

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Tuesday, February 27, 1979.

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

MOTION
Select Standing Committee on Radio Broadcasting

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Thatcher (Thunder Creek):

That the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Radio Broadcasting of Selected Proceedings be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — I would like to take this opportunity today to introduce to the Assembly a very important group of students from Estey School in the constituency of Saskatoon Westmount. It is my understanding they are situated in the west gallery. They are Grade 8 students and they are accompanied by Mr. Taylor and Miss Parker.

I am sure that all members of the Assembly will join me in welcoming these students from Saskatoon Westmount constituency and Estey public school. I hope they have an enjoyable day here and a pleasant trip back to Saskatoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of this legislature a group of 54 students from the Melville constituency — from the Melville St. Henry's separate school. They are here under the care of their teachers, Garth Gleisinger, Tom Durham and Delia Wihlidal and, of course, the good bus drivers with two separate buses, John Omar and Al Miback.

The members of this legislature I am sure want to wish all the students well and that your trip to this legislature has been interesting and worthwhile. We wish that the rest of your tour and stay in the city here today is successful, worthwhile and beneficial as well. May you have a good and safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome 49 Grade 12 students from Bedford Road Collegiate, who are seated in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon. As I said before, I will make it very brief. I welcome them and I mention that they visited the RCMP Depot and found it very interesting. It is my hope that they find the proceedings in this House, this afternoon, interesting also. I say on behalf of all members a pleasant journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome 35 Grade 8 students, who are visiting us from Cardinal Leger School in Saskatoon. We are delighted to have them here. On behalf of all members we hope they enjoy their time here today and wish them a safe journey and a happy time here in Regina. We hope they enjoy the proceedings of the House and find them worthwhile.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

PCB Spill

MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman). In connection with the PCB spill at Federal Pioneer would you tell this House in your own honest opinion if in fact the incident was a serious enough matter that the minister in charge of environment at that time should have been notified?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the minister could well have been advised and should have been advised. I think that the Deputy Minister of the Environment has already made a statement publicly that if there was an error in this regard it was an error in his judgment with respect to advising not only his minister, but with respect to advising the city of Regina. I think that question was raised. While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I took notice yesterday of a question by the hon. member for Arm River, regarding . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you said yesterday, that this wasn't of importance. Why some two years later, when this spill has been made public that the Minister of Labour found it an important enough issue to have an order to Federal Pioneer to begin an occupation health service to protect his workers exposed to PCBs?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I think the member, Mr. Speaker, is attempting to suggest that there was nothing done by the Department of the Environment, by inferring that because the deputy minister did not report to the minister or did not report to the city of Regina that the Department of the Environment did not take action with respect to when they became aware of the spill of PCBs at the Federal Pioneer Plant. I can cite to you from the information on file that when they were advised by the Department of Labour that there had been a spill at the Pioneer Plant they contacted the Pioneer Plant and not only did they contact them but they continued to take action with respect to matters related to the PCB spill at the Pioneer Electric Plant here in Regina. They continued the activities of surveillance up until the time that the matter was made public by the press. I think there is no way that the member should infer that because certain people were not notified or the city of Regina was not notified that the Department of Environment, as a result thereof, was not attending to its duty in regard to the necessary surveillance in regard to the spill.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — In pursuing what you say, this not being an important matter yesterday, would you also tell me Mr. Minister why the matter is also important now that

on November 5, 1978 the province has asked the National Research Council in Ottawa to provide a team of experts to review the problem?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I can advise the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government was involved at a much, much earlier date than the date which he records as being of significance. The federal government and the Department of the Environment in Saskatchewan both reviewed the situation very early in relationship to the spill date and both concluded that the actions which were taken by the Department of the Environment were the proper and the appropriate actions for managing and for the surveillance necessary to see that the spill was not a public hazard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Question directed to the Attorney General. I have here a copy of a chronology of events related to the PCB spill at Federal Pioneer prepared by the Water Quality Division, Water Pollution Control Board in which it states:

On June 9, 1977 we wrote the Attorney General's department for advice on issuing a minister's order under The Water Resources Management Act if and when this became necessary.

My question is, did the Attorney General pass this information on to his cabinet colleagues and particularly to the Minister of the Environment?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I did not receive that memorandum. I had no knowledge of that memorandum. I think the member himself, in the question, indicates the memorandum was as between officials in the departments.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does this mean you have employees in your department, as in the environment department, like Mitchell, who would not inform his ministers?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is a little bit confused as to the role of the Department of the Attorney General. The Department of the Attorney General provides legal advice to other departments of government. That involves departments and officials, perhaps even ministers on occasion at various levels, depending upon the circumstances. It is totally conceivable that a department would be writing to the Department of the Attorney General requesting an opinion of the Department of the Attorney General say in the Department of Environment which opinion would be tendered in the normal course without the minister being advised. It is being done I can tell the member daily, hourly, and I concur in that practice.

MR. R.L. COLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General decides in his own wisdom that such a serious matter as PCB spills alerting his department in November of 1977, fully a year in advance of the press digging up the necessary dirt to make sure that this serious matter was brought to the attention of the people, and the Attorney General is suggesting that he is not alerted by members of his department that serious occurrences are occurring, whether or not there are legal problems. Is the minister trying to tell this House that we should accept that?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member for Nipawin will or will not accept. That is up to him but I want to tell the hon. member that the Department of the Attorney General on a daily, hourly basis is asked to provide legal

opinions on a variety of matters.

I have, I bet, today in Saskatchewan at least dozens of cases which are very serious criminal cases. You suggest that I should be informed of every one of them and get some sort of a political or policy judgement on them. Well that may be your conception of the way the Department of the Attorney General runs in that kind of interference, judicial interference, but it is not my concept of the way it runs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Firearm Safety Program

MR. J. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. In Saskatoon on February, 1977, he promised the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation Convention that his government would implement a mandatory firearm safety program for all hunters 18 years of age and younger. Now, two years later, the promised program has not been implemented. Why the delay in implementing this program?

HON. A. MATSALLA (Department of Tourism): — Mr. Speaker, to answer the member's question, the decision to change the decision was made because of the fact that the federal government was coming forward with gun control legislation and it was thought that it would have some bearing on the mandatory firearm legislation that we had been proposing. Therefore, to find out what the bearing might be, if any, we decided to continue with a voluntary firearm program but we stepped it up. During the last couple of years there has been, I believe, a substantial number of people taking the firearm safety program and it has been very successful.

Now until the time that we have the full results of the federal gun control legislation and the effect that it may have no consideration will be given to mandatory legislation.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, a new question then. Would the minister please tell me why now, two years later since they have been waiting for this federal report, at the last Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation convention held last Saturday in Saskatoon that convention unanimously supported this program being brought forward. Why are we still having the delays? How much longer are we going to have to wait?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, the federal gun control legislation came into effect on January 1, 1979 and we still did not have an opportunity to see what the results from that legislation may be.

