

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

November 28, 1977.

EVENING SESSION

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to take part in this Throne Speech debate. In listening to the members opposite and their contributions that they have made so far in this debate, I want to say that two of the best contributions made, I believe, came from this side of the House by the mover and seconder of the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — The member for Pelly should be congratulated for the fine speech he delivered on his first day in this Assembly. It is clear already, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Pelly constituency made the right choice when they went to the polls and elected a New Democrat in the June 8 by-election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the member for Meadow Lake who, in seconding the motion, showed once again his ability to more than adequately represent his constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, The Throne Speech contained several proposals that will be most welcome in my own constituency of Redberry and by people of Saskatchewan in general. There is good news in this speech for farmers, for conservationists, for small businessmen, for women, for residents of northern Saskatchewan, for municipal governments and for senior citizens. They will all benefit from the legislation that is outlined in the Throne Speech. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, instead of whining and fussing about the exact location of my chair or whether or not it should be a few feet one way or the other from where it is now, I intend to address myself to issues which, if properly resolved will enhance the lives of Saskatchewan people. Just before I leave this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the members of the Conservative Party, if all they can think of to do is fight about where they want to sit that they are never going to make it in these chairs on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the Throne Speech express our government's support for the Canadian Wheat Board. The board is going to need all the help it can get in the months and years immediately ahead of us if it just wants to survive. Farmers should know that both the hon. Minister Otto Lang, the federal minister responsible for the Wheat Board, the Conservative Leader Joe Clark, have both been talking of scuttling the Canadian Wheat Board recently. Mr. Lang told the Wheat Pool delegates last week, Mr. Speaker, that a deficiency payment should be made to those producers who sold grain under the open market. Mr. Speaker, he told them that payment should be made because the prices were so low. Well, Mr. Speaker, orderly marketing of grain is not going to last very long if that kind of system is going to be developed. Even more senseless was the attack on the Canadian Wheat Board which

came from Joe Clark, the Leader of the Conservative Party. Mr. Clark speaking to an audience in Morden, Manitoba advocated letting private corporations and organizations compete with the Wheat Board to sell grain. Well, Mr. Speaker, that kind of an arrangement would be wonderful for the Japanese or the European buyer, or one Canadian selling agency against another to bid the price down. It would be good for the governors of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, who could once again reap huge profits speculating on the product of hard work of prairie farmers. One of the grain barons was campaigning the provincial Conservative Party in the Pelly by-election.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why?

MR. BANDA: — Why, making it clear that the platform of the provincial Tory Party suits him just fine. This points out where the Tory Party stands on orderly marketing, contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition of the Conservative Party said just a day or two ago. Mr. Speaker, because of a combination of factors, this year will see farmers net income drop to approximately \$733 million, from \$1.47 billion in the very good year of 1976. At a time like this, the Canadian Wheat Board should not be under attack. It should be strengthened, so as to provide prairie farmers with all the traditional advantages of orderly marketing and open up new export markets across the world for Canadian grain.

Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged to see in the Throne Speech, indication that the provincial government would keep Saskatchewan farm land from falling into the hands of non-resident absentee landlords. Existing legislation which was limiting land based on an assessment has not proven to be completely effective, especially in this past year. This action is being taken at the request of a number of farm organizations who share with this Blakeney government a strong commitment to the family owned and family operated farm.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech dealt with the subject of grants under several headings. I want to just say a few words about provincial grants. The Leader of the conservative Party has recently been critical of the Saskatchewan government for its grant programs. A couple of paragraphs from the Saskatchewan Star-Phoenix which covered the provincial Tory Convention to demonstrate what I mean. I quote:

Collver also attacked the excess number of grants available from the federal and provincial governments and the attitude they are creating. (He goes on.) The governments gain more control over locally elected officials, because every dollar in the form of a grant comes on the strings of a puppeteer.

Mr. Speaker, as the Throne Speech clearly states, not all grant money comes with strings attached. In 1971 provincial grants to urban municipalities were less than \$1.3 million. While all of that grant money was conditional, this picture has changed considerably today. In 1977-78 grants to urban municipalities will be almost \$46 million and of this amount, nearly \$26 million of that will be in the form of unconditional grants. That money, Mr. Speaker, has no strings attached.

Another example is one of revenue sharing. Representatives of urban and rural municipalities at the present time are engaged in discussions to establish a new system of sharing provincial revenues. That is a move towards greater local control — that that the Premier of Alberta rejected outright just last year. Mr. Speaker, in Conservative run Alberta, so often praised a model by members opposite, the Deputy Premier, Hugh Horner refers to municipalities as, "Children of the province." A survey of the grant

money available reveals that only 12 per cent of all grants in Alberta are unconditional, the remainder have strings attached, like the Leader of the Conservatives says we have here. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Conservative Party put his foot in his mouth once again, with his statements about provincial grants.

Now, in my own constituency of Redberry in 1976, there were 1,041 mixed farmers and cattle producers who received over \$1.4 million from the Beef Assistance Grants. In many cases this saved their beef operation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Nipawin should tell those farm families that they don't deserve to get that money, if he dare do so. The Farm Start program in that same year helped numerous farmers in my constituency diversify their farms with livestock. Would the Leader of the provincial Conservative Party tell these people they have no right to Farm Start grants and that the \$273,918 must be paid back? Apparently he would, Mr. Speaker, because that is the position he has taken at his party's annual convention. The member for Nipawin would say to the people of Krydor, or Fielding, or Richard, who have recently received a new recreation grant, facilities grant, no you can't have any provincial money for recreation facilities. Raise it yourself, or do without.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of communities across this province have used the Community Capital Fund money to build skating rinks for their young people, to buy a fire truck to protect their homes, or any number of other worthwhile useful things. Hundreds in fact, 250 senior citizens' groups have received grants to operate their activity centres from this government, 10 of them in the Redberry constituency. Many ethnic and cultural groups have received grant money to carry on their colorful and interesting activities. Mr. Speaker, I say to the Conservative Party that what this government gives out to local municipalities, charitable organizations, retired peoples' organizations, and other similar groups is money very well spent. We in the New Democratic Party stand opposed to any effort to put an end to it. In the same view members of the Conservative Party have been critical of our province's utility companies' policies. They have referred to Sask Tel's assimilation program as government control over the lives of individuals. That is of course, foolishness, and the facts prove it. However, it doesn't change the situation. It's still good Tory policy.

Mr. Speaker, there is a possibility that about 50,000 telephone subscribers would be affected by the changeover to Sask Tel service. That program will cost in the neighborhood of \$100 million to complete. That will bring about vastly improved telephone service to those who convert. I think it is important to note that the switchover is voluntary, and the local people can instruct their company to opt in or just stay as they wish.

The members opposite indicated in this House that Sask Tel and Sask Power should provide services at cost. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the 50,000 rural subscribers were to pay the cost of putting into effect the underground cable as is the case with the assimilation program the cost would be approximately \$2,000 per subscriber and it wouldn't be free of charge for a member of a rural telephone company, as the case is now.

The Tories are saying they're against grants, they want people to finance their own services, more local control. Let them sell that proposition to rural telephone subscribers and ask those people to pay \$2,000, or have no phone because Tory policy is not to interfere with local people.

Saskatchewan power rates for electricity and natural gas have also drawn criticism from both opposition spokesmen. It is interesting to me that there are always calls for an across the board reduction in rates. Do the opposition parties not know, Mr. Speaker, that if we took a 10 per cent across the board reduction what that would save a senior citizen living in his or her own home? Possibly only four dollars a month, while it would reduce the electricity bill for the Cominco Potash Mine, or an Eaton's department store by several thousand dollars, Mr. Speaker, . I think they know that this is the way it works and that is precisely why they advocate it.

Mr. Speaker, an across the board reduction will mean virtually nothing for a senior citizen who is a low user of power. Across the board reduction in power rates won't help people living in senior citizens' homes. If the members opposite are serious about what they say, about utility rates lowering the cost of living, then they should be pressing the federal government for a more realistic pension for senior citizens, a provincial-federal cost sharing assistance plan to help low income people meet the rising cost of living. That would make more sense. This would benefit them more than lowering what is already amongst the lowest utility rates in this country, and the low income people would get the benefit. At the same time, taxes would have to be increased to provide capital to meet the demand for power and telephone services if we were to reduce the rates across the board.

A rigid, no profit policy, is just as short-sighted. Saskatchewan Power has in years past planned very wisely for the future. It has involved setting aside money for expansion when it was needed. The alternative is to borrow all of the money required when a major capital project is needed. If that is done interest charges are assumed and must be kept up for many years.

Mr. Speaker, I think the publicly owned utility companies of Saskatchewan have a very good reputation among Saskatchewan people, and criticism by Liberals and Conservatives of those Crown corporations will not meet with very wide acceptance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the recent oil decision. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that from 1947 to 1972 oil companies earned some \$2.7 billion on exploration and development of our oil resources. After operating costs and royalties these companies realized half a billion dollars in Saskatchewan oil. In December of 1973, the Saskatchewan government passed Bill 42, The Oil and Gas Conservation Stabilization and Development Act. It was passed because the price of oil was going up dramatically due largely to the cartel known as the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) which was forcing the international price up. Our oil still cost the companies the same to produce, but there were within the space of a few months, massive profits to be made on Saskatchewan crude, thanks to the price fixing that was going on in the Arab capitals.

It was at that point that the Saskatchewan government moved to intercept the windfall profits for the people of Saskatchewan rather than letting them go to the international oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, the oil companies have made sizeable returns from Saskatchewan oil. Even after full taxes have been paid under Bill 42, while the CIGOL case involved less than \$5 million, there was a hundred times that amount at stake. It is money that was collected in good faith by this province, and the bulk of it has been returned to the people of Saskatchewan through a variety of government programs.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to quote from the Leaders of the Opposition and what they say about the oil companies. I am quoting the Liberal Leader, Mr. Malone:

The NDP government now found itself having to pay back \$500 million improperly collected in tax from oil companies.

And he stated this in January, 1977 in the Prince Albert Daily Herald. I wonder how he knew that we were going to have to pay back \$500 million before it was even at the Supreme Court and the decision wasn't made? Somehow he knew what the decision of that federally appointed court was going to be.

I want to quote from the Leader of the Conservatives. He Mr. Collver, said:

Small companies such as Cigol have nothing to lose challenging the constitutionality of Bill 42.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Small companies!

MR. BANDA: — Small companies. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a little more about some of these small companies. Let's take a look at Imperial Oil for example. They have extracted 137 million barrels of Saskatchewan oil, valued at more than \$400 million, they paid only \$44 million royalties, and they are suing us and they want \$40 million back, Mr. Speaker, leaving us with a return of about one and one-quarter per cent. That's quite a fair deal, that is!

Let's take a look at the big tough job that they are doing in getting oil in this province. We look in 1972, their daily production - 262,000 barrels; 1975 they brought it up one per cent 265,000. Let's look at the profit. Profits after taxes, Mr. Speaker. Around \$151 million in 1972; in 1975 - \$250 million, up 65 per cent profit. Well they say that they've had a tough job. What did they spend on exploration in those years? \$74 million in '72; \$74 million in '75, no increase. How many wells did they drill? 20 in 1972; only 6 in 1975, but profits increased.

Mr. Speaker, that's not a very poor outfit to be grumbling about.

Let's take a look at the small company that the Leader of the Conservative Party talks about. This is a little interesting because I'm looking at an article that was written in the Star-Phoenix, Saturday, February 19, 1977. The headline says:

NORCEN GERMAN CHUCKLES AT HIS SUCCESS

Well, what's Norcen? First of all Edmund Bovie, Bouvie is the corporation chairman of Norcen Energy Resources Limited created only three years ago, but fast achieving blue chip status with the giants of the industry is chuckling about his success.

Who is Norcen .. and I am reading out of this article, Mr. Speaker.

Both Bouvie and Norcen can trace their origins back to Northern Ontario Natural Gas Limited, known as NONG, which was the centre of a scandal nearly two decades ago, involving company and government officials

Bouvie joined NONG after the scandal erupted, a scandal that was highlighted by the conviction of the company president for perjury in connection with testimony before a government inquiry over the distribution of NONG shares. Shortly after NONG changed its name to Northern and Central Gas Corporation and proceeded to expand, acquiring such firms as Lakeland Natural Gas Company, Greater Winnipeg Gas Company, Quebec Gas Company (now Gas Metropolitan Incorporated of Montreal).

In 1974 Northern and Central and its thriving Calgary subsidiary, Canadian Industrial Oil and Gas Limited, known as CIGOL, were merged to form NORCEN, based in Toronto.

