Saskatchewan people are better able to examine options before them.



The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is consistent with the policies and programs we have developed in less than six short years. This government's record is a good one, it is one which reflects the confidence we share in relationship to this province and its people. We believe that the economic and social development of this province has been steady over the past six years; we still have some distance to go and I am confident that with the continued support of the people of Saskatchewan we will succeed in our goal of fulfilling those commitments and realizing those dreams which are shared by the vast majority of those people concerned about our province. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion and voting against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

The amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 17**

Malone	Anderson	Birkbeck
Wiebe	McMillan	Ham
Merchant	Clifford	Berntson
MacDonald	Collver	Katzman
Penner	Larter	Lane (Sa-Su)
Cameron	Lane (Qu'Ap)	

**NAYS — 31**

Blakeney	Mostoway	Tchorzewski
Pepper	Banda	Shillington
Thibault	Whelan	Vickar
Romanow	Kwasnica	Skoberg
Messer	Dyck	Nelson (Yktn)
Snyder	McNeill	Allen
Byers	Feschuk	Koskie
Kowalchuk	Faris	Johnson
Matsalla	Rolfes	Thompson
Robbins	Cowley	Lusney
MacMurchy		

The debate continues on the motion.

**HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Co-ops and Co-operatives):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the current Throne Speech debate it gives me great pleasure to

congratulate the hon. member for Pelly, who was elected during the past summer, as the mover of that motion and also the hon. member for Meadow Lake, who was the seconder of the motion. I think both of them made significant and worthwhile contributions to the debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for Pelly for his election in the by-election which occurred last summer. I had the privilege of going to that constituency and participating in that by-election. I was pleased to note that the two or three polls I had some campaigning in, we substantially increased the majority in those particular polls.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Speaker, since we last assembled in this Legislature the hon. member for Thunder Creek transferred his allegiance from the Liberal Party to the Progressive Conservative Party - you can tell by the vote that just occurred it really wasn't much of a transfer - he followed in the footsteps of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle who transferred his allegiance at an earlier time. I am sure that the hon. member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party welcomed these travellers in the wilderness to his bosom. They are all aggressive ebullient self-made men, horrible examples of unskilled labor. Mr. Speaker, I note also that some comments of the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) - he's not in his seat at the moment - I note that he was telling us some kind of a fish story. I didn't really hear very clearly but something about the aging of fish. He reminded me of a story of the fellow who was telling the story to his friend. He said, "I caught a fish; it was that long; I never saw such a fish." His friend said, "I believe you." I guess a lot depends on the interpretation you put on things.

I note that the hon. member for Eastview (Mr. Penner) had some comments with respect to inflationary trends. He tried his best to heap criticism on the government and allot all the blame for inflationary trends to the government of the province of Saskatchewan. That's very strange reasoning when you look at the facts. I would contend, Mr. Speaker, that all governments in Saskatchewan, even those of varied political stripes, for more than three decades have shown good fiscal responsibility. I look back at the record and I find under the Douglas administration, the Lloyd administration, the Thatcher administration and the Blakeney administration, we accumulated some 30 surpluses and 3 deficits. When a government goes into the market place and spends more money than it takes in, it obviously has some inflationary impact. That has simply not occurred in this province for more than three decades. I regret to say that's not true, Mr. Speaker, at the federal level. I hope to have a good deal more to say about this tomorrow in the Throne Speech Debate and I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:40 o'clock p.m.