MR. GARNER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are 31,000 members in the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation Organization . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh, that's good, that's good. I learned one thing here today then, that my opposite members know what the membership is of that. That's the first.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation Organization has the people in place to implement and handle this program. Why cannot the minister give me a definite answer on when this program can be brought forward?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, I've quite clearly explained the reason to the hon. member and I don't think there's any need for repeating it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Up to Date Situation on Golden Acres Motel

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, question to the minister in charge of SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). Mr. Minister, as I was driving down here this afternoon, I happened to drive by the Golden Acres Motel and I happened to notice that the snowdrifts are piled high and I happened to notice that the place is still boarded up. Mr. Minister, my question to you is this; about a year ago, you went on record as saying that the position of the Golden Acre would be made fully clear to the public; that the personal guarantees would be called if the asset was not disposed of. Mr. Minister, with you on record — of course, you reneged a couple of times and on record, but — being on record last year as saying you would clear it up forthwith for the public, a year later, will the minister tell this Assembly today, precisely what is the up to date situation on Golden Acres?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely correct; I made that statement a year ago and I stand by that statement. I'm glad that Golden Acres is still standing and it's still there. Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the hon. member though, that there has been a great deal of activity on the Golden Acres and I hope that if he takes another route the next time he comes to the session he might find that the doors will be wide open for business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, with all this activity, I'm afraid the only tracks in and out of there are mine at the present time. Mr. Minister, out of a mortgage of \$435,000 and it is now four or five years later, by simple computation of interest means that obviously the government is on the hook and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are on the hook for some \$800,000, or very close to it. I challenge you to dispute that figure. Mr. Minister, that amounts very simply to \$80,000 a year, \$6,600 a month or \$220 per day of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money that is being lost. Now, Mr. Minister, are you prepared to assure this Assembly right now that this \$80,000 can be recovered from that asset? Are you willing to go on record, right today, that that kind of money can be recovered from that asset?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the hon. member gets his figures from, but the figures that I have are completely different and I can assure the hon. member that in time we will recover the moneys that SEDCO has outlaid on the Golden Acres.

MR. THATCHER: — I have a supplementary question. On my final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the minister's answer, if my figures are wrong and he has a completely different set of figures, will the minister accept my challenge that if he can prove my figures wrong and if he cannot, will he then call a public inquiry into Golden Acres and SEDCO?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think a public inquiry is necessary. I think the facts will all come forth in due course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Flooding in the Souris Valley

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — I have a question to the minister in charge of the environment and possibly the minister in charge of SPC. Can these ministers let the people of southeastern Saskatchewan know what they have done regarding the possible flooding coming again this year? This could be the eighth time in ten years. Could you tell us what plans your departments have made with regard to the possible flooding this spring in the Souris Valley?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) has brought this up on previous occasions and I convey to him, as we have conveyed to him in the past, the amounts of water that are released from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation operations are controlled by the Department of Environment and they use whatever information is available to them to best inform themselves as to what policy the Crown corporation, Sask Power Corporation, should follow in relation to its needed operations. Unfortunately, we cannot dictate the amount of snowfall that this province may receive during the winter months, nor the period of time that it may melt. It is unfair for the member to assume that all of the problems that those unfortunate people are confronted with emanate directly from the actions of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. That is not the case. We have, in the past, tried to ease the problem as much as possible. It is not within the realms of government to be able to assure that there will not be consequences from flooding in the future in that area, as is the case with some other areas in the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of the Environment then. Can the minister tell us if the hydrologists have given you accurate reports as to the amount of snowfall, the amount of flooding that could take place with regard to various types of spring break-ups? Do you have this information, is it going to be passed on to that area?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I have seen information coming forward from the department officials with respect to what they consider the spring run-off to be and they consider it to be normal. So far as a detailed analysis of any particular water course or water drainage system, I have not seen any information with direct respect to that or specifically with respect to the Souris Valley.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister advise the people in a straightforward manner on up-to-date information at all times during the spring break-up? I think one of the main problems has been that of communication between the department and what actually is happening. Most of the people down there don't think you know what you are doing. Would you advise the people in a straightforward manner what is happening from here on in?

AN HON. MEMBER: — They knew.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They sure did.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the presence of the hon. member here obviously suggests that they did not know what they were doing on October 18. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no way that the water control branch, or the hydrology branch, or whatever, in the Department of the Environment will be able to ever give answers in detail of the kind which the hon. member seeks with respect to flooding, and flood control conditions in the Souris valley. There is just no way that the kind of situation that

occurred last year, which brought a great deal of the problem to the people in the lower Souris River basin — the heavy rainfall for example that occurred in Radville and around that area can be predicted. There is no way that any hydrologist, or engineer, can make predictions or take actions which will overcome those kinds of situations.

Pending Deduction of Mortgage Interest on Taxes

MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley): — My question is for the Premier. On the 19th of February, the member for Saskatoon Centre indicated that your government would be presenting legislation allowing for the deduction of mortgage interest on your primary residence, off the provincial income tax. Would the Premier tell this Assembly what the progress of negotiations are with the federal government and whether we might see this legislation this session?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the matter which the hon. member raises is a matter which will be dealt with more fully in the provincial budget of the session of 1979. There have in fact, been negotiations with the federal government and they are continuing because we obviously wish to get a system with respect to the tax measures that were outlined in our election program, which will cause taxpayers the least inconvenience and which will not require any more forms to be filled in if we can avoid it, and the like. No one can predict whether or not what negotiations are going to mature successfully, particularly negotiations of that nature where there may be differences of view between one government and another on the merit of the program. And, I therefore, can not give an assurance that negotiations will be successful. However, there will be further announcements in due course with respect to the broad program.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The member for Saskatoon Centre also, on that same talk show, noted a program by the federal Progressive Conservative Party which is very similar to that program; he in fact endorsed that program as well. Does the Premier also endorse the program of the federal Progressive Conservative Party on that point?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I think that the program put forward by the federal Progressive Conservative party is significantly different from the program that we referred to in our election campaign, and the differences will, of course, be clearer when details of our program are brought in. As the hon. member from Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) points out, there is a significant difference also, in that we have every intention of bringing in legislation and the federal Progressive Conservatives are in no position to promise those.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I take it with the speculation of a forthcoming federal election that the Premier would indicate if in the event that there is a minority government that the New Democrats would again be supporting Trudeau and his policies of PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee) and the abandonment of the Crow's Nest rates?

PCB Spill

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question from the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead) yesterday regarding a

spill of PCBs at the Federal Pioneer Limited Plant here in Regina. His specific questions were:

1. When did the Department of the Environment first become aware of the spill?
2. How did they become aware of it?

From the information available to me and available to him, obviously because he is quoting from the same information, the answer to the first question is, about August 19. The answer to the second question is, the Department of the Environment was advised by the Department of Labour, the Occupational Health Branch. I should go on to inform the hon. member that the Department of the Environment contacted Federal Pioneer on August 10. Your information from our files will indicate that to you.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I know the members in this Assembly will forgive me if I, because we are on the air today, repeat one or two things that I said yesterday in this Assembly. The first one I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is to thank the constituents in Nipawin for re-electing me to this legislature and to this Legislative Chamber. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Progressive Conservatives and those individuals all throughout the province of Saskatchewan who supported the Progressive Conservative Party in the last provincial election . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — I think it is important to note that although we did not win government and although the number of members on the opposite side to us in this Legislative Chamber, the NDP, are the government and have 44 members, they nevertheless did not quite achieve a majority of the people of Saskatchewan in their so-called mandate. Some 48 per cent of the people of the province of Saskatchewan voted for the NDP. It might also be interesting to note, and I am sure the members opposite who took the 1975 election as a mandate to nationalize the potash industry, we Progressive Conservatives got a mere half percentage point less in 1978 than the NDP received in 1975. So therefore, the Progressive Conservatives in terms of support from the people of the province of Saskatchewan received almost the same number of votes as the NDP received in 1975, which they took as a mandate to nationalize the potash industry. It is therefore important, I believe, Mr. Speaker, for all of us in this Assembly to understand that the so-called mandate the NDP received is not a mandate to do anything. It's not a mandate to do anything that they decide. It is merely to govern the province of Saskatchewan.