The small little oil company. I will go on, Mr. Speaker. I want to read from what their chairman said and I quote:

We can see the company achieving one billion dollars in sales in the next three to five years, Bouvie said, with a cash flow of \$80 to \$90 million. Norcen, as an ambitious and integrated energy company, has not only room to expand but an adequate pool of funds to finance development without borrowing.

And I continue to quote, Mr. Speaker:

It has budgeted about \$35 million to explore for oil and gas this year, half of it in high risk ventures, but profits have jumped \$20.9 million in 1976 and roughly have doubled in the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, these are the small companies that the Supreme Court and the members opposite are fighting for — the poor fellows. Members opposite stand in this Legislature to fight against the people of this province to retain their rightful share of our own resources. They say that the companies should get \$500 million back, clear profit, Mr. Speaker, clear profit. Could that possibly be, Mr. Speaker, that those members opposite fight for them because the eight largest oil companies gave those two parties \$546,000 in campaign funds for a year, for a year, Mr. Speaker? Could that be why they stick up for them? Mr. Speaker, I reject that vote. Mr. Speaker, I am whole heartedly in favor of moving now the Legislature that not even the smallest percentage of that revenue collected under Bill 42 will ever have to be paid back to the oil companies.

And as for the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, I think this government is on the right course and to express my support, I will be voting for the original motion.

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to rise in this Assembly again and speak on behalf of the people of the Yorkton constituency but first of all I too want to congratulate the member for Pelly, Mr. Norman Lusney on two counts. First of all, for his resounding victory that brought him to this House as its member for Pelly. And let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that that victory brought a message to the rest of this province; a message that they won't be forgetting too soon. And secondly, I am pleased to congratulate him on the fine job he is doing for his constituency and also for the very fine job he did in presenting his first speech in moving

the Speech from the Throne. I also congratulate Mr. Gordon McNeill for the fine speech he made and seconding Mr. Lusney's motion. We are all certainly very proud of both of you.

I am proud to speak of the achievements of this government and to show why it has to be the best government in Canada today. I say we have the best government because we have continued the process begun so long ago by the CCF under the former Premier, Mr. Tommy Douglas. Yes, we the NDP are proud to continue the work begun by such men of honor, as J.S. Woodworth, Tommy Douglas, Woodrow Lloyd in the old CCF.

The hon. Allan Blakeney, Premier of this province, will well remember when he was in the Cabinet of the former CCF government. He will remember developing the Hatton gas field in the south-west corner of the province of Saskatchewan. That field was owned by the people of Saskatchewan that supplied the gas to the system that now heats our homes in this province. Then, the so-called free enterprise Liberal government took over. What did those so-called free enterprisers do? They sold that gas field at bargain counter prices. But the Saskatchewan Power Corporation now, Mr. Speaker, pays \$1.04 per thousand cubic feet for that gas that is used in the homes and the businesses throughout this province.

The so-called free enterprisers, Progressive Conservatives and Liberals, like to attack us for raising the price of natural gas used in Saskatchewan. But where, but where, Mr. Speaker, does most of our natural gas come from? Why it comes from that wonderland, that so-called free enterprise Conservative Alberta. In 1973, the Alberta Conservatives charged us 16 cents per thousand feet of natural gas. Today they charge your Saskatchewan Power Corporation again, \$1.04 per thousand cubic feet. That's an increase over six and one half times in the last four years. Strange how the Saskatchewan Conservatives now come on as the great defenders of the people. The great defenders who would have people believe that they would reduce power rates. Alberta Conservatives increase their gas prices to you and me by six and a half times but the Saskatchewan Progressive Conservatives say reduce the prices in power. Great logic, Mr. Speaker, great logic. It is obvious what they would do if they got their hands on the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. No doubt, another increase of six and a half times.

Just look at the actions of the PC government in Manitoba. They promised a tax reduction in the election. Now we see them talking about a supposed terrible financial situation in Manitoba. Obviously the PCs of Manitoba are preparing the people of that province for a whopping tax increase. They are preparing the people of Manitoba for a beautiful reversal of their election promise — a reduction in taxes. Promise one thing during the election and then do exactly the opposite, when it comes to keeping the promise.

The so-called free enterprise PCs tell us they are the friends of everyone in Saskatchewan, everyone, Mr. Speaker. But we know from experience, from the experience of people in other provinces whose friends they are. Now these quotations have been given many times before but they certainly bear repetition. Let me quote for you once more from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of March 16, 1977, "PC MLA Roy Bailey says people in Saskatchewan would

pay \$10 a day to get into hospital". If this statement is false, Mr. Speaker, why doesn't the member force the Star Phoenix and the Leader Post to retract that statement. If the statement is false go after them. The federal PC Leader Joe 'who' said that visits to the hospital should be considered taxable benefits.

The Liberals and the PCs say that they're friends of the businessman too. But let's look at a few facts. During T.C. Douglas' years in office as Premier of this province from the years 1957 to 1964, the annual increase in investment in Saskatchewan was 4.8 per cent. During the so-called free enterprise years of the Liberals from 1964 to 1971, the annual investment growth for eight years, says the member for Assiniboia, great years, the investment rate was 2.27 per cent in spite of the giveaways to the free enterprisers that were their big friends.

During the Blakeney years from 1971 onwards, the growth rate of investment in Saskatchewan has been 22.1 per cent; 2.7 per cent increased investment under the so-called free enterprises; 22.1 during the NDP government. Who is the friend of business in Saskatchewan? The hon. E.L. Tchorzewski ably documented how the government assistance in loans helps small businessmen. I would like to show how our government helps small businessmen in another way; through grants, through municipalities and organizations and I would like to show just how these grants help the businessman.

Let's take a six year period of the last so-called free enterprise Liberal government from 1964 to 1971. During that time, Yorkton received only \$443,938.25 in highway department grants for work within the city. From 1971 to 1977 another six year period under the NDP government of Allan Blakeney, Yorkton received \$2,343,356.41 of highway grants — over five times as much as they received under this so-called free enterprisers. I have often given details of the grants to the city of Yorkton, no strings attached grants. Suffice is to say that municipalities received 1600 per cent more in grants than they did under the so-called free enterprise Liberals.

Now, I had the pleasure of presenting grant cheques to various social services and other institutions in Yorkton. I presented \$503.00 to the Yorkton retired senior citizens group. It was a final payment of a \$1,100 grant to this group. I presented a \$3,000.00 grant to the Yorkton Agriplex to put on a display of Saskatchewan products in the coming year. Thirty-eight thousand, five hundred and twelve dollars was presented to the Yorkton Society for the Involvement of Good Neighbors; SIGN we call it in Yorkton and I had the pleasure of presenting the final payment of \$51,770.00 to that very valuable society that works with people who are less fortunate than others.

But what is the purpose of grants like these to municipalities and to groups like the ones I've just mentioned: these grants not only help to help provide services to people who need them; these grants not only help to build streets and roads and reduce taxes; they supply jobs and keep down unemployment and the jobs and money that is generated in this way enable people to buy the goods they need in our city and to help support the small businessmen and keep prosperity rolling. Considering the above evidence, I heartily concur with the Minister of Health that the NDP government is the truest friend of the

small businessman.

Let's see why a PC government would be unable to provide grants on the same level as the Blakeney government. Look at the PC government in New Brunswick. To quote Premier Allan Blakeney recently, he said "If we applied the proposed New Brunswick potash tax rates to Saskatchewan, our province would lose \$50 million a year." Let's put that figure into perspective. There would be \$50 million less in which to pay grants from the potash. That would mean that the taxpayer and the small businessman, certain the small businessman, not the big one would have to dig into his pockets to provide the money needed. In effect, the economy would be short on close to \$100 million on potash alone. Such statistics show solid evidence that the value of this government of the value of this government to the businessman and it is also solid evidence of what would happen should this province ever be subjected to a so called Progressive Conservative free enterprise government. The stand of the PCs on the CIGOL case is just another indication of what would happen to our province under PCs or Liberals.

Liberals say negotiate when Imperial is demanding a return of 39 million out of the 44 millions paid in royalties. By that demand Imperial Oil wants to pay a rate of 1.25 per cent of the oil that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan. That is some spot from which we would start negotiations. I don't mind negotiations but at 1.25 per cent the royalty rate is just a little bit low. The Federal Conservatives and the Conservatives here would have the people of Saskatchewan and Canada pay back over the \$580 million owed to the companies. But as has been said many times before, and will be said many times again, Mr. Speaker, that money belongs to the people of Saskatchewan and it shall stay in Saskatchewan.

The Liberals and Conservatives want us to try any law and oil royalties in the courts and have them tested in the courts before we use it.

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — You don't believe in courts.

MR. NELSON: — Oh yes, I believe in courts, but that would mean a tax holiday for their corporate friends, naturally. And naturally, the members opposite favor such a move. The last case, Mr. Speaker, on CIGOL lasted over three years. Once more we have the Liberals and PCs side by side, fighting for their financial supporters, their allies in the big business. A three year tax holiday for those friends, Mr. Speaker, that's what they're fighting for. But what disturbs me most about the Liberals and Conservatives on this CIGOL case ..

AN HON. MEMBER: — Do you abide by the law?

MR. NELSON: — Oh yes, I abide by the law but that's a different story. Let's just continue with this thing. The thing that really disturbs me about this CIGOL case is their attack on the Attorney General and the government, and their handling of it. The Attorney General they say should resign. They say he's incompetent. He doesn't understand laws and law making, they say. The PCs attack is the same. Right, says the member for Assiniboia. Only the whole government should resign. But let's read the final paragraph of the summary

of the Supreme Court judges. I quote, Mr. Speaker:

Mr. Justice Dickson with whom Mr. Justice de Grandpre agreed, dissented and wrote the minority opinion. The minority stated that the royalty surcharge was a tax and not a true royalty but was a valid and direct tax. The mineral income tax was also said to be valid and direct and not to have a tendency to be passed on. The minority pointed out that the price of oil would be the same whether the tax existed or not. (Justice Dickson also stated that the expropriation provisions were valid and that there was no interference with the Federal trade and commerce power.)

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Attorney General of Saskatchewan is incompetent then by inference all the judges that favor the tax law are incompetent also. So say the free enterprise PCs and Liberals.

Many judges, Mr. Speaker, in the Canadian court system voted in favor of seeing that the tax laws were correct and that they do not contravene any Canadian law. Judges saying that the Saskatchewan tax on oil was valid were as follows: one judge on the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench, five judges of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeals, two judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, in total, a total of eight judges voted in favour of the law, seven judges voted against it. Now I realize fully, and nobody needs to tell me, I realize fully that that Supreme Court has a final say but let's look at the facts. If the Attorney General doesn't understand the laws, law making, then neither do these distinguished judges of the courts of Canada. If the Attorney General and his department are incompetent then so are every one of these judges. Let me read again from the final summary of this decision: The minority report stated that the royalty surcharge was not a true royalty but was a valid, direct tax.

No, not at all, I'm just saying that if the government members are incompetent, then you are also saying that the judges are incompetent.

Mr. Speaker, last week we witnessed an attack on your office by the PCs. This week it's an attack on the judicial system.

Here we have the Liberals amendment on the Speech from the Throne decrying the lack of a move of the government on law and order. We hear constantly the PCs talking about law and order. You cannot deny that by inferences the judges who ruled in favour of the laws are incompetent if our government members are incompetent. What other conclusions can be taken?

It is just another part of this constant attack on law and order and the PCs have been leading.

The PC leader cried loudly at his convention how they will be attacking him. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what politician in his right mind does not expect to be attacked? This politician from Nipawin weeps big tears about attacks on him. Naturally, he's going to be attacked. How can any member opposite expect that we should not attack that man?

Let me read from the newspaper, Yorkton This Week of November 7, 1977, and I quote, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

Case in point, Saskatchewan Progressive Conservative Leader, Dick Collver talking with this newspaper while visiting in Yorkton several weeks ago, noted that it's 1979 or never, as far as voting the New Democrats out of power. Once that happens he suggested those people won't be able to become active in any political party, that is people in government, especially as an opposition political party. And he continues, but maybe Mr. Collver is looking too deeply for hidden motives. Maybe he should address his outrage towards the Progressive Conservative Party in Alberta which forms the government in that province. The PCs there aren't going about trying to stay in power by lessening the political activity in such a surreptitious manner. They have introduced into the legislature a code of ethics for the civil servant which goes beyond forbidding them to work in part time jobs and other such non-becoming past times. It also forbids the civil servants to take an active part in any political organization. Strange, he says, strange. We always assumed that to be a basic right of a citizen in a free society. Not so apparently in sunny Alberta, where a government has grown so certain of its power it feels it can change basics at will. Sneaking moves can be uncovered, exposed and hopefully changed. Bold moves such as these displayed by the Alberta PCs could be even more dangerous, because they not only show a lack of concern for public opinion but they assume that no one dare raise opposition.