What is our role in this government? And I think it is important to emphasize this. What is our responsibility in this legislature and over the next four years — depending upon the whim of the Premier as to when he calls the next election? Our role primarily is two-fold. The first and most important thing that we have to do in this Legislative Assembly is to stand up for what we believe in, to stand up for what the people of Saskatchewan

elected us to believe in, and to present to this government our alternative programs. And the second, in the words of some great statesman who I can't recall at the moment, is to protect the minority from the majority. In a free society it is the role of the opposition to ensure that the minority of citizens and their individual rights are protected and preserved from the will of the majority — to make absolutely certain that governments do not run roughshod over people's rights.

Is there anything wrong, Mr. Speaker, in seeking satisfaction through personal achievement? Where would this province be if our pioneers had lacked individual initiative? Where would we be if they had not had freedom of choice? These are the questions we should think about. Because here lies the fact that individual initiative has given this province its wealth. And that wealth has allowed the development of social justice programs that our citizens need and have a right to expect.

Let me emphasize a point here. Neither socialism nor the competitive enterprise system has anything to do with social justice programs. But in Saskatchewan, a socialist party — and I suggest to you that that is true in the light of previous provincial election — has been able to convince a large number of people that only its system will provide social justice programs. That's nonsense. The simple fact is that socialism has not, cannot, and will not generate as much wealth for a nation as does the individual competitive system. There's a strong basic reason for the economic failure of socialism. It tends to discourage freedom of action and of individual initiative. It is a fact that an individual Canadian farmer is more productive than his counterpart in a socialist country. That is a fact. We believe in individual initiative and responsibility. We, on this side of the House, believe in social reform and social justice. I believe the record of the Progressive Conservative Party in this country stands as a leader in the field of social justice. So I say to the members of this Assembly, I say to the people of Saskatchewan, let us be proud of what we have come from, let us be proud of what we stand for and let us go forward and move forward on the basis of individual initiative and rewards thereof in a society that offers freedom of choice to every citizen.

What does the Progressive Conservative opposition in this legislature stand for? I want to inform the members of the Legislative Assembly that every single Progressive Conservative member — and there are more than 40,000 in Saskatchewan today — every single member has a card that he carries in his pocket and on that card are the four basic principles of our party. I think it's important that we go back to basics now in this legislative session. These are the four principles of our party and every single action of the NDP government opposite will be graded in accordance and judged in accordance with these principles; first, a heritage of freedom based on individual initiative, honor, integrity and individual moral responsibility; second, equal rights under the law for all without discrimination; third, government as the servant, not the master; finally, social progress based on the needs of people, not as a means to power.

We are going in this session of the legislature and in forthcoming sessions of the legislature to be asking ourselves the basic question: does the legislation, do the actions of the present government, do the actions of the treasury board and of the Premier stand the test of those four basic principles for which we stand? We ask ourselves this question now and we say no. It does not stand the test of those four basic principles. The Government of Saskatchewan today does not stand the test as to what good government in Canada will be. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that I have been in conversation with people all over the province of Saskatchewan who say to me, 'Dick, times are good, times are terrific, the economy is booming. For goodness sake don't stir the pot, don't let things upset. We've never been better off in Saskatchewan,' say these

people. 'Economically we've never had more, finally we are getting a chance,' say these people, 'finally we are getting a chance.' And I notice the members opposite say 'Hear, hear' to that. Finally we are getting a chance and I agree. But the NDP has had the desires in this province to take credit for good crops, to take credit for the fact that our farmers have produced more in the last three or four years than at any other time in the history of Saskatchewan. They have also wanted to take credit for the fact that farm prices have been good and have been buoyant. Not today — they are starting to see the chinks in that little statement and that little armor. They are starting to see that we are not moving our grain. They are not selling our grain and suddenly the NDP government is trying to do what it always tries to do. Mr. Speaker find a bogeyman to blame. Instead of saying look, here is how we are going to provide a better government for Saskatchewan; they came up with a throne speech like this one, which can only, in the best sense of the term, be regarded as vague. A statement of the future of Saskatchewan it is not. A statement of the aims and objectives of the leadership of the province of Saskatchewan, it is not.

Now, one hack suggested that this was because there is a federal election coming up. One suggested that we mustn't stir the pot right now. I say to the Premier of Saskatchewan, there are issues in Saskatchewan today, that requires attention, that need attention. I am going to outline some of them today. It should have been in the Speech from the Throne, your statement of principles in this regard and your statement of aims and objectives in this regard as to how you are going to lead Saskatchewan into a new decade of the '80's.

What do we stand for and why were we elected? We stand for individual rights in this province and you have taken them away. We stand for the rights of local governments to make local decisions and by manipulation you have taken that away — by manipulation. We stand for the rights of locally elected boards and agencies to make decisions at the local level. By manipulation and juggling you have taken that away. We stand for government of the people and by the people and for the people — government that the people know is going to be honest and fair and you are not providing that. You will be judged over the next four years on how you stand the test against these principles, how you stand the test and the test of time.

Where are we going in this country? Where are we going in the province of Saskatchewan when we reward the kinds of governments that take away our individual freedoms and take away our individual rights by saying that because our economy is good, we should leave them in? Where are we going? Where are we going in Canada? Are we to reward, in the next few months, a Prime Minister that has brought our country to the brink of disaster? Are we to reward in the next few months a Prime Minister that over a ten-year period of time has introduced policies that have destroyed the fabric of Canadian unity, the essence of Canadian unity; are we to reward that by allowing him to continue? Are we to reward the fact that a government in Ottawa over the last ten years has mismanaged our economy so badly that the Canadian dollar is at its lowest level since the dirty '30s, that we have slipped from number two in the world, in terms of standard of living, to number eight in the world in terms of standard of living and the slippage is continuing. We are behind such countries as Luxembourg today. All of that within the last ten years. Are we to reward a Prime Minister who leads us in an economy that fails to recognize the real aspirations of western Canada, that fails to recognize the absolute necessity to provide a means by which western Canadian farmers can get their grain delivered on time, can sell their grain and get it moving and at the same time, not destroy the lives of citizens in the smaller centres and small towns of

Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba. Are we to reward the perpetrators of the Prairie Rail Action Committee?