That's arrogance of the worst type and the most difficult to combat, I agree, Mr. Speaker, that's arrogance.

In August of 1977, the PC Leader was to be in court. All the proper procedures had been taken to have that man in the court house. Where was he? He was in Europe. There had to be a court order to bring him back. Now let me read parts of that news release that tells of that incident. I quote from the Regina Leader Post of Saturday, August 13, 1977:

The Court of Queen's Bench in Regina put out an unusual tourist alert, Friday when it ordered Progressive Conservative Leader, Dick Collver to return home for a European holiday by August 22nd. Collver left for Europe about one week ago, breaking of a six weeks examination for discovery, a type of pre-trial after only three weeks were completed. In his judgment, Mr. I. MacDonald ruled that Collver at 9:30 a.m. on August 22 stating: "Once the Registrar appoints a place, date and time for examination, it becomes the duty of the party to be examined to attend at that place, date and time, and to continue in attendance until the completion of the examination."

To continue on further, Mr. MacDonald ordered Mr. Collver to return, saying "It is obvious that agreement between the parties is not possible". Isn't that funny? The courts can't get the member for Nipawin to make and keep his agreements, and neither can we in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, this typifies the attitude of disrespect for law and order that the member for Nipawin displays.

We saw the leader of that party vote for a motion in this House that in effect said, that the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland had used a falsehood when he said hospitals were filthy. Those people then went right out of this House and backtracked on their very own vote inside this House — a complete

disregard for law and order.

And on Friday last, we had the PC Leader's attack on all the people of European and eastern European stock. How long, Mr. Speaker, will the PC members opposite allow themselves to be dragged into the dirt by their leader? How can any member opposite back a leader who casts slurs on people of a different race? How can those members opposite support a leader who defies the law? Those people in the PC caucus smile and talk about law and order, but when we see their actions in this House and in the courts of law, we can rightfully say to the people of Saskatchewan, 'be careful'. With their attitudes, with the attitudes of that party, it is obvious what would happen to law and order if those PCs ever took over this province.

Those people smile and talk about how well they will treat the businessman, but their stand on CIGOL shows who they would favor — it's obvious — their big corporate friends, Mr. Speaker. The PCs smile and talk of how much they would do in the health field, but look at what happened in Manitoba — a 90 day freeze on the construction of health facilities. Be careful Saskatchewan if you vote PC or Liberal your health care institutions will be destroyed.

The PCs talk about improving the unemployment situation. Again, let us look at the freeze on construction of health facilities in Manitoba. Certainly, such a move will not improve the unemployment situation in that province.

It's the old line of the PCs and the Liberals — say one thing on their election platform and do the opposite when in government. In comparison, let's look at the record of the Blakeney government. In our 1971 platform, 'The New Deal for People' was virtually all completed. Our 1975 platform, 'New Deal '75' is well on the way to completion. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are proud of the honor and integrity of our leader, Allan Blakeney. Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the honor and integrity and ability of our cabinet ministers. They are as capable as any in North America, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to support this government.

I cannot support the amendment to the motion on the Speech from the Throne.

The Liberal motion, supported by the PCs demands that we do something about crime, yet as we have mentioned before, and by the PC Leader as well, on the motion that he is going to support that it's a federal jurisdiction. How will the PCs vote on that one? It's going to be interesting. They talk against it — it's interesting to see how they'll vote.

They demand a halt in the growth of government bureaucracy. Let's look at the figures. Saskatchewan has one of the lowest number of civil servants per capita of all Canadian governments. We have 1.8 per cent of our people in civil service. Conservative Alberta has 2.4, Conservative New Brunswick has 3.4. It's obvious that the PCs and Liberals are looking at their own government when they talk about big government.

The amendment demands that we should deal with Indian problems. Mr. Speaker, we on this side are quite happy to leave it to the Indian and Metis

people to decide which government is concerned about their problems, just as we are concerned about the problems of everyone else in this country and this province.

Lastly, they demand that we prevent increases in power rates. How can you control power rates when 80 per cent or more of our natural gas comes from Conservative Alberta?

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I will be proudly supporting the main motion and opposing the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise and try to reply to the Throne Speech. However, after listening carefully and reading the Throne Speech, I find that it offers very little in the way of encouragement for the farmer or the laborer, or the industrial section of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to welcome the MLA from Pelly, and I hope that he will make a larger contribution than most of the backbenchers back there. He has so far without ramblings and screaming and yelling and tears that they have. But I also say that we expect his stay in this Assembly will be complete after the next general election.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to cover a few areas here tonight — the DNS which I know the minister wouldn't expect me to leave out — the Saskatchewan Forest Products, and if the Minister of Finance was here, maybe I could let him in on a little secret about some of the waste and some of the extravagance of money being spent.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — You don't think ...

MR. WIPF: — You are not capable of thinking; maybe that's your problem.

Mr. Speaker, although this government is vitally interested in the development of the north, once again, very little consideration is given to the individual citizens in the north. And we will see, because of this attitude of the NDP government, that problems will arise more frequently amongst the northerners, more frustrations as they find themselves hamstrung by bureaucratic controls and lack of efficiency on the government's part. Mr. Speaker, for the past five years, the DNS has been a thorn in the sides of many residents in the northern administration district. A department that started out as a few million dollar department has grown into a \$65 million bureaucracy with one civil servant for every 45 residents, with control over their everyday lives and control over their future. It's just about equal to the parent/teacher ratio now in the schools. The minister has been asked repeatedly to call an inquiry into the DNS and even refuses an internal investigation, that is, he did until last spring when we exposed some of the problems of the RAP program, and since then there has been an RCMP investigation conducted in there. This fall the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan made some of usual bright, but contradictory statements. First he said that one of the problems with the DNS is that they rushed

programs too fast and had no long term plans. He denied that this spring in the Budget Debate. So he set up an advisory committee. In a Government Service release here, he said that long range planning should not be left solely to the high ranking civil servants or the politicians; that the committee's role is to provide comments and advice on existing and proposed government policies and programs, he said. He carried on to say that the solution to northern problems is not more money, and I agree with that. We are getting into trouble now by going too fast. Our problems in the past have been mainly due to the lack of experience and developing meaningful long term programs.

Mr. Speaker, he set up this advisory committee, and I suppose that this was to have local input and some advice. However, the next time he speaks out, the minister has announced that the DNS plans to bring about programs at a rate of speed that will cause more social upheavals than has ever been seen in the history of the north, and this is to happen in the next 10 years — planned social upheavals in the north, and that there will be no, or very little debate or consultation with those affected before the program was brought in.

Mr. Speaker, this government does not care about the individual anymore. And According to the honorable minister of the DNS, the main purpose of the NDP is to place more control on, and shove more programs at our residents, until there is a crisis and the planned social upheavals take place. This type of policy is designed and instituted like a dictatorship. The same people who designed and brought in the takeover bill of the Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act, Bill 84, so that the minister has the power take over any business in the north that he wishes. This same bill is still very controversial in the north and has caused many tourist camp operators to review any expansions that they had planned.

For years the residents of the north have wanted direction and assistance so that they could go on their own, start construction projects and build the North. However, they find themselves instead what they find there is a government department that has squashed any hope and has itself become the largest construction company in the North and has actually stopped many northerners from getting ahead in that area. I grant that there are some local people who have started on their own and they are doing work for the RAP program. However, some of these have found it rather hard to compete on the market with the DNS.

Mr. Speaker, over the last summer many problems have come to light and one of them held very serious allegations against employees of the DNS. I refer to the Gran Report. This report has named and listed, what I consider, some very serious allegations against some very reputable DNS employees. I felt that at least the DNS could at least help these employees clear their names and it suggested an internal investigation. This same call was made by two representatives of the people of the North but not by the two northern MLAs. This report was damning against many in the DNS yet this government chose unfair tactics and instead of attacking and correcting the issues in the report you attacked the author of the report. You attacked him as if he was your enemy. I ask you, why didn't you try to clear the reputations of your employees who were involved and why did you ignore the substance

of the report, the allegations in that report? Why didn't you challenge this Ken Gran and make him prove these allegations. I believe the answer is that you are afraid to bring out in public some of the issues that were mentioned; that you are afraid to be exposed. In order to take pressure and attention away from the issue you did the same thing as the report did and practised character assassination. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the very answer that this government comes up with every time a touchy issue arises, they use the tactics of attacking a person and not the issue. It's cheap but something that you are experts at and it used to be effective.

I heard in this Throne Speech Debate and again tonight half truths, half statements, but I tell you it matches some of your wit. You are masters of deceit in a lot of areas. However, more people in Saskatchewan today are recognizing these moves by the NDP government and this minister. The more you do it, the more the voters wonder just what is this government trying to hide from us now. And do you know that you have done that very thing many times in this session already and the voters will expect you to continue doing so. However, Mr. Speaker, let me assure the government opposite that each time a voter in Saskatchewan hears an NDP member attacking another individual on a personal basis the voter will be trying to figure out just what is the NDP trying to cover up this time.

Mr. Speaker, I had a bit of a humorous experience this fall. I had issued a press release which stated that the Minister of the DNS had lost control of his department and it was costing the taxpayers millions of dollars as a result. A few days later the minister issued a challenge asking me to account or to show where the moneys had been badly spent but he accepted that he had lost control of the DNS and not ever denying it.

Well, I've had people on the street ask me if I was sure the money was being wasted and when a few fine citizens from Buffalo Narrows came to talk to me and they asked about what proof I had, I showed them a document that the minister tabled in his Estimates last year where it showed that vast quantities of money that could not be collected because the document had stated that they were lazy fishermen, do-littles, alcoholics or many other reasons. May I tell you, Mr. Minister, that they were rather surprised northerners when they learned that you had tabled this document and made it public with no regard to the individual or what it could do to their families. Again more proof that this government does not care about the individual.

MR. FARIS: — You take the high road.

MR. WIPF: — I'll take the high road right now for you.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Finance was here because all summer long we heard that our fires cost us \$3 million more than they were supposed to cost. You had estimated a half million dollars to fight them and they were \$3.5 million or something like that and I would like to read you some observations from an expert, from a man who understands and I tell you that I have a high respect for this man looking into and investigating the fire.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's the name?

MR. WIPF: — I can't give you his name, it is a confidential memo. It's from the government, mind you. It says and I am going to read this to you so it will give you a little idea of the mismanagement and the inefficiency that goes on in that department. I would suggest that you did right there, Mr. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, telling them to keep quiet and listen. It says:

Following are my observations and suggestions that I feel could be instituted, in order to have less confusion in camp and more productive use of men and equipment at job site and improve staff morale.

To begin with, camp conditions were deplorable. (I am talking about the mission fire, there were many, many other fires.) There was no kitchen set up at all, the people doing the cooking left something to be desired. If there was a shortage of cooks, a better calibre could have been found.

There was no base radio, the only radio response I was able to get was the helicopters. (And I don't know what those helicopters cost, \$300, \$400, \$500 an hour, that's a bit expensive to use for a radio and this was only intermittent.)

There was no washing facilities for personnel, no power to bunk trailers. After rain people had to plough through mud and water to move around camp. There were no hygiene facilities. (That's your government, that's the way you look after your workers.)

There was no control on provisions, (waste) people just took what they were able to find. There were no suppers, only for those people who were first. The last two days there was supper, but it was all completely cold, even the coffee was lukewarm. This is very demoralizing to people who have been working all day and had a can of cold beans for dinner. If a cook had been on duty, food would have been kept more palatable. There were two kitchens sitting on the site, all they needed was cleaning out and getting set up. (They were fire fighters and maybe that is some of the reason why they spent an extra \$3 million up there.)

There should have been a base radio as one of the first's, even if it had to be set up in a bunkhouse. A wash car could have been brought in at the very first. People were very dirty working on the fire and they could not even shower. (No concern for the individual again and he is out there trying to do your job for you and you sit in the back there and laugh at him. You have never been on a fire probably so you wouldn't know what I am talking about.)

Where camp was set up, terrain had to be dozed off when it rained. It acted like a swimming pool. You can imagine the condition of all the trailers when the staff was forced to plough through this mud to this extent. If terrain had to be dozed off there could have been walks made up of scrap lumber that could be taken to the site at very little notice. All camps could consider walks which can be picked up and moved when the camp is. There should be a camp co-ordinator appointed, to ensure that a plan can be actioned, and ensure the camp has proper facilities and personnel to set and maintain, control of provisions, radio, kitchen staff . . . (and the like.)