You know the federal government, Mr. Speaker, goes to a great deal of trouble and trial and expense to introduce a number of commissions to 'study the situation in western Canada as it relates to the movement of grain, Snavelly, Hall'. And finally the definitive one, Hall. This is the commission to end all commissions. The federal government appointed Mr. Justice Hall to do a complete examination of this problem and he did and he provided a report to the people of western Canada that surprisingly enough, immediately received the support of the NDP government of Saskatchewan; received the support of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada; received the support of the NDP Party of Canada. This was a commission that was implemented by a Liberal government, a study that was implemented by a Liberal government. One would think we'd have unanimity of purpose. One would think that we'd have unanimity of spirit. And when Mr. Justice Hall comes forward with his recommendations that we all support, that the farmers themselves support, that the citizens of the small towns support, the answer by Mr. Lang and the present government in Ottawa is to immediately appoint a Prairie Rail Action Committee that eliminates rail lines — we think heartlessly, we think unreasonably. No one is going to object — and I noticed yesterday when I mentioned this the Premier nodded his head — no one is going to object to the federal government not wishing to pay a subsidy for a rail line to Regina and the people don't want it; no one is going to argue against the abandonment of that line and that the federal government should not be required to pay a subsidy. But I'm surprised that the members opposite have been so loath to suggest why this Prairie Rail Action Committee and why Mr. Lang and the Trudeau government are so hell bent for election in destroying small towns in western Canada. It costs a great deal of money to subsidize the railroads, but let me tell them this: it'll cost a lot more to subsidize the people who are disjointed and thrown out by implementation of the PRAC. The fact is we should not reward Mr. Trudeau and his cohorts. And it's a fine thing. I think, that western Canadians are deciding in ever-increasing numbers that he will not be rewarded for this ten years of mismanagement.

Think about it, Mr. Speaker. Are we to reward a government in Canada that over a ten year period increased government spending four times? Are we to reward that kind of government? Are we to reward a government in Ottawa when it has been proven that members of its cabinet tried to interfere with the judiciary, a proven fact? I'm not going to go through all of the litany of ills that have been put forward by the press and put forward by the opposition in Ottawa as it relates to the present government in Ottawa — that's going to be done by our very able candidates for federal office. But I am going to say this, that unless we in the province of Saskatchewan stand firm on not rewarding a government that so mismanaged our economy, on not rewarding a government that so centralized authority in Ottawa, on not rewarding a government that has destroyed the essence and the fabric of being a Canadian, and unless we find some new way to govern our country over the next few months, I predict that our country will not survive. There is no survival by rewarding those who caused the failure.

No farmer would hire a hired man, or a manager of his farm, who continued having a crop failure year after year when all of his neighbours were doing well. No business person would rehire, or re-engage, someone who has seen the Consumer Price Index in our country skyrocket faster than anywhere else, except Italy.

Inflation, that destroyer of the old and the sick and the needy; inflation, that destroyer of those on fixed income; inflation, that destroyer of savings and life insurance and all of the things that have been put forward in our society to meet the social obligations, has run more rampant in Canada under Mr. Trudeau than any other country save Italy, where there have been I don't know how many umpteen different governments in that same ten year period of time.

Taxes in Canada constitute the largest single claim on total family income — the largest single claim — more than food, more than housing, more than medicare, more than anything, taxes constitute the largest claim on a family's income. We in this Assembly, and we on this side of the House owe a responsibility to the people that elected us to ensure, to make certain, that those taxes are minimized by ensuring that we are as efficient as possible. I'll refer to that in a little while in terms of Saskatchewan, but in Canada I don't think anyone who has read the booklet *Legacy of Spending* can possibly support the present government being reintroduced into Ottawa. I don't think anyone could support Mr. Trudeau if they would just get a copy of the book *Legacy of Spending* and find out how the largest single claimant on your hard earned dollars is spending your dollars. Last year we went through them in some detail. The press didn't pick up many of them, but I invite every intelligent voter of the province of Saskatchewan everyone who wants to see good government of whatever party, everyone who wants to know that the party they are voting for and the individual they are voting for is going to minimize those taxes and the largest single claim on the family income, to get a copy of the *Legacy of Spending*.

I notice the members opposite staring at the light up there for the radio. I notice that it's off. I presume it's a burned out bulb, and not the fact that we're not being picked up. Oh, you mean we're not getting our share of radio time today? Marvellous negotiation, deliberate on the part of the government members.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of facts that I might just bring to the attention of the people at this point in terms of where we're going federally. The cost of operating the Prime Minister's office — just one example, very small, — the cost of operating the Prime Minister's office in 1968 was \$767,000. The cost of operating the Prime Minister's office in 1977 was \$2,270,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been critical of the NDP in the past. I have been critical of the Premier of Saskatchewan in the past, but at no time have I ever seen the Premier of Saskatchewan spend money like that. That kind of an increase in spending can only be done by the most expert spender of them all, Pierre Elliott Trudeau. This cost of the operation of the Prime Minister's office does not include the Privy Council, does not include the Prime Minister's residence or his summer's residence at Harrington Lake.

That far I am prepared to go Mr. Speaker, and that is, to let the Premier know that although we are going to be critical of him for spending, I sincerely hope that we don't see that kind of increase in spending that Canadians have been subjected to for the last 10 years.

Where are we going federally? I sincerely hope we make a change. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, a change of direction is absolutely necessary and is absolutely needed in the next federal election. I know that every member in this Legislative Assembly will support me in that aim. A change is needed in the direction of Canada. A change is needed in the Prime Minister's office. A change is needed if we are to survive as a nation.

Where are we going in the province of Saskatchewan? Is money the only goal that we should be striving for? Is money the only aim that we should be striving for? Does the Speech from the Throne or any of the speeches given so far by the NDP in this Legislative Assembly suggest any change of direction in Saskatchewan, suggest any improvement for Saskatchewan citizens? Are we devoted only in the province of Saskatchewan to the purported resource management policy of the present government? Are we devoted only in the province of Saskatchewan to pursuit of the almighty dollar? Now I know it is important, I know it is essential but, Mr. Speaker, that is not the only area where the present government should be offering leadership and where we find them totally lacking in terms of a test against those principles that we talked about earlier. Secrecy in government persists. How does that possibly encourage individual participation in government if the kind of secrecy evidenced by the PCB spill incident is allowed to persist and continue and the kind of attitude autocratic and arrogant, presented by the Minister of the Environment last night on television when he said it was an error in judgment in terms of the radon problem, it was an error in judgment in terms of the PCB problem. If an error in judgment occurs in the future we'll continue to forgive it. What kind of a way is that to govern the province of Saskatchewan on a legitimate matter, on a matter of concern, on a matter of deep concern to the people as to what shall become of the Saskatchewan environment? What shall become of the people of Saskatchewan in that environment? What kind of an attitude is that? No mention in the Speech from the Throne, no mention of what is going to be done to improve the public's knowledge in government, of what is going on in the inner sanctum, in the inner circles of the Premier's group who run the province of Saskatchewan. No mention at all.

We, for our part on this side of the Legislative Assembly, are going to insist, Mr. Speaker, that governments open their books. And if they don't open their books we are going to try our best to make sure that they open their books and try to ask the questions that will require them to open their books. So far the answers of the ministers, I must say, have not led one to believe that the books are suddenly going to open in the province of Saskatchewan and the people of this province are going to find out what goes on in the inner sanctum of government. How does that encourage individual initiative in the province of Saskatchewan? How does it do it? If you persist, Mr. Premier, in small groups making these decisions behind closed doors, I am even thinking that perhaps a member like the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble), who does appear to have the ability to think for himself from time to time, whether we agree with him or not, may, as happened before in your very government some years ago, cause you a great deal of difficulty and embarrassment. So for your own protection open the books for government; for your own preservation open the books to government and let us see what is happening and see how you make your decisions and don't hide such things as serious environmental hazards from the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

We talked a lot on October 18 about leadership. There was a great deal of discussion about it. I would like to ask the question, where is it? Where is the leadership promised in the October 18 election? Where are we going morally? Where is the leadership?