MR. KOSKIE: — Signed by.

MR. WIPF: — I have a little more.

Camp supervisor was chauffeuring personnel to various locations. While he was doing this, he was out of contact with his main body of men and fire control. This job should have been assigned to someone else so that the camp supervisor would be in contact with what was happening. (I have as much difficulty reading as the member for Yorkton does.) Waiting for his return caused many lost hours for men and machines. If he had carried a portable radio he could at least have been contacted while he was in the van. This is very disheartening for personnel to just sit and wait when they know there is so much to do. The camp showed a complete lack of direction. (Typical DNS.)

I did not see any sign of road construction supervisors. I am sure if they had assessed this situation, they would have taken action to improve conditions in this camp and try to end some of the confusion. DNS is very low in the estimation of the private people concerned. (And lot of taxpayers, I may add.)

A lot of the operators were told that beds, blankets, etc., would all be supplied. They were told they did not even need their own sleeping bags. Much to their woe, they found out differently. Two operators left Saskatoon at 3:00 a.m. with their machines, unloaded them, went to work and did not get anything to eat until around 6:00 p.m. the next evening, when I was able to borrow a couple of sandwiches from other operators, as soon as I was aware of their situation. (Sounds like the boys' camps in the North. Fifty or sixty hours without food.)

One other major time wasted was lack of basic tools on each piece of equipment and flashlights for night operation, so that basics can be checked. We were stalled for two hours with a swamp tractor, for lack of basic tools to take off plugged fuel line and blow it out. Two hours later, fire swept over where we had been stranded. All the tools we were eventually able to get was one pair of pliers. This was enough to get it going again.

On another occasion we were stranded for three hours at night with the personnel van, because we had no tools or flashlight to take off the fuel filter and clean it. There were many occasions where an hour here and an hour there was lost for lack of tools for minor repairs. We were fortunate that two private operators had a tool kit we made use of ..(You ought to know a little bit about your inefficiency up there and your mismanagement, this is probably some of it.)

I also observed that if the private operators had a minute they cleaned their tracks,

checked oils, greased and just generally looked after the machines. There was not one private operator who had even a minor breakdown.

The pulp mill people were very good. They had some minor breakdowns, their mechanic was always summoned immediately and their machine would be operational within a few hours.

I think DNS could take some lessons from the private sector and the pulp mill. (A little opposite to what you people have been saying.) The difference is drivers and operators. Supervisors should do their utmost to make operators out of their drivers by coaching them on proper operation and maintenance of machines. We should have some small 12 volt fuel pumps so that the fuel has to be taken into the machines, the man on the fuel tender does not spend all his time pumping fuel by hand and is not trying to fuel up the fuel tender, plus a large cat while he is being fuelled up.

I also observed that the fuel meter on the IHC fuel tender which was used on mission fire was not operational. I wonder how the fuel people had any idea how much fuel was being put in each unit. They were just guessing as to how much was being pumped. There will likely be quite a discrepancy to what was purchased. How can people fill out fuel account slips and be accountable, when they don't have a meter to go by?

There was only one DNS cat on the crew that I had on the south side. I did not have it on Sunday with the rest of the crew. It was supposed to have run Sunday night. The night operator ran out of fuel. From Sunday night it sat close to the main road for two days before it was operational. It was quite a joke among all the people who saw it there.

I don't know what these cats cost per hour, probably \$50 or \$60 an hour, but it is quite a way to leave them sitting there.

MR. KOSKIE: — Keep to the script.

MR. WIPF: — Oh! I've got lots of scripts for you.

This shows that if an operator does not check his fuel when he starts his shift, it is not likely he checked anything else. This shows a lack of training on the part of his supervisors. He has not been taught the habits that make an operator out of a driver.

There are many more instances, where problems were created because of lack of proper direction and good basic work habits. At a time of crisis such as a fire, lack of training really magnifies and compounds any problems we may encounter.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that the minister . . .

MR. BOWERMAN: — Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's your point of order?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is reading from a letter which he says he is neither taking responsibility for, nor is he going to table it. I believe it is the rule of the House that he should table the letter.

MR. SPEAKER:— If the member brings forward a document that he is reading from, either he must cite the document so that other members can refer to it, or he must take complete responsibility for the document itself.

MR. WIPF: — Well I don't recall saying I wasn't going to table it, Mr. Speaker. It will be tabled at the end of my speech if it is okay.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the member should table it at the time he has concluded reading from it.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to tell you about the greatest constituency in Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Wilkie.

MR. WIPF: — No, not Wilkie. Of course you all know the Prince Albert-Duck Lake seat and its people, as most of you were there last spring and I am sure that you have to agree with me that this is one of the greatest constituencies in Saskatchewan. My constituency is very diversified and I represent a true cross section of the people of this province. I have the city of Prince Albert, the town of Duck Lake, the hamlet of MacDowell, Davis and Red Deer Hill, plus the total of two RMs of Duck Lake and Prince Albert. Farming through this constituency is diversified from straight grain farming to mixed farming to ranching.

Mr. Speaker, I also have two reservations in this seat, the Muskoday and the Beardy's, both very industrious and conscientious and bettering the lifestyle of their people. May I add, both are very fairly independent.

The people I represent have been very encouraging to work for. I am continually in contact and have found that party lines do not divide us. I look forward to serving these people as their MLA for a long time.

The east side of my constituency is a farming area. The farmers worked hard this fall and they finally got their crops off, as did most of the farmers in Saskatchewan. This was done with a great deal of good neighborliness and co-operation, and this was done throughout the whole area, of course, in the North. People working with people in the true meaning, not because they were forced to, but because they wanted to. This fall was one which the farmers do not want to experience again, with grain lying in the fields for several months, and no sign of good weather. But there was one humorous but serious event when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) told the farmers not to panic, that it wasn't unusual that crops were not harvested by that time of the year, at the time he made his statement. The farmers agreed. However, they wondered where the minister was in the past few years because it was very unusual for crops to lay in the swath for two to two and one-half months. Because of this unusual condition, the farmers in Saskatchewan were concerned. I would advise the minister to get his facts straight before making these stupid statements. However, Mr. Speaker, the good Lord did provide good weather and our crops came off.

In the past several years we have witnessed community spirit in Duck Lake where the residents have instigated and built recreation facilities and other facilities for their town. They are a very community-minded group and have been trying to increase the tourism industry in that area, an area that holds more historical significance than any other area in Saskatchewan. This is the area where the Riel Rebellion took place, the

area where the Almighty Boy's capture took place, and the area where the first government was located. Mr. Speaker, the Prince Albert-Duck Lake constituency was the home and the headquarters of the Northwest Mounted Police. This is a type of history and it is a credit to the people of the area that they want to develop and restore this significance to the area.

This is also the area where the movie *Alien Thunder* was made and it is shown all over the globe. In fact, Mr. Speaker, last summer people travelling in Canada, from England, made a special trip to Duck Lake to see this site. They say that the film has been shown in England and it is not chopped up and cut like it was in Canada or Saskatchewan when we saw it. However, it was an embarrassment to the local people. They had to tell these people that the provincial government had bought this movie site for about \$80,000 and then spent another \$70,000 fixing it up and now they want to tear it down. I can't emphasize enough the need to develop this whole area for historical reasons.

Another town in my constituency where the local people have got together is MacDowell. A great little town, Mr. Speaker, a town that has a very active community spirit. Over the past few years our senior citizens have rallied and now have their own hall. The residents of its district have rallied and now are constructing a large community centre.

The young people in my constituency are very active in sports and they happen to be the fastball champions of their league. I believe that I would be safe in challenging any other MLA here to bring his best ball players and we will take them on and we will win. We've got some of the best.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Did they get a grant?

MR. WIPF: — Twelve hundred dollars. I want to thank you. That's the money that the taxpayers and the senior citizens have paid in for years and years through taxes and are just getting a little bit back.

This total constituency is one that I am very proud of Mr. Speaker, from Duck Lake to Steep Creek. May I also tell you that some of the best oldtime dances are held on a regular basis in this constituency the senior citizens make it possible for all senior citizens to enjoy them by moving these dances to different places each month.

This fall the other problems that I heard of were road conditions. That was from the people living east of Prince Albert, the problems they had. The farmers phoned me, the teachers and the working people coming to Prince Albert on that way, found just after they entered the Prince Albert constituency that the roads were terrible and many detours were needed. Well, Mr. Speaker, soon after I received those complaints the roads began to improve. I don't mind doing another MLA's work for him if it is necessary to get things done. As for the city of Prince Albert, I feel that this government could help in a more positive way than has the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the hon. Mr. Vickars, when he made statements and gave press releases saying that the city which I represent is a selfish city. I take it that when one of your senior or cabinet ministers make statements like this that it was the feeling of the Cabinet that Prince Albert is a selfish city. Mr. Speaker, with a friend like the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce, I know what to expect from this NDP government for the city of Prince Albert.

I mentioned our senior citizens, Mr. Speaker. The Throne Speech had very little in it for the senior citizens .. three things. In fact, I think they received pittance — a proposed

universal home care plan, a revised home repair grant plan — that's good, but both are going to require much more red tape and confusion for our elderly, and the highlight was the additional funds for the senior citizens nursing homes, that is, those who require the extra attention. Mr. Speaker, our senior citizens deserve more than that. The member opposite tonight said — "Go to the federal government and ask them to raise the old age pension for them." Mr. Speaker, the majority of our senior citizens are not residents of nursing homes, nor do they own their own homes. So what do the rest have to look forward to? Well I believe that the answer is really, nothing. Their fixed incomes are being eaten up by this government's steady rise in costs of power and gas. Last Monday I believe it was — whatever day it was — the Mayor of Regina made that statement, that they can't afford to have any more costs put on them. In fact, this Throne Speech all but missed the people who built this province.

Once again you say that a pensioner is a little different than any other citizen in Saskatchewan by refusing to recognize their contribution to our province.

The Premier spoke about the medical plan and the drug plan the other day. Mr. Speaker, in September a news release went out and it was to cut off senior citizens and people on a Y card for Social Services from certain drugs. I had many senior citizens come to me and talk to me about that. I have a letter here — we talk about our senior citizens getting it in the neck — addressed to me (I'll table this one too for you) it says:

Dear Mr. Wipf: The following is a list of residents in Mont St. Joseph who are Y recipients and have full drug coverage. The new drug law states that they will now have to pay for any drug not listed under the Saskatchewan Drug Plan. These people will indeed be seriously affected due to the lack of funds.

That was written on October 12. There are 43 senior citizens on that list. The people that helped build this province have been cut off from the very things they needed to try and survive their golden years. And you laugh about it. He said:

We do hope that you will look into this matter. Out of our 81 residents, 43 of them, even the ones paying for their own way, the price of drugs causes them great concern. Thank you for your consideration.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Tell the rest of the story.

MR. WIPF: — You'll have an opportunity to stand up and tell the rest of that story.

I wrote a letter to the minister. I got a phone call again today from a little lady who was suffering from being cut off from drugs. She informs me that she just got a letter the other day. I don't know when you mailed them out. But senior citizens deserve a lot better deal than that. Senior citizens have asked me to ask the Minister of Social Services that if he has extra money to spend on the inmates in Prince Albert to send them out swimming, please spend some of that money on them, let them go swimming. If he has money to send the inmates out to go hiking, spend it on some of the senior citizens so they can go hiking, or so they can go on canoe trips. I see many senior citizens in my constituency — I don't know about yours — whose windows are broken and if they break the window, they end up with a pillow in it. In your department, you break a window you get them all paid for.

Mr. Speaker, in fact . . .

MR. ROLFES: — You'll wish you never made that statement when I get finished with

you . . .

MR. WIPF: — Is that a threat? In fact, Mr. Speaker, in . . . You like being slapped by a wet noodle, I think. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the moose got a better deal than the senior citizens in this Throne Speech. For years the pioneers have asked for a department in government that would understand their plight. This request fell on deaf ears of the NDP government. I believe this year when the Premier went up North, and was flying to his destination he saw a moose down there and he decided right there and then that that little moose needed a very special department. No other programs. Now we see we'll have a special program for the moose, and as it's advertised, you can't shoot the cow, you can shoot the calf and the bull. Mr. Speaker, for the last few years we have seen this government put potash before people and the member for Yorkton was talking about this New Deal for People. Now the New Deal is a moose before the senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a few contacts with the labor movement in my area. Last month the Saskatchewan Forest Products boys were forced off the job. I went out and I talked to them, and they said they were trying to get a meeting going but couldn't get one. I phoned the minister's office in Regina and found out that he was on a trip in Australia or somewhere to do with uranium. One and a half days after the strike started, the department didn't know anything about it. I was told by the assistant executive, or whoever answered the phone there, that you were hiring a new manager on the 17th of November, don't worry about it, everything should be okay by the 17th of November — that meant leaving the labor man standing on the street for 10 days to wait for this new manager to be brought in to settle the strike. I wonder if at that time you didn't have an indication about the CIGOL ruling coming down and you were trying to start saving some money on the backs of labor.

Mr. Speaker, I got a little notice in the mail today — there were a few of the NDP over there that worked before they were elected and they can probably understand the workers' plight. It said that on the 24th negotiations had broken down with CUPE and the government and they came to an abrupt halt today. The question the people want to ask is: is it the government's intention to save its loss of some \$580 million in oil revenue out of the pockets of the public sector employees? That's a question that many are asking out there.

Mr. Speaker, because the Throne Speech has nothing in it to better the economy of our province, because the Throne Speech has nothing in it for the farmers, the senior citizens, or even not too much for the rural municipalities, or the working man or woman in the labor force in our province, I cannot support the motion, but will support the amendment.

MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in this debate. First of all I would like to offer some comments to the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake who ranted and raved about the North. I want to caution the member for Duck Lake that when one becomes an instant expert, he soon falls to the bottom of the heap. I am told that he spent at least two days in the North in the last few months. With two days up North that's a pretty skinny attempt at learning the problems of the North. I wonder why, Mr. Speaker, he didn't talk about some of the programs that are going on in the North like airfield construction which is at an all time high, something like \$487,000 in the last year for airfield construction, whereas very little

was spent prior to the time when we were elected. What about road construction in the North? I wonder how he enjoyed the road between Prince Albert and La Ronge, if he drove it. That's a pretty nice stretch of road, he didn't mention that, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he visited the schools up North and realized what fine facilities there are today in the North. The amount of money that we have spent on gymnasiums and schools has skyrocketed in the last few years and the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake chooses to condemn the NDP and talk about cold beans.

Mr. Speaker, he hasn't mentioned the fact that it was the NDP government that brought in local government in the North, the Northern Municipal Council. We are providing substantial grants to this council to make their views known to the people of Saskatchewan. We get the odd black eye because they are saying it like they see it, and that's government for you and I say that's good government. The member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake chooses to talk about getting stuck in the mud which is not uncommon in the North; not to mention the grants to community colleges and other programs. And he talked about welfare. That's an interesting point, because I have a graph here which indicates that since 1973 the payments in welfare to people in the North has dropped fairly drastically, it has been cut in half literally. This is because of the economic programs that the NDP has implemented in the North. The member didn't talk about that at all.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he took a look at the houses in the North and in every northern community, Beauval, Buffalo Narrows, the new houses that are going up; it's amazing, yet he chooses to talk about small things. I would like to mention for clarification of the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake that since the NDP has been in office, in the North we have built no fewer than at least 100 houses every year; this is continuing. For the year 1977-78 we propose to build 136 houses. I can remember sitting in this House in the years when the Liberals were in office and they built the fantastic sum of one to five houses in any given year. It took something like 36 months to build a four-room school. We watched the minister of Public Works, the then Allan Guy go through his antics and all the kickbacks there were unbelievable.

Progress is here with us, and I am very pleased today to be able to point out to the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake that he must do a little more homework and take a little more time out to see what is happening in the North before he takes a lot of time in this House to tell us about the riffraff and the gibberish.

Mr. Speaker, to turn now to the more formal comments of my speech this evening I certainly want to congratulate the mover of the Throne Speech, the member for Pelly. He did a wonderful job. I heard him on radio as I was driving up and it was a pleasure for me to spend a few days working in his by-election and I know that he will be an asset to his constituency and to the NDP team in this Legislature.

Also, Mr. Speaker, regarding the opening ceremonies of this year's session I want to commend the government for bringing in the members of the 4-H Clubs across the province to host the afternoon tea. And I think that was an excellent idea and I am pleased too, that I had two members from the Cut Knife 4-H organization here and they were just pleased to be here. We all know that 4-H is the backbone of rural Saskatchewan and I was very pleased to see them here.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech gave emphasis to heavy crude development in the Lloydminster-North Battleford area. The 16 million Heavy Crude Recovery Program has been of tremendous benefit to my constituency and we can expect real growth and

benefits in the years ahead. Already in 1977, it's almost all gone now, 11 months gone by, an estimated \$11 million of that program has been used up by oil companies across the province.

In our area several millions have been spent in drilling activities and fire, flood and steam injection projects. Mobile Oil with offices at Maidstone and Lloydminster has just announced an \$8 million heavy crude retrieving plant in the Tangleflags Field just northwest of Maidstone. Sales of Crown leases to oil companies reached an all time high in the last round of sales just held two months ago.

This activity in the northwest corner of the province is the exact opposite of the gloom and the doom spread by both opposition parties about NDP oil policies in the last few years. These activities in the oil industry prove that our government is on the right track and willing to modify its approaches in order to reap the greatest benefits for the people of Saskatchewan.

And just to reinforce what I have said, I want to put on the record of the House a comparison of the oil drilling record for 1976 as compared with 1977 in my area. And I am referring to the area that does not include the Battlefords, nor the drilling that has taken place north of the North Saskatchewan River. In every month except February and March the number of oil wells has increased dramatically. For example, in June of this year 41 new wells were dug as compared to 15 the previous year. In October of '77, 50 new wells were drilled as compared to only 10 in October of 1976. In summary, the number of oil wells drilled in my area from January to November 18th was 106 in 1976 and 210 in 1977. And that was a 98 per cent increase in oil drilling activity in the constituency of Cut Knife-Lloydminster.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Husky Oil has announced a major \$527 million upgrading plant for the Lloydminster area. And our Minister of Mineral Resources has been actively promoting the building of such a plant and we feel that since 85 per cent of the heavy crude in the Lloydminster Field is extracted from the Saskatchewan side, the plant should be built on the Saskatchewan side. I have had a chance to meet with Husky Oil officials do discuss their proposed plant, and I want to compliment the management of that company for giving me, the elected member of that area, a chance to discuss and make some suggestions. One major suggestion that I made was that Husky Oil should consider building the plant on the Saskatchewan side on a branch line between Lloydminster and Hillmond which is slated for abandonment. However, if Husky Oil would build on that line, that 15 mile track would be preserved and upgraded, thus saving many farmers the long grain haul to other alternate delivery points. This was one way that Husky Oil could prove to be a good corporate citizen showing concern for all of rural Saskatchewan as well. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see Husky Oil officials take that idea down when they left for Calgary after that meeting.

At this time, we are fully confident that the plant will be built, and we hope it will be built in Saskatchewan. Either way, the royalties are charged at the wellhead and our provincial revenues will increase with the increase in production. It is estimated that oil production must be doubled from 50,000 barrels a day to 100,000 barrels a day by 1982 when the new upgrading plant will come on stream. Therefore, the number of oil wells will have to be doubled within the next five years. And I make no bones about it that the economy of the Lloydminster heavy crude area is very important to the economy of all Saskatchewan.

One of the major concerns of my constituents has been the steady erosion and decline

of railway services. We have just lost the dayliner between North Battleford and Edmonton. Now, there is no rail passenger service between these two centres. As well we have lost all the local railway stations between North Battleford and Lloydminster. The blow to the communities of Paynton, Maidstone, Lashburn, Waseca and Marshall has been totally demoralizing. I have championed hard for continued and indeed expanded and upgraded rail facilities and presented briefs at the hearings in Lloydminster and North Battleford. When it was announced that the dayliner from North Battleford to Edmonton via Lloydminster would be cancelled, I called in all seriousness for the immediate resignation of Otto Lang, the Minister of Transport who supports reductions in rail service to western communities, and also the resignation of the Honourable Cliff McIsaac, Liberal MP for Battlefords-Kindersley. Mr. Speaker, I called for the immediate resignation of these two Liberals and what did I get. I got Jack Horner — a Conservative turned Liberal — even worse than I bargained for and no improved rail service. Not only that the Honourable Member for Battleford-Kindersley has now decided not to run in Kindersley-Lloydminster but has chosen to run in Meadow Lake instead.

It is sad that the federal Liberals have dragged their feet on the Hall Commission recommendations and have consistently refused to listen to the needs of Western Canadians.

And the threat of losing the Crow's Nest Pass Rates concerns the farmers in my constituency as indeed it does all western farmers. The loss of the crowrates will add 30 to 40 cents a bushel increase to the cost of marketing our grain, thus reducing farm income further in a not so good year.

There is also the matter regarding the railway rates on rapeseed meal and rapeseed oils in our province. Our rapeseed crushing plant in Lloydminster is experiencing some difficulty in making reasonable margins of profit, or any profit at all in some months, because of inequity in freight rates. Rapeseed travels at the crowrates but the processed meal and oil go at a much higher rate. This federal policy is placing Saskatchewan's rapeseed crushing industry into jeopardy. Our minister, the Hon. Gordon MacMurchy in charge of provincial transportation, has constantly raised these issues with Ottawa but to date little has been achieved and this is bad news for Saskatchewan farmers.

One major step mentioned in the Throne Speech, in which I am pleased, is the consolidation of some 15 school acts dealing with education into one school act. Along with the consolidation we will see some changes and updating. I am particularly proud of the manner in which the revision was carried out. All educators in the province had ample time to peruse and discuss our White Paper for several months. The two major partners in education in Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association have had direct input into framing of the legislation as well as all interested individuals. And well over 200 individual briefs and letters were considered before revision took place. It is often said that if neither the STF or the SSTA is totally satisfied with an education bill, then that bill is a good one. And this may well be the case with the present consolidation of school law because it means the government has not leaned toward any one organization alone.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to a matter that concerns a very important minority group in our province — that group is our Indians and the question of Indian land settlements. Resident of all the various cultural groups of Saskatchewan must be concerned about, this matter if social tensions in our province are to be eased. It is a

fact that in Saskatchewan as in other western provinces, the federal government has not lived up to all the terms of treaties signed in the 1870's. Today our native people have many concerns but hunting rights, council authority and land claims are some of the most outstanding problems of our reserve Indians.

It is my contention that many of the social and economic problems encountered by Indians today could be greatly relieved if land claims were to be settled quickly. A brief summary of the background of Treaty 6, signed in August and September of 1876, will give members of this Assembly some insight into the nature of the problem. I have one Indian Chief in my constituency who, to this day, 98 years after the signing of Treaty 6, has not been granted a reserve. That is the Treaty which surrendered 121,000 square miles of land to the Canadian government and promised to return one square mile for each family of five Indians. Chief Rod Okemow of the Lucky Man Band refused medallions for himself and members of his band at the ceremonies held at Beardy Reserve near Duck Lake in August of 1976. The hon. member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake will remember that occasion. In his refusal of these medallions and so-called trinkets, in his refusal speech he stated, and I quote:

My band once numbered 872 people. Today, there are 48 of us. We are scattered throughout this province on different reserves, in cities and living under conditions which 'civilized' people would not tolerate. My band is without a home. We are squatters on the reserves where we live, without a voice in the councils of those reserves, without land, without pride of place, or possession.

Chief Lucky Man, his predecessor, asked for a reserve in 1882 when his band number 872 persons, but was refused. And I am told that history proves that he was considered to be a troublemaker and that the federal government thought it wise to separate him from his relatives, Chiefs Little Pine and Pound Maker. Again he asked for a reserve two years later in 1884, and again the government turned down his request.

These are the types of injustices that persist in our province today and I want to commend our government and the minister in charge, the hon. Ted Bowerman, for his serious and sensible approach to this problem. Our government is co-operating with the federal government and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, in an attempt to negotiate outstanding unfulfilled lands claims in Saskatchewan. While I am at it, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to praise and commend the Saskatchewan Federation of Indians for the reasonable stand that their organization has taken in approaching this serious problem, which could be highly flammable at any time.

This is a far cry from the attitude of the Conservative government of Alberta, for example, who have told their Indian bands to take the government to court if they have any land claims. And that's Alberta's answer to the problem of land claim — go to court. It is very disappointing to see the federal government pulling back somewhat on its earlier commitments to settle land claims, but I hope progress will be made in the months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to clarify the difference in philosophy of the two opposition parties in this Legislature as opposed to the New Democratic Party. I want to compare philosophies in two areas — health and natural resources.