You would think that the Premier, who writes the Speech from the Throne (we all know that) would have shown in the Speech from the Throne some moral leadership of some kind. Some of the serious problems facing the people in the province of Saskatchewan might have been mentioned in this particular Speech from the Throne.

Let's take the issue, Mr. Speaker, of the rampant and increasing pornographic literature that appears in our books on the newsstands to which we are subjecting every child — the Year of the Child, we talk about — to which we are subjecting every child who walks into that store. Rampant, blatant pornography! Where is the leadership to bring an end to that? Watch your TV set any day of the week. Where is the call of your government to bring an end to the presentation of that kind of filth in front of the people of the province and the children of the province? Where is the call in the Speech from the Throne? Where has ever been your government's call? Where has ever been your personal call? Strangely silent on that issue.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that unless we in governments today decide that we must of necessity, increase our moral standards and increase our vigilance in terms of the preservation of decency and a standard of decorum in terms of our youth, we are going to consistently see the kind of high crime rate and high suicide rate that was reported to us at the dinner the other evening by Father Laire. We are going to see that increase because we in government have not been diligent and have not insisted that this kind of pornographic display is not allowed to be made to our children and is not condoned or allowed to run rampant throughout our province.

Where is the leadership that was talked about on October 18 as it relates to conflict and disclosure? Where is the leadership? I challenged the other day and lots of time has ensued since. I challenged the Premier the other day to stand up and be counted if he believes in disclosure — if he believes as I believe and hope every member of this Legislative Chamber believes, that no member of the legislature should be ever put in a position, ever, of having his own personal aims come before those of the people who elected him. The only possible way to ensure that that happens is, first of all, to disclose what interests you have.

I challenged the Premier prior to this, to do that; I challenge him again to do this. Disclose the interests that you have. People are not interested any longer in the little games and subtle innuendoes that you have implied against me. What they are interested in now is to ensure that your government is clean and appears to be clean. What they are interested in today is for your disclosure, Mr. Premier, to show leadership, and after that we can make some suggestions as in terms of disclosure, who works for what department and what individuals are working in what government agency and whether they are related to any member of this Legislative Chamber.

As to whether any government — we would have a statement, an affidavit for example, swearing to the effect that no member of the member's immediate family was employed by the government or by a government agency or, if they were, to state where they were employed. That does not prohibit them from being employed. All that does is tell the people of the province of Saskatchewan in no uncertain terms where they stand.

What organizations does the Premier belong to? What involvement in investment does the Premier have? Where is the leadership in that area? It has not come forward but I hope is going to come forward. We wait for it with baited breath. Where is the conflict of interest legislation that was called for by the Attorney General's white paper four years ago? Where is anything to protect the people of the province of Saskatchewan from one of your ministers being actively involved in an organization doing business with your own government? Where is anything to that effect? Recommended four years ago — 'Oh', the Premier said, 'there are a great deal of problems and difficulties'. If you have so many problems and difficulties in preparing this legislation, Mr. Premier, we would be happy to prepare it for you. We would be

happy to present to you the kind of legislation that every member of this legislature could support — more than happy to present to you. The problem is it would cost money — and we can't introduce it as a money bill — but we would be most happy to provide you with the information that you need to write the legislation, and we could do so in a lot less time than four months since the last election, or four years since the Attorney General's white paper recommended a change in disclosure laws in Saskatchewan, and conflict of interest legislation in the province of Saskatchewan.

Where is the leadership that was talked about so much in the last provincial election in terms of promises of government, in terms of truth in advertising? Yesterday I drew to your attention rather succinctly I think, the fact that in medicare you asked a question in one of your ads. On October 18th, you said 'Should you pay to visit your doctor?' and you lied when you said the Collver Conservatives said yes, because we never did. You lied when you said 'Should we pay medicare premiums?' The Collver Conservatives said yes because we never did. 'Should you pay \$10 a day to stay in hospital?' You said yes for the Collver Conservatives; we never did. The fact is that we didn't say any of those things. Forget the lie, forget the fact that you were able to fool the people into believing that most unbelievable statement that you said, and that you came out with in your great advertising campaign. Look at your own statement? Where is the morality in your own statement? Should you pay to visit your doctor? — Blakeney New Democrats no, October 18th; February 16th — should you pay to visit your doctor — Blakeney New Democrats; yes, because patients all over the province are paying to visit their doctors. The fact is, Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — . . . you can not introduce morality into government in Saskatchewan unless you are prepared to lead. And you can't lead unless you are prepared to stand up and be counted, not slither and slide as you did the other day, in disclosure — not try and present a little bit of this, and a little bit of that — but stand up and be counted on some of these important issues that are facing the people of the province of Saskatchewan today. Stir the pot! You bet we are going to stir the pot! We are going to make sure that you live up to what you said you were going to do. WE are going to make sure that you stand up and be counted when the chips are down on these important issues — not slither and slide, not let your public relations boys make you look like a big hero while at the same time the morality and general tenor and tone of the province of Saskatchewan is slipping away.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention another area in which we have been waiting for leadership from the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. The other day in the city of Saskatoon a member of the press (not ourselves) revealed to the people of Saskatchewan that a cabinet minister was a member of the homosexual community in Saskatchewan. The Premier is aware of that report. We have been waiting, Mr. Speaker, with baited breath for the Premier to answer that question. Why? Mr. Speaker, do I care personally what a cabinet minister does? I do not. Do I care personally whether this abhorrent sexual behavior is encouraged? Yes, I do. But most of all I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, because no cabinet minister has stood up and said, 'Yes, I am a member of the homosexual community.' If that's the case when no cabinet minister has stated so, then I say the Premier must do one of three things if he is to lead and we have said nothing since that report waiting for the Premier to do it: (1) he must refute the charge given by the president of the Saskatoon gay community or; (2) the minister must stand up and admit it or, (3) the Premier should conduct an investigation. Why? Not because it matters whether or not a cabinet minister is a homosexual but what does matter, Mr.

Speaker, is whether or not the people of Saskatchewan are prevented from being blackmailed. If it's true — and I hope it's not — the people of Saskatchewan should be protected from that minister being blackmailed because he is ashamed to bring it forward. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting for the Premier to refute this allegation put forward by Mr. Curry in Saskatoon. If the Premier is not aware of it I would be most happy to read the press report that was put out in Saskatoon. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, unless we are prepared to show the leadership necessary to ensure that total honesty is put before the people of Saskatchewan, unless we are absolutely certain to present this to the people, then we stand the chance of every cabinet minister being called into question, we stand the chance of every cabinet minister being subjected to blackmail . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I notice the Attorney General makes jokes. I notice he thinks that this is a funny situation. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that no one in the province of Saskatchewan is prepared to accept jokes being made about this important issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's the issue?

MR. COLLVER: — The issue is whether or not a cabinet minister tells the truth. The issue is whether or not the president of the Saskatoon Gay Society is telling the truth to start with. If that's not true, then it should be refuted. But if that is true, show some leadership in this issue because the problem is, Mr. Speaker, unless this kind of thing is brought out in the open . . . they laugh about whether or not homosexuals hidden in our government and the charge thereof . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . said they were hidden in the PC caucus.

MR. COLLVER: — . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — That's what he said.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He did not.

MR. ROMANOW: — He did so. Have you tested your boys?

MR. COLLVER: — . . . (inaudible) . . . I notice the Attorney General wants to put forward tests. I don't know what he is going to do but I can tell you what we are going to do. We are going to continue to draw to the attention of the people of the province this lack of leadership in the moral section of our society. We are going to continue to draw to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan the fact that our Premier refuses to answer these problems.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to touch on is, where is the leadership mentioned in the Speech from the Throne with reference to another moral issue which is plaguing our entire province and that is the use of Saskatchewan hospitals . . . continued abortions? Where is the leadership, where is the Attorney General . . . there is the Attorney General making jokes again about whether or not that important issue should be brought to the people of Saskatchewan. Make jokes, Mr. Attorney General, prior to an election the next time about these important moral questions. Make jokes Mr. Attorney General and Mr. Premier, who sits strangely silent on these issues, whose throne speech was strangely silent on issues which affect the lives of every single citizen in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, for whatever . . . the Attorney General makes jokes and the Premier

may sit strangely silent . . . I, for one, do not want to see a society where we as a society and we as a government in the province of Saskatchewan are encouraging homosexuality amongst our youth. I, for one, do not want to stand on that particular . . . Mr. Speaker, let them make their jokes. Where is the leadership in terms of the crime rate in the province of Saskatchewan? Where is the leadership in terms of coming to grips with this ever-increasing crime rate? The city of Regina has one of the highest crime rates in North America. Any mention of that in the throne speech? Any mention of any new directions in that area? All we read about in the paper is convicted rapists who are out on the street to repeat their crimes. That's what we read in the papers. Do we hear any leadership from the Premier in trying to answer that problem, any increased allocations, any increased energies of the government to try to answer the crime rate in the province of Saskatchewan? The answer is no.

A bland throne speech, says the press. A bland throne speech, say other people. Oh, the Chamber of Commerce thought it was terrific. The Chamber of Commerce thought you had the most responsible throne speech ever. That's a good group to be in favor of a socialist throne speech that doesn't answer any serious problems. There were a couple of other groups that praised your throne speech but generally speaking it was thought of to be bland because it's a federal election year — and you wouldn't want to stir the pot.

Where's the leadership in terms of gambling and lotteries? The encouragement by the Government of Canada, the encouragement by the Government of Saskatchewan to people to slip into that kind of moral attitude which says that there's something for nothing and, therefore, we'll play the book in the Saskatchewan lottery, we'll play the book in all of these gambling games — where is the Premier's leadership in that regard? None whatsoever.

What the Premier is saying in this throne speech is the most important, not the only area that I'm concerned about is intergovernmental affairs. So he announces a new department that he had already announced last year, and already announced in the election campaign and thank goodness he has because we recommended three years ago that an intergovernmental affairs department be created here as it was in Alberta. The Premier's just a little late, just three years late in terms of creating that department.

He tried to take credit, Mr. Speaker, for the good crops and he tried to take credit for the Year of the Child. I don't think an NDP created the Year of the Child. And even in his own words at the banquet the other evening, the Premier must admit that the Progressive Conservative's have even done better in terms of the production of children.

Mr. Speaker, I praise the Premier for increasing and making a commitment to increase agricultural research. Again, Mr. Speaker, again an idea that we put forward years ago. Where is the leadership? Where are we going individually as individuals in Saskatchewan? The policies of the NDP, and more important, the actions of the NDP are designed to break the spirit of the Saskatchewan citizen who would stand up and be designed to break the spirit of the Saskatchewan citizen who would stand up and be himself. Let me give you an example, just one, there are lots, many. The NDP, when they take office, tear the contracts of the timber producers in Northern Saskatchewan to shreds. Legitimate contracts made by legitimate government — they tear them up and say the game is starting over. Nothing doing there, Mr. Speaker. They've done it in many areas. You'll recall they did it to hearing aid dealers and they did it to a great many people in our society. Tear up the contracts, re-write the law. All of the things that you came to believe in the past; that doesn't mean anything. It's a new day. We'll start again say the NDP. That's designed to tell individuals and individuals business people in

Saskatchewan if you don't play the game our way, we're going to step on you.

Another example is the imposition of the ward system which happened a few years ago. That tells the individuals. Another example is Bill No. 47 — exactly where if you don't play the game our way, we're going to step on you as individuals. We're going to disobey all the rules. We're going to go against the rules of Canada, the rules of fair play, the rules of integrity, the rules of honor, the rules of everything and we're going to re-write the deal. Play it our way and look what we'll give you. We'll make a new deal with Imperial Oil in the North. We'll make a new deal with Gulf in the North. We'll make a new deal with multi-national after multi-national in the North. Why? Because you guys are playing it our way! We'll even make a new deal, Mr. Speaker, with the potash boys. The immorality of that situation is beyond comprehension. Tax a group of people so highly that they can't afford to do business, nationalize half of them and then come in and have the unmitigated gall to say in the Speech from the Throne this year that you're going to adjust and negotiate the taxes because now you've got 50 per cent. Break the spirit of those who would stand up and be themselves. Don't establish rules and regulations that last for some time. We'll step in and if you play ball our way, then we'll look after you. You've done it to the local governments. You've done it to business. You've done it to individuals. You've done it to employees who work for the government of the province of Saskatchewan and employees who work for the Crown corporations. You've done it to everybody in Saskatchewan. Break the spirit of he who stands up and cater and kowtow to those who do it our way.

I must say the Premier has been successful. There are business people — and I know every member of our caucus will admit the same — there are business people throughout the province of Saskatchewan who say, 'Gee, business has never been so good. For goodness sake, don't stir the pot' — business people who say retail sales have never been higher. Why? Because the farmers have more money. Why because God gave them a good crop. Don't argue against a government that perpetrates this centralist attitude and this destruction of the individual spirit in our people. Don't call attention to that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I notice the minister says nonsense; let him talk to those who have been stepped on and say nonsense. That particular minister — who used to be minister in charge of Northern Saskatchewan — let him talk to residents of the North. And what did the people say? They don't like being stepped on, that's what the people say. Over the course of the last . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I notice a great many people are saying they said it on October 18th. I don't believe that's necessarily true. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that when it relates to one individual soul in Saskatchewan who gets stepped on by an unthinking, uncaring government; if the vote on October the 18th was 494,999 to 1, we should be concerned about that one individual person who was stepped on by an unthinking and uncaring government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — That's not the way free societies behave, Mr. Speaker.