In the area of health, the Conservative program is now becoming crystal clear. First of all, they would impose a 'user pay' policy of up to \$10 a day on hospital beds, and

indeed Conservative Ontario is considering this move at this time, and indeed Conservative Alberta charges \$5 per acute care admission and \$4 a day for hospital users after 120 days. So the precedence is there. Conservative Ontario has closed down some 3,000 hospital beds and some hospitals. Conservative Alberta (and I hear Manitoba too) has placed a freeze on hospital construction in their provinces. Conservative Ontario charges \$384 a year medicare premiums for families and Conservative Alberta \$169 a year per family. Alberta has no prescription drug plan, no dental plan for children, no hearing aid plan or SAIL plan. Rich Alberta. This is the kind of health care program the Conservatives are promoting and action speaks louder than words. The Conservative Premier of Manitoba has just announced major cutbacks in health budgets in that province. This, Mr. Speaker, is the new dynamic free enterprise system of health care advocated by the Conservatives.

New Democrats on the other hand, were the builders of hospital and medical care. We are steadily improving our health care programs as revenues are made available. We abolished the Liberal deterrent fees; then we abolished medicare premiums for everyone, including the hon. member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant). We brought in a hear aid plan for our pensioners. We now have a prescription drug plan for everyone. The dental plan for children is now in its fourth year and is working smoothly. Saskatchewan's Aid to Independent Living (SAIL) program provides wheelchairs, braces, crutches, etc., to all who need such aids — one of the finest plans in North America. Not to mention an extensive Senior Citizens' Home Care Program which enables pensioners to stay in their homes rather than being institutionalized, not to mention the new thrust in Home Care Nursing Program to be implemented soon. Saskatchewan under the NDP has kept its health priorities high, while other provinces are slashing their budgets. This is the progress with a New Democratic government.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have received a devastating blow, temporary, by the Supreme Court of Canada with the announcement that Bill 42, that bill which collected a large portion of windfall profits on oil for the people, is unconstitutional. That bill was upheld by the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench and by Saskatchewan's highest court, the Court of Appeal. However, the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled it unconstitutional by a seven to two vote.

The issue here is whether a province has the right to control its own resources and whether it has the right to tax companies for the benefit of the people of the province. This decision is a blow to all provinces and does not bode well for them in the future. By deciding against the government of Saskatchewan the Supreme Court has thrown its support behind the oil companies and has made it clear that oil companies are above provincial law. I can't help but feel that the final decision, made by those seven judges who voted against us, that decision was made more on philosophical grounds or beliefs more than on constitutionality.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is quite a spectacle to watch the Liberals and Conservatives in this Legislature aligning themselves with the big oil companies and against the people of this province. Oh! They can weasel with their words and say that the people shouldn't have to return the oil revenue money, but in the same breath say as the member for Nipawin says, "Bring in the Alberta royalty legislation". This suggestion by the Conservatives would mean losing anywhere from \$200 million to \$250 million in oil revenues and giving it to the oil companies in one fell swoop. This proves once again

that that party is in the pocket of the multinational oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, here is the greatest philosophical difference between us in the NDP and the old parties. We feel the greatest possible benefits from our oil, which is a non renewable resource, should accrue to the people of this province. We feel we should conserve our oil. The old line parties believe they should help the oil companies maximize their profits, and this is to be expected when one sees the huge financial contributions made to the Liberals and Tories by oil companies. Not one red cent is accepted or received from foreign oil companies to the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party or the federal NDP. And I am proud of this fact, Mr. Speaker. The oil companies are aware of these facts, yet they are increasing their oil drilling activities greatly in the heavy crude areas of our province and this proves without a doubt that they are willing to expand their activities under an NDP government in this province.

Mr. Speaker, this is the major philosophical difference between us in the government and the opposition parties. For all these reasons I will be supporting the Throne Speech with enthusiasm, but very definitely voting against the opposition amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, as the Liberal critic for the Department of Social Services, I am pleased to be able to speak in the Throne Speech Debate tonight. Rather than go into great detail about how the Throne Speech lacked insight and substance (I figure that was self-evident), or rather than go into detail about all the great things the previous speaker said that they had been doing for the constituencies — actions speak louder than words — or rather than go into the old rhetoric about what the Liberals did to hospitals when on the other side of the fence, you can't get into a hospital in Saskatchewan today, instead, Mr. Speaker, I will dwell on the areas and proposals that I would have presented in the Throne Speech had I been a minister of Social Services. In case the members opposite are not listening to the speeches from the Liberal Party, we have been doing this all along. As critics from each one of our areas, we have been presenting positive proposals for a Throne Speech that we would have made.

Let me first begin, Mr. Speaker, with the area of senior citizens and nursing home care. I have often voiced the concern, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has the highest rates for nursing home care juggling west of Quebec. No amount of figures will change that, and indeed I think we can compete with any province for that dubious honor.

Accordingly, last session, Mr. Speaker, I proposed that an inquiry be made to look into the economic problems in an effort to propose some recommendations. I was very pleased that the minister did appoint an inquiry to do so, but unfortunately, very few of the recommendations have been put into effect. Hopefully, there will be some upcoming in the near future.

Let us look at the Throne Speech proposals, Mr. Speaker. The government says that it will give special attention to the needs of senior citizens and will announce plans to provide additional funding for relief for them. This will be a welcome sign if they give them meaningful assistance rather than just a token gesture. We have suggested many time, Mr. Speaker, that the logical answer to nursing home care problems in costs, would be to put all levels of care under medicare and have them under the jurisdiction

of the Department of Health, so the Minister of Social Services would not have to bother with the problems that are there. So far, this has been rejected, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps it is too logical. However, being of a dedicated nature, I feel that perhaps by osmosis, it may take effect and I will mention it one more time.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the proposal of home care the government tried to focus on the protection of dignity and independence. But in the present nursing home care system, they foster instead a loss of dignity, by causing the senior citizens to spend all but their last cent on the exorbitant costs and then to feel that they are burdens on society because they have to receive assistance. This feeling should not exist, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately it is difficult to adjust human nature. Another course of action came to me, as well, Mr. Speaker, and I will in due course during this session be presenting a resolution in more detail. The resolution will suggest that whereas the rural hospitals in Saskatchewan are seldom filled to capacity, and whereas there is a need for nursing home facilities in rural Saskatchewan, the government consider where applicable, a percentage of the available facilities in rural hospitals be made available for nursing home care. This type of suggestion is being allowed in some special cases at the moment in rural Saskatchewan and it is a procedure that can greatly benefit those senior citizens who need nursing home care and the reassurance of knowing that they can remain in their own community.

Let me turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the province of senior citizens before they require nursing home care. The strengthening of the home repair grant program is commendable by the government as is the concern for the home care for senior citizens. I stated that the idea is commendable, Mr. Speaker. However, I, with many others, cannot support the home care options as proposed by the present government.

Mr. Rolfes has stated that he and the government are interested in getting feed-back from individuals, groups and organizations concerning the preferred method of organizing and administrating the delivery of home care services, the type and extent of services to be offered, the persons who are to receive the home care services, the boundaries and the service districts and a selection of board members. The document covers a large area. The most encouraging part is that the Department of Social Services and the Department of Health have got together to discuss this problem. Both these departments must be involved in the decision making, but as is too often the case as in nursing home care program, the jurisdiction in reality overlaps but on paper is supposedly unrelated. Much discussion has followed releasing this document and a model, I would say, would be a good idea for the government to re-examine this and look at it very carefully.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I will outline some of the concerns that have been expressed by groups and individuals to myself and to the minister and I am sure to other members of this House. I will quote from a number of these letters and briefs as they project an insight from experience that most of us have never had. The first one I will quote from is a letter from the Wilkie Union Hospital which the ministers have already received but I think puts very eloquently the problems, the basic problems that are in this home care proposal. It says:

A recent document entitled 'Protecting Dignity and Independence' presents itself as a misguided attempt by the Department of Health and Social Services to provide a much needed and comprehensive service to the elderly and the handicapped. A view of the document suggests that it has been based on the premise that if an individual needs one of the included services,

then he or she requires all of the services. It also suggests that all of the services are inter-related when such is definitely not the case. Home care nursing is a distinct entity, separate and apart from other needed services, such as home maintenance and friendly visiting. Home care nursing is health related and consequently we believe that it would be a serious mistake to remove it from the nursing care component under the Department of Health. The other services noted would, however, most assuredly contribute to the provision of dignity and independence and to the quality of the given individual's lifestyle. The expansion of these services would indeed be invaluable and should be proceeded with. In keeping with the aspect of home nursing services, we feel compelled to express our concern with the failure of the government to include nursing representation on the internal government committee which prepared the proposal. Surely, it would stand to reason that any program which deals with the delivery of nursing service, must have a nurse as an active committee member. We also understand that the government has steadfastly refused to appoint a nursing representative to the consultative committee. While we appreciate Dr. Hatswell's expertise in the area of geriatric medicine, specifically as it relates to the institution of setting, we seriously question the government's neglect in not appointing a nurse with specific knowledge in the home care field.

Option one proposes a development of a new branch in either the Department of Social Services, or the Department of Health, which would have sole responsibility for the administration and delivery of home care services in the province. Would this not, in fact, result in a creation of yet another hierarchy in the government and a directly proportional decline in community autonomy. Options two and three propose a creation of district home care boards and regional boards respectively. We are concerned re the apparent contradictions in the government philosophy with respect to health care delivery system. Approximately one year ago, regional hospital councils were abolished throughout the province on the premise that they did not serve a good enough role in our health care system and because they were not economically feasible. Now the government is proposing as options the formation of either regional or district home care boards, presumably with a similar administrative function to that as the now defunct hospital councils. Are we to assume that the proposed district and regional boards would not only be more functional but they would also be more economically feasible.

We also question the apparent duplication of services that would result if regional boards were, in fact, set up to deal with home care services. At this time, most, if not all, health regions are governed at least in principle by community boards. Would it not then be possible for these same boards to take on this new co-ordinating responsibility. As well, we take exception to a fee for nursing service under the program when an individual could enter an institution and receive the same care at no charge. Surely a fee for service would not encourage continued independence.

Mr. Speaker, this letter goes on and on to describe the problems of the home care proposal as well as a number of other ones from representatives, whether it be in Rosetown or Moose Jaw, or a number of other ones from the Saskatchewan Registered Nursing Association. I am sure, Mr. Minister, that you also received a number of other proposals from senior citizens' groups. But the main point that we have to make and

understand in this instance is that the proposal needs to be looked at again because there is much concern and I think it is important not to rush just to have a new program underneath your belts, but yet to have another look at the proposal.

I will, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in the near future present a resolution that we further delay implementation of the Home Care Options Program for a minimum of six months until local representatives and qualified nursing personnel can be consulted and duplications in department and community services are eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, another recent proposal that the government has made also concerns myself and many others. In September the Department of Social Services as was mentioned previously, ended its policy of providing assistance to recipients with free drug coverage. Instead, the government said that only drugs covered by the Prescription Drug Plan would be free and it increased its social assistance by five dollars a month to cover additional costs. This move, I suspect was a hasty move to try to budget cut. After many complaints, however, the department saw that the change caused undue hardship for many and reconsidered its position. I commend you for your reconsideration. It is presently making revisions and I will be anxious to hear new proposals. Hopefully with more time and more knowledge behind the matter, these changes will be a little more realistic. The Department of Health has also mentioned that it is considering rebates for people that have accrued high drug bills because of its previous changes. I hope the Minister of Health will stand up after I speak and tell the people concerned, and the Legislature, you're not going to tell us when they can expect to be reimbursed. That is a very distinct problem that we have, and I'm sure they are waiting to hear your suggestions. It has been suggested before, Mr. Speaker, by the Liberal Opposition, that the government look into a plan, should look into a plan more along the lines of the Manitoba plan. And I say that we should look at the program that Manitoba had, Mr. Speaker, because I presume as has been exemplified in this House, you can never really tell what the government will say, as a PC government, you don't know if they mean what they say or not.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, it likely would be a more workable program if all drugs were covered after the drug costs exceed a specific amount per individual family. Such an amendment would cut down on the abuses, and as well exclude such people as myself and many in these Chambers who do not need this so-called free drug program because we can rightfully pay for them at the moment. This type of a system could exclude senior citizens who are apt to be using the drugs most. I would also extend this further to say that all drugs for senior citizens as prescribed by their doctor should be covered by the Prescription Drug Plan. I make this distinction because many doctors prefer other drugs for patients than are on the formulary. This is particularly true with coronary and high blood pressure conditions which affect senior citizens.