The idea, Mr. Speaker, behind the NDP policies generally as they relate to individualism in local government, is to grab by the scruff of the neck with one hand while at the same time feeding back a little graft on the other — 'Let's buy the people with their own money' — and we intend over the course of this session and others, to prove beyond any reasonable doubt that that's precisely what the NDP have done. They grabbed by the throat the individuals of Saskatchewan, the individual initiative and the spirit of the people to try something different and replaced it with committee style, gray style and judgment from the top down; they appointed committees throughout the province of

Saskatchewan, passing on everything from hospital decisions to nuts and bolts. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these appointed committees making all these important decisions are nothing more than an arm of government, and nowhere have the NDP proven that than by their recent attempt to purge any and all Progressive Conservatives thought out of their civil service. That's already been brought up before this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, where is the leadership in the province of Saskatchewan as it relates to the powerful groups in our society that have taken over too much control in our society? Where's the leadership, for example in this Speech from the Throne, answering the question that many individual members of the trade union movement have asked: when are we going to get some legislation that guarantees our right to a free vote that is secret? When are we going to get some legislation that guarantees our right not to be told by the trade union boss what to do but to allow us the option at our local level, to make our own decisions. When are we going to get that kind of legislation? When are we going to get the kind of legislation that insists that the trade union movement be as responsible as it is responsive to the economic pressures of our day? When? No leadership in that area. So individual trade union members throughout the province of Saskatchewan — most of them afraid to come forward, most of them afraid of retribution — continue to lie in the shadow of their labour union boss. Not all unions are like that. But there are some, there are enough in this province to require legislation.

Mr. Speaker, where is the action promised by the Attorney General time after time after time after time to improve the situation as it relates to our legal system and especially the civil legal system in Saskatchewan. The Attorney General has mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that he's going to do something about the problem of the court system. But is he going to do anything about the monopolistic control that is exercised in the province of Saskatchewan by the lawyers? Is he going to encourage or even try in some way to answer the problem of . . . I see the Premier sitting there counting the lawyers on our side of the House. But I say to the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan, the people are getting fed up with the lawyers controlling all input and all aspects of the legal profession and the practice of law and even some lawyers . . . You didn't read the paper today. You should have. Because it said lawyers have praised the ruling by Mr. Justice Horace Krever that courtroom counsel have no immunity to negligence suits. Something new. Something new. The suggestion that the public needs protection from young lawyers has come under attack. But he has suggested in the paper today, that they need protection from incompetence. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, what possible steps is the Attorney General planning to encourage the bar society for example, to require lawyers . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh, but I think of the House is interfere, compulsion; that's all they understand. Leadership they don't understand. Setting an example as an individual he doesn't understand. Going to a bar society meeting — of which he is a member — and making suggestions, he doesn't understand. The Premier is a lawyer. Has he ever gone to a bar society meeting and made suggestions in terms of improving the practice of lawyers to totally ignore the rule set down by court, for example, the 15-day rule on filing of documents. There is one that the court requires 15 days but not a lawyer in Saskatchewan insists on it. Every lawyer says, oh well, the other lawyer is going to catch me sometimes with my pants down and, therefore, I'll just wait for three months, four months or five months before I file my documents. That's just one example of the kinds of abuses that are going on in the province of Saskatchewan.

What is the result of that to the individual Saskatchewan citizen? The result, Mr. Speaker, is exorbitant costs to individuals for real estate transactions, exorbitant

costs to anyone who wants in Saskatchewan to exercise his rights as an individual in our court system, exorbitant costs as they relate to governments that have the moneys to be able to pay teams and reams of lawyers.

What has this government's solution been? It has been a legal aid system that doesn't work which required after a great deal of thought a commission, study, a ruling by an outsider. The Attorney General says he is going to listen to that ruling. He is definitely going to go ahead with some changes in the legal aid system. I hope that they are meaningful, Mr. Attorney General. But at the same time Mr. Attorney General it might be incumbent upon you because your party is led by lawyers to suggest to the Saskatchewan Bar Society that they start to answer some of the criticisms that are ever-increasing in our society about the monopolistic power of lawyers in our society — the fact that no one appears before the courts, unless they are lawyers, unless they have a lawyer with them in terms of the civil justice system, the fact that all lawyers are appointed to the bench, the fact that lawyers become actively involved in legislatures and as a matter of fact, in the cases of your party, have control of that party in reality. There are two lawyers at the top. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that unless this serious social problem is answered soon, unless the ever-increasing cost of the legal profession and the cost of getting justice in our country is come to grips with soon people will be ever-increasingly looking outside the legal system.

It is not a solution, Mr. Speaker, as the NDP has suggested to create quasi judicial boards in replacement of courts. That's not a solution because what happens is, as the Attorney General well knows, the people hire lawyers anyway; they are required to sit through days and months of ever-increasing turmoil with their lawyers sitting there, with their tremendously high exorbitant costs, which is materially affecting the efficiency of our country. Perhaps instead of putting forward platitudes, perhaps instead of putting forward suggestions as the Attorney General has done in the past — oh, we are getting computerized and oh, we are doing this and we are doing this with this court, perhaps instead of doing that the Attorney General should think about the real bottleneck because every judge in Saskatchewan, will tell you where the real bottleneck is. The real bottleneck is the cushy nice little deal that exists between lawyers — the waiting and timing and stalling and delaying that ever increases the cost of justice to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I don't say that the government of the province of Saskatchewan should interfere today. I say the Government of Saskatchewan should show the kind of leadership we are talking about and should tell the Saskatchewan Bar Society, look, answer this problem. Answer it because the people are demanding it, answer it because justice delayed is justice denied, answer it because there are too many people in Saskatchewan who are afraid to bring their just matters before the courts because it is too expensive. Answer it because we can no longer afford to have laws and ever increasing numbers of laws enacted by lawyers, interpreted by lawyers.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What do you say to that, Roy?

MR. COLLVER: — We now have to have a change in the direction of that thought . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the Attorney General says coming from me it's not wheat.

MR. ROMANOW: — Weight, bears a lot of weight.

MR. COLLVER: — Oh, bears a lot of weight. Well, I knew that was true because I've

gained 20 pounds. Mr. Speaker, where is the leadership in this government as it relates to local government? Has the government of the province of Saskatchewan today insisted that local people make the decision when uranium development is going to occur in their populated areas? Have they listened even to their members like the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble)? Have they listened to anybody? The answer is no. Do local people make the decision? No. The minister says, 'You made that decision on October 18.' Nonsense, tell that to the people of Warman, tell that to your member for Saskatoon Sutherland. They didn't make that decision October 18 and you know it. They are entitled as local people to decide whether or not that kind of development will occur in their local areas. They are entitled to make those kinds of decision without the coercion of your department, without the coercion of your ministers and they are entitled to make that decision before you have already made the decision for them, before you have already gone too far down the line as we suspect you have with reference to the refinery at Warman, before you have gone too far down the line to allow local people to make that decision.

The Premier was quick to jump yesterday when I mentioned that in the last provincial general election he said 45 per cent of his budget was allocated to local governments — that's not true, he knows it — for their use as they see fit. And he jumped quickly when I talked about highways but if a Government of Saskatchewan says here is \$10 million and you will build a highway from here to here and this is who you will hire and this is how you will do it, that's not local people making local decisions, Mr. Premier. If you want to try and fool the people into believing that because you transferred the money under those terms and conditions to a local government and said, here, you spend it this way, under our authority, under our direction and under our terms and conditions.

If you think that that is local government then you do not understand local government as I do. Local government, we believe, is locally elected officials making the decisions at their local level as they see fit.