In the case of senior citizens and their welfare, I don't think we should force them to use drugs other than the prescription, than those prescribed by their doctor simply because they are in the formulary and therefore bought at a cheaper rate through the government preferred dealer.

The case will be presented that the drugs in the formulary are the same ones that are in other provinces, so therefore the system should be all right. Two or three injustices in other provinces don't necessarily make it right, and this discrimination should be removed.

Senior citizens are being penalized by being forced to pay for drugs as prescribed by their doctors simply because the brand is not in the formulary. This procedure can be projected to a ridiculous level and I'm sure one of the ministers will try to do such, but I think that there should be a serious look at this matter as there are real problems in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a moment in general terms about SAP and FIP programs. The mover of the Throne Speech, the member for Pelly, stated that there have been many problems in the FIP and SAP, but they were getting straightened out. Well, I couldn't agree more than to say that there have been many problems. Last session we found that there were close to \$1 million in overpayments still uncollected in both of the plans. I hope the minister will now stand up when I get finished and tell us what the state of these programs are.

I stated last session, possibly two solutions, at least in part would help remedy the situation, that being that you simplify the forms and that you have a quarterly audit so that large overpayments wouldn't build up. I still stand by these suggestions as partial solutions, and again by osmosis, Mr. Minister, I hope that you will consider them.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move into another area of responsibility under the Department of Social Services — that of Corrections. There has been much said about the state of law and order in this province and country and it is an area of great concern in this Liberal caucus. Looking into the problems of institutions themselves, the government formed an inquiry headed by Judge Moore. This action was long overdue and I'm looking forward to hearing the report.

I have previously dealt at length in the last two sessions with the problems of the provincial system — namely too large a case load for the probation officers, and to date the situation has not improved in any measurable degree.

I was interested in a proposal from the American Bar Association on the legal status of prisoners. The recommendations were to put the prisoners to work and pay them what they would earn outside the prison for the same work, tax them, charge them room and board, and require them to make financial restitution to the victims and support their families. The committee's chairman, Herbert S. Miller said, "You don't prepare people for return into the world of work by having them do nothing in prison". He said, "If prisoners can't earn a living after their release they're going to have problems and they'll repeat their crimes. Getting prisoners used to working, paying taxes and meeting legal obligations would be cheaper for the taxpayer in the long run".

Mr. Speaker, as most of us meet our legal obligations and financial agreements or go to court to prove otherwise, I think this idea may have some benefits. This idea is also supported by David Rothenberg, executive director of the Fortune Society in New York, an organization that works with ex-convicts.

Now, the minister has mentioned that this isn't a penitentiary system. I don't think that any minister should try to exclude ideas that possibly work in another jurisdiction in another country, or a larger system because you can use as many good ideas as you can get. The committee also suggested that industry work closer with the prison system to provide jobs. In Sweden, prisoners work in factories. In Japan, one of the biggest shipyards in the world has an apprenticeship program for prisoners.

I have dwelled on this Mr. Speaker, because I feel we can always use new ideas. As I have said, I realize the differences in the United States and other countries as compared to ours. As well, I realize the extent to which we are having upgrading and training done in the institutions. Such programs should be extended. Such a proposal however, fosters responsibility to family, society, and restitution to the victims, so that the prisoners must realize what the society outside is like.

Besides the above problems mentioned, I feel there is another gap that must be filled in corrections, Mr. Speaker. At present there is a void in the area of juvenile correction services. Juvenile offenders between the ages of 16 and 18 presently have little alternative for referral other than the jail situation. There was previously another setting that could have helped in this area, that being Wilderness Challenge. In my opinion, that program was a good one and provided part of the solution. As we all know however, Mr. Speaker, the above program is being questioned by an inquiry headed by Judge Maher. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that I called for an inquiry into the camps to get the issue out of the political arena, and in an effort to salvage whatever was left of a good program, after the party on my left used it as a political football. This was another case, Mr. Speaker, where accusations were made often without consideration or concern for the effect that it would have on the future of the program or its participants. Such cavalier and irresponsible action has been witnessed before in this House by the party on our left. When it affects human lives, I find it totally unacceptable and repulsive. It is just to get to the bottom of rumors that there are other methods that can be used besides hanging the individual before he goes to court. Recommendations from the inquiry will be soon presented to the House, Mr. Speaker. But in my opinion, the hatchet job done to the program, unfortunately will likely be irreparable. This time I hope I'm wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of what to do with juveniles between 16 and 18 still exists. The Ontario legislature has looked into this and I will be proposing that we also look into a re-organizing of the departments to fill this present void.

Mr. Speaker, I will briefly outline Ontario's proposal for reference and for consideration. I ask that a new division as far as new positions does not necessarily need to be created but a re-organization of priorities and responsibilities. This new division in Ontario was created to consolidate all special services for children and youths in the province. The purpose of such a division according to the minister of Correctional Services, Arthur Meighen, is to bring about an effective integration of the range of children's services offered by the ministries of social services, health and correction services in Ontario. The programs that will be part of this new division are from the ministry of Correctional Services, the juvenile division, including training schools, group homes, foster homes and special rate homes, services in the probation and after-care services. From the ministry of health — the children's mental health services branch, facilities and programs operated under the Children's Mental Health Centres Act, regional children's centres, children's special units in private hospitals, and the family court clinics. From the ministry of the Attorney General — the observation detention centres, and contract homes. From the ministry of Community and Social Services — the child welfare branch of the ministry, and facilities and programs operated under the Child Welfare Act, the Children's Institution Act, the Children's Boarding Homes Act, the Charitable Institutions Act, the Child Abuse program of the ministry, the Mental Retardation Services for Children, the day nurseries branch and ministry of facilities and programs operated under the Day Nurseries Act.

Now, again, this is in a different province, but this proposal may be of some merit and I

think it is worth considering, especially when there is a void in the juvenile programs.

Mr. Speaker, there are two more areas that I want to cover briefly before I close, the first being that of the problems facing citizens due to inflation. As critic of Consumer Affairs for our Caucus, I cannot pass by without asking the government opposite, what real assistance you have given to the citizens of Saskatchewan. At a time when the cost of living is becoming more unbearable, what have you done to assist, in particular, those on fixed incomes?

It has been mentioned previously that SPC, Sask Tel and SGIO made substantial profits last year, but were there reductions in the rate above? By the way, before the members on my left get thinking that this is a great revelation of their idea, they may recall that it was our party that first suggested that because of the profit in these monopolies to the taxpayer that the taxpayer should receive relief from increased costs. Although the above is a problem to all, we are particularly concerned about the ability of senior citizens to cope financially in this time of inflation.

In addition, because we believe in the de-institutionalization of senior citizens, and appreciate the contribution that senior citizens have made to the province of Saskatchewan, we propose that a Liberal government would, and the present government should, work with the municipal governments to give our senior citizens tax breaks in their property taxes, hold firm their utility and their housing costs, to the extent that such taxes and costs not rise higher than they were in the year people turned 65 or retired at a later time. We feel that this would be a positive step in assisting those who need it most.

In light of the Safety '77 program that was previously mentioned this evening, Mr. Speaker, I think that it puts in a way the consumers in a bind. Although the legislation does not require that children under five use seat belts in the front seat, there is a drive to provide safety equipment for them, and it is evident that this proposal is important to the government. I agree that it is import to ensure the utmost safety of children and it should be one of the government's major advertising reasons now that they have made the legislation compulsory. The Highway department has provided information for parents on purchase of car seats but because of the high cost which they acknowledge in the pamphlet that they gave out it is too high for families of many children.

Safety '77 provided grants for traffic safety projects and an interesting one by a Kinette Club in Saskatoon, won a service award for their project. They purchased infant car seats and now rent them to parents for a nominal fee. This type of an idea could be expanded within the government to increase the opportunities for parents to provide a safer atmosphere for their children while riding in the family vehicle.

The last area I will cover briefly is concerning a resolution that I have on the order paper regarding the age of retirement. We plan to present a bill allowing the 65 or older the option to continue active employment. Although the majority of people prefer to retire at the customary age of 65 or earlier, there is a small but important minority that either does not wish or cannot afford to retire at 65. Compulsory retirement discriminates against this group. Such legislation will in no way hinder the people that would like to retire earlier but will allow the individual to work if he or she so desire and not feel like being put out to pasture, as it so often happens.

Going on a step further, but still along the same lines, we feel that there is a wealth of talent and experience in many retired people and that many retired men and women

wish to continue to contribute their abilities to productive efforts but don't have adequate opportunity. We therefore, propose that a retired persons talent bank be established which would assist in co-ordinating the demand and opportunity for work from retired people with the availability of retired people to do work suitable to their particular experience.

Mr. Speaker, these are positive proposals to a definite need, and we will dwell on these in greater detail during Private Member's Day. Mr. Speaker, the foregoing have been proposals that I would have had in a Throne Speech, if I were a minister, proposals of a responsible opposition and a party that is capable of being a responsible government. Because I feel the Throne Speech lacks such realistic and much needed proposals, I cannot support the motion but I will be supporting the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Let me first congratulate the new member for Pelly on the honor his constituents were given to move the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention something about my own constituency and the fulfilment of a dream of the people in the northern part of my seat, the near completion and construction of a northern water pipeline. It is interesting to note, that during the days of the former member, an NDP member, things were very slow getting off the ground and almost died. But fortunately because of the concerns of the people of the town of Martensville, and the town council, they would not let it die. Today with the involvement of the MLA and new proposals to the government municipal planning the pipeline is working in Martensville and shortly going to be extended to include Warman, Osler and Dalmeny. As the comment goes within the department, the Water Supply Board, if you want to know what is happening, don't ask the minister, the member for the area is usually two steps ahead of him. The towns which I referred to shortly will be receiving a high quality of water which is treated by the good CUPE union in Saskatoon, Local 49.

Mr. Speaker, I was very short about this particular item but I think I should talk about something that concerns all of us in the province and the people in my constituency are very concerned about. It's called uranium. The comments and views that I express are simply a reflection of some of the concerns of my constituents to obtain as much information as possible regarding their concerns. I realize the Bayda Inquiry has a difficult task; it was made more difficult by the time limits placed before it by this government. During the hearings it became apparent that uranium development and nuclear energy causes a great deal of disagreement among the experts. This disagreement causes further confusion for the public and leaves laymen, such as myself, with unresolved concerns. If most experts were at least to agree, citizens would have a better understanding and feel a little more safe re the development of uranium. I submit that the questions of this development are totally arguable between the experts, with one expert saying one thing and another expert saying the other thing. Although this inquiry was established to review the Cluff Lake project, I believe its establishment was triggered by the concerns expressed over the proposal to build a refinery in the Warman area near a major centre near Saskatoon. The concerns over the Warman proposal certainly raise the entire question of uranium and nuclear energy development. It was felt this concern which led to the review of the Cluff Lake which we understand was given the go-ahead by this government and had spent approximately \$35 million when the inquiry was called. One thing, we cannot only look at uranium development on the economic terms; we must also view it in the lights the risk to the people and the environment. We must view it in the rights of the communities and the

rights of the individuals, sometimes too often forgotten by that government.

I have heard people in Uranium City argue that if those that who live in the South are concerned about safety then all the elevators should be shut down because of grain dust but the comparison is not valid. People working in elevators or where grain dust exists do so of their own choice; entire communities are not exposed to this health hazard. People working directly in the uranium industry do so of their own choice. They have decided what the risks are. But placing a uranium refinery in a basic agricultural area does not allow the citizens that have lived there to make a choice. Possibly the real danger here is that attempts will be made to convince citizens of so-called economic advantages and convince them there is no risk. This should not be done. All possible information should be available and provided so citizens can decide for themselves rather than attempting brainwash them as this government so often does.

While government has the responsibility to govern in the interests of all citizens, it also has the responsibility to protect the rights of the individuals (interjection) — to the member for Redberry, I believe it was the NDP government that invited that refinery to be built in this province — these rights include the risks to our health and our environment. In the development of nuclear energy apparently the actual mining of uranium is the most dangerous, followed by the reactor, followed by the refinery.

If such development is foreseen no choice is possible regarding the location of the mine. There is a further amount of choice as to the location of a reactor, although a large amount of water is required. However, the refinery can almost be located anywhere. That being the case, then a refinery should not be placed in an area where citizens are concerned about the possible risks regardless if the experts say the risks are not there.

It was stated early in the Bayda Inquiry that only two people were living in the immediate area of the Cluff Lake mine, a trapper and a cottage owner. They have been able to make a choice, with the company, of what they will do if the mine proceeds. But the Warman Refinery proposal does not and cannot provide a choice to those citizens farming and living in the area.

I am advised that SEDCO was negotiating for the land. Some farmers were told that the project would not be cancelled, only on the basis that the people in the area did not want it. That, you tell me, is a government that listens to the people!

Serious consideration must be given to allowing all citizens in the area a vote, or a voice on whether they want this refinery or not. Considerable emotion surrounds the overall issue of uranium development as it does on the Pacific Refinery proposal. At this stage not all facts are known. It is unfortunate the people of the area and indeed all the people of Saskatchewan were not properly and fully informed from the beginning. There is no justification for SEDCO and Eldorado to be secretive about their plans. The public's right to know is much greater than the concern that possibly the price of the land will go up.

In making recommendations, the Bayda Commission must try to consider whether the benefits of uranium development are worth the risks. But possibly of even greater importance is that the public must know all the risks before anything is done. There is no need for the government, or companies, to gloss over the potential hazards. I have

complete faith in the public's ability and its general wisdom to consider all risks and benefits and to make a decision in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan, both now and in future generations. Not as one person, as the Bayda Commission said, people are too fickle and do not have an understanding. I do not agree with that member of the Bayda Commission who made that statement. If the Bayda Inquiry has not had sufficient time to consider and study all aspects of uranium development then I urge the Premier to recommend further study. Uranium development will bring economic benefit to Saskatchewan, but will these benefits be realized by all people of Saskatchewan? Will the development improve the quality of life in northern Saskatchewan and the other areas directly affected? These are the questions which I hope the inquiry will comment on in its report.

I have heard a great deal about safety during the inquiry, and there has been a lot of disagreement among the experts on this. While the Bayda Report may comment on the areas of safety or unsafety, they must also comment on whether sufficient information is available so citizens can decide themselves whether they wish to accept the risks involved.

If I choose, or you choose, to work in any aspect of the uranium industry, that is your right or my right. If my decision to do so is based on incomplete information then my rights and your rights have been curtailed. When one person's right is curtailed then the rights of all citizens are threatened. Unfortunately, we see the rights of individuals, of families and neighbors, so easily brushed aside in the name of progress. We are supposed to be living in a society which respects family unity and a person's home. Yet, we see government's expropriations of homes for highways, parking lots, industry, etc. such expropriation is supposed to be in the interest of all of us, but if the quality of life of those expropriated suffers then I submit no progress has been made. We will all suffer. The establishment of a uranium mine or a refinery should not result in the quality of life of any citizen to suffer, otherwise, what do we gain? An economic benefit alone will not necessarily improve the quality of our life.

We must also consider the use of uranium. Is it to be used in nuclear energy? Is it to be used in nuclear weapons? Is it to be used for medical purposes, such as the treatment of cancer? These are the questions the citizens of Saskatchewan have a right to decide, but we can only decide the question if we have all information available. I shudder when I feel we are getting cut off from much of this information because of a time limit put on the inquiry by this government.

If further discussion is needed, then I hope the Bayda Inquiry will recommend it. Possibly the report from that hearing can be the basis of broader public inquiry. I feel the experts have had their say. I'm not convinced that the ordinary people of Saskatchewan have had their say. And I ask that the Bayda Commission makes recommendations to ensure that they, the people of Saskatchewan, have their opportunity before anything is done. I am hoping that 10 years down the road, or 20 years down the road we do not all have to wish we could turn time back because of the mistakes we made in a hurried decision.

Let's make sure that all citizens have the right to understand the total picture before we make a decision on the uranium inquiry.

Those are the concerns that I am hearing throughout my constituency, from all the people who have been at the Bayda Commission and any other hearings — the only ones that seem to speak are those from the government who are talking about money,

and the benefits the money will bring. They don't seem to be worried about the people and the environment of the area.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to speak on labor for a short while but I promised the member across who speaks behind me that I would leave him sufficient time, so at this point I would like to comment that I will not be supporting the motion.

HON. N. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by congratulating the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Lusney) and the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McNeill).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am sure their constituents are proud of them. I think we have come to expect this kind of high standard from the member for Meadow Lake. He wrestled his seat away from the Liberal Party, a seat that they had held for many years, quite an achievement in 1975. Indeed, only he and the hon. member for Regina North have managed this. When I heard him second the reply to the Speech from the Throne, I had, once again, reason to applaud the good sense of the electors from Meadow Lake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It was the maiden speech of the member for Pelly. Like many members in this Assembly I spent a good deal of time in Pelly last spring; indeed, I worked and had the pleasure of working in the poll that the Liberal candidate lived in, his home poll. I may say that I was somewhat surprised that we won the poll. I was certainly surprised by our margin of victory in the constituency. I think I can say as well that the Liberal Party didn't fare as badly as they did because of their candidate. He is well-liked in his area, well-liked by his neighbors. In many ways, he's a good candidate.

I was surprised by our margin of victory in the constituency. While I expected to win it, I was surprised that we did that well. Perhaps I was surprised because I didn't know the member for Pelly very well. As I travelled through the constituency I noted that our Premier, Allan Blakeney, was respected by all, rock Grit, Tories, Conservatives and of course, New Democrats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I also noted that our policies and programs were receiving general support, but it was a by-election. Historically the by-elections go against the party in power and when we did as well as we did, part of the credit has to be a personal victory for the member for Pelly. I am sure he is proud of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Like many members of this House I felt I had a special relationship with the late member for Pelly (Leonard Larson). I am pleased to see that his shoes are being so ably filled, in many ways a person much like Leonard. (Interjection) You only say it once though, when you make your first speech.

I want to go on by congratulating Miss Saskatchewan Roughrider. I had the honor of representing Saskatchewan at the 1977 Grey Cup and Miss Roughrider won the Miss Congeniality contest. A great honor for Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — In a more serious vein I want to echo something that was said by the Ottawa member for Lloydminster, I, too, am pleased at the progress that is being made in the settlement of Indian land claims. I have a lot of native people in my riding and there was a time when, not because of anything this government had or hadn't done but simply because of what our society has done to them, I wasn't very proud to meet some of those people. Now, I can meet them with pride, we are making a real effort to meet their land claims. It won't be done easily, it will take a great deal of time but I think we are, at long last, making a start on meeting our obligations to the first Canadians.

I am sorry the hon. member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) isn't here. I suspect that he is at the Agribition. I gather they are not showing cattle this year. I was going to remind him of something he had said to the member for Lumsden. I recall him being somewhat critical of the member for Lumsden when he changed. I recall him saying that he was disappointed in the member and then he went on to say: "and as I watched what I felt was a totally different individual addressing this Assembly and tonight I can only think, what price the soul of the member for Lumsden."

The question I think many people are asking tonight and I think many people in his riding, "What price the soul." I hope that the member for Thunder Creek has opportunity to speak in the House and I hope he has an opportunity to tell us why the changes.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Simpson will get him.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Don Simpson will get him, he might well.

Turning for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the rapidly dwindling Liberal ranks. I was surprised to hear that the hon. members for Wascana and Regina South were deserting the provincial Liberal Party. I knew already that the temptation was strong to leave a sinking ship. In fairness I think both of them are attracted to the federal sphere. When I recall that the federal Liberal government has so mismanaged the economy that we are currently subjected simultaneously with record deficits, record unemployment and an inflation rate that is alarming. When I recall that the federal government is headed by a Prime Minister who was elected on a promise to unify the country and now having brought the country to the brink of disaster offers himself as the only person who can save the country. When I recall that the federal government is protecting a \$10 billion deficit, I concluded that these two hon. gentlemen couldn't possibly let their names stand for a government with such a bad record. It is going to take all of your talents and more I'll tell you.

I thought the hon. member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) would be particularly revolted having been exposed to a government with a string of balanced budgets; a government which provided such wise and far-sighted leadership. The economy of Saskatchewan has gone from being a 'have not' province to one of the stronger economies. A government which in its leadership has not divided the people but rather has played a part in an environment in which the cultures of all people are flourishing. I thought having being exposed to such a remarkable string of successes that these two hon. gentlemen simply couldn't allow themselves to be associated with such

unmitigated disaster. That they did decide to run federally is undoubtedly in part at least a cold blooded calculation that they had a better chance of surviving in the federal sphere than in the provincial sphere. And that I suppose is in part due to the somewhat unique accomplishment of Joe Clark. This rather talented individual has managed to convince the Canadian public that he would do an even worse job of running the country than Pierre Trudeau and that's quite an achievement.

MR. MacDONALD: — You're awfully mean tonight.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I guess I am a little mean. Part of Joe Clark's problem is that he never takes a stand on any issue. Many Canadians have concluded that having no ideas of his own he is not likely to provide leadership or direction. The provincial Tories I think might learn something from this. It is simply not credible to avoid every issue and then when the public and the press are so uncharitable as to suggest you ought to take a stand and call for a plebiscite.

I heard the hon. member for Rosthern tonight call for yet another plebiscite, this time on the refinery, a very narrow issue, the refinery in Warman. The Tories know full well that the plebiscites don't solve anything. Indeed, they make the problem worse. On the seat belt issue the Conservative caucus knew as well as we did what the public mood was — it was sharply divided. A plebiscite wouldn't solve that, it would merely sharpen the divisions and make the problem more difficult.

I never cease to be amazed by the cynicism and the contempt of a Legislature than we see coming from the Conservative caucus. They have obviously come to the conclusion that in the point of view of the opposition very little of what happens in here is relevant and perhaps events may prove them right or wrong.

The member for Nipawin displays this contempt by his infrequent attendances and his rare participation in the debates. He spends a good deal of his time preparing for press conferences and none for his work in the House. I find it amusing, Mr. Speaker, to see how he wraps himself in the mantle of John Diefenbaker. Whatever the nature of the Rt. Hon. gentleman for Prince Albert he had a love for the House and a loyalty for this institution. I sometimes wonder what he must think of his successor. Unless the hon. member for Nipawin finds the courage of his convictions, begins to show some leadership I predict Joe Clark's rapid decline in popularity.

I want to briefly, Mr. Speaker, to applaud the action of the Saskatchewan Minister of Finance in removing wage and price controls. Although there is some opposition to removing them and some opposition continues, it seems clear that correct action was taken. It is regrettable that the federal government doesn't have the courage of their convictions to follow suit and end them much sooner than next April. Whether or not the controls were fair, whether or not they will be effective I suppose will be the subject of debate among our academics. Fair they were not, prices are manifestly harder to control than wages. Even the most unscrupulous government would be hard put to apply wage and price controls evenly. Given the traditional close relationship between the Liberal Party and the business community, it is little wonder that the controls operated so unfair and that organized labor was so unhappy with them.

As the cost of living rose so rapidly in Saskatchewan the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley knows full well that on those prices the Saskatchewan government had very little effect. That, Mr. Speaker, is the result of an inadequate and ineffective and basically unjust federal program, a federal program which I am sure you people are as

ashamed of as we are.

The question of the effectiveness of wage and price controls is more difficult. With the benefit of hindsight it seems that they didn't directly control prices but with sheer good luck, including the decline in food prices, over which the controls had no effect they seem to have had an aura of success. In spite of this they may have succeeded by accident. While they had no direct effect on inflation the controls were instrumental, I believe, in making the inflationary breaking. It seems clear that controls had a positive effect on public expectations. By the spring of this year the public was no longer numbed to continually rising prices as they were in 1975.

The hon. member asks when we are going to raise rent controls. We will be raising rent controls as and when the situation permits. We will do it in a fashion which won't cause a violent adjustment which occurred when rent controls were raised suddenly in Alberta. We will do it in a fashion which allows the market to adjust for the lifting of rent controls.

I want to commend the draftsman of the Throne Speech for the section on energy and the promise to create an office of energy conservation. There is no doubt from where I stand that energy conservation in the long run is going to be our most serious problem. No other problem will cause such a violent adjustment in our society. (Interjection) It is pretty hard to do they seem to be pretty dead, except they seem to be able to speak from the chairs, not from their feet, from the chairs.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the area of energy conservation. We are doing more than just paying lip service. We are providing some leadership. We're doing what we can in the government to control energy. We have in design and construction of new buildings adopted some of the highest energy conservation standards in effect anywhere. We will be ordering new vehicles, ordering compact vehicles and they say that's a decision that didn't meet with unanimous approval from the public servants but we believe the government has a responsibility to set an example.

Mr. Speaker, each of the sessions seem to be dominated by an issue. I predict that this session will be dominated by the resource issue. I have a good deal I want to say on the resource issue but with more time than I have today. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:46 p.m.