What about your Department of Municipal Affairs jumping in and encouraging — not encouraging — insisting that the citizens of the municipality of Torch River implement their so called tax on people that are just outside of major cities, the tax that is designed to keep the doctors and lawyers from building \$100 thousand residences on 10 acres of ground? How about your Department of Municipal Affairs going up there and telling them to tax widows and the retired and the old because they do not have more land than their neighbour? Their neighbour can be farming 10 sections and have a \$200 thousand house on which he pays no tax when right across the road is a poor widow on a quarter section that is producing nothing and she must pay tax on her house.

AN HON. MEMBER: — On a quarter section?

MR. COLLVER: — On a quarter section. She must pay tax on her house. Right across from the — oh the minister — I notice you turned around to see the minister. They minister is well aware of this because I brought the people in to see him and they presented their problems to him. They said, we are in trouble because our council . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . at the insistence of the minister's members and at the insistence of his people this local council went out and taxed these poor widows and poor retirees and older people on the basis that those who are working off the land to try to build up a little stake, who are out there as plumbers and capital people and laborers and others striving to beat heck to build their quarter section into a half section . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You just go ahead and have a talk with your deputy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. COLLVER: — I think that the member for Shellbrook would be well advised to keep his mouth quiet in this debate because after his performance last night on television where he wants to continue to reward people who make errors in judgment, I would suggest . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Premier that his flimflam of the people of Saskatchewan in terms of local people making decisions is nonsense. I suggest that he has jiggered the rules, jiggered the laws and jiggered the administration to such an extent that local people have no say anymore and it is getting worse. Where are we going economically?

Well, things have been pretty good in the province of Saskatchewan for the last four years. Everybody over there smiles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Everybody over there smiles as well they should. Smile, members of the NDP because . . . (inaudible) . . . well I do not think that good government, Mr. Speaker, provided the good crops.

During the best possible years that Saskatchewan has ever had, this year I predict will be the fourth successive deficit budget. Good government!

We are, said the Minister of Finance just a little while ago, going to put away in the times of plenty in order to have sufficient when we need, like the seven years of famine and the seven years of plenty. We are going to be biblical in our approach. But what I would like to know from the Minister of Finance and the Premier, is why would you suggest that the last four years have not been years of plenty? What have you been putting aside in the last four years? The answer is nothing. You have been dipping into the pocket, dipping into the till.

What have we really gained? What have we really gained by your supposed good government? Show us the increase in real terms, in real dollars, discounting the increase in oil price in the world; show us the increase in oil production in Saskatchewan. That is real. Prices are unreal; production is real. Show us the increase in the production of oil since you took office in the province of Saskatchewan, from your policies, because that is one industry. Mr. Speaker, that is directly related to government policy. Show us an increase in exploration in Saskatchewan as a direct result of your policies, because there, Mr. Speaker, is another area which is directly related to your policies, directly. Show us an increase, for example, in manufacturing in Saskatchewan. Show us that in real terms, not in dollar terms; show us an increase in real terms since you took office. Show us an increase in these areas, these economic areas, since you took office that are directly related to the policies of your government. I suggest you can't do it because it doesn't exist. I suggest that you have been covering up because of the tremendous and dramatic increase in the world price of oil that has given you a lot of dough to work with, a lot of dough to work with.

There is an old adage in the sector, for the benefit of the Premier, that says you got to

have money to make money. So when you get all this money you now think you can make money so you impose government on efficient organizations; you impose government on the people of Saskatchewan.

Who benefits? Shell, certainly; Gulf, absolutely; AMOC, certainly — big multinational companies. Have the little guys benefited, the little service industries in the oil business? Why don't you go down to the member for Estevan's constituency once in your life, Mr. Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Vickar) or whatever? Why not go down there and take a look and see? Where are they? Why don't you go to the member for Swift Current's (Mr. Ham) constituency and find out about the tremendous activity in the oil exploration area?

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . ask him if they are hiring more people.

MR. COLLVER: — Since when? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, to suggest there has been any increase for the little guy is nonsense. The big guy — Saskatchewan Power, government Crown corporations, sure there has been an increase. The big guys are still big in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer. Check that fact, Mr. Speaker; check that fact, Mr. Premier. Why not, Mr. Speaker, check our what's happened in terms of the disparity between low income groups and higher income groups in the province of Saskatchewan.

So here I am told that time on the air is over so now we can relax?

I have a note here for the members opposite just so they'll know. I want to answer these questions just so you'll know where we're going. What do we stand for? I've done that I think. Where are we going federally? I've done that. Where are we going provincially? I'm just in the middle of that. And what are our policies? When I get to our policies it might take a couple of minutes so relax and we'll let you know what we think should happen in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take this part of the time to just persist in answering the Attorney General who loves to call across the House. He wants to get the issues out, and I'm prepared to take him on. I hope he will do the same favor to me when we call out the issues and he answers the issues. So I'll answer your issues in this part, Mr. Attorney General.

You asked what about potash and what about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. To us it makes absolutely no economic sense of any kind whatsoever. To put up great quantities of government funds to get a profit that you could get with taxation anyway, just makes no sense whatsoever. It's like saying to an entrepreneur, put up your own money if you can get somebody else's. And not an entrepreneur worth his salt would do so. It's even like saying to one of the richest men in this Chamber, if not the richest man in the Chamber, the man over there who has quite a bit of knowledge about his own personal affairs . . . I just can't understand how he can relate making money on his own personal affairs to that of government. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, he can't. We see no sense whatsoever in putting money up and putting out time and effort and energy and expending all of the resources of the people that you've spent to acquire something that you already had — and to acquire something you could have got all the benefits of that you've got now through taxation. No question about it, you could have taxed it . . . Well I don't know about more benefits but certainly as many. You have all the control you need over those organizations. You've proved that because you passed a law that nationalized it. So you have all the political control you need. So I say

to you, why are you participating in that northern development on an equity basis? Why? For what possible reason? What are you gaining for the people of Saskatchewan. The right to lose money? You certainly don't gain the right to make money because the right to make money is already there through taxes. So what you've done is you've used the people's money to put it up there in those ventures in the north, to put it into the expanded potash business for no earthly reason. Now unfortunately, because you did that a Progressive Conservative Party in government would be faced with a problem and the problem is that the Government of Saskatchewan would be actively involved in the ownership of that equity — not because we wanted to do it, but because you wanted to do it. We would be faced with that problem. Now how best to solve that problem given our way of thinking? Admittedly the socialists believe the government should run it all on a day to day basis. We don't believe that; we don't accept it; we never have and we never will. We will continue to fight you on that issue. But given . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Attorney General, what nonsense, what nonsense. I'll accept your apology.

Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that notwithstanding our agreement on radio time, Sask Tel cut a line into this building and I haven't had any radio time all day today. Now I sincerely hope in keeping with the spirit of co-operation that is existing in this legislature that the members will allow me to start all over again tomorrow . . . (interjection of laughter) . . .

The fact is we're faced with a problem, Mr. Attorney General and Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to answer the Attorney General's comment called from his chair, and I'd be happy to try and do so if he will just allow me to finish. Fact is we have this problem with those competitive businesses and as the Attorney General mentioned — I just want to emphasize this for a start — that where the people of Saskatchewan are required to provide a service to the people of Saskatchewan such as Sask Power, such as Sask Tel, such as SGIO (Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office), where a monopolistic service is being provided to the people, we do not believe that the private sector is the best place. As a matter of fact, we don't believe it is the best place. We believe that government Crown corporations are in fact, a positive step forward in providing those services. That answer you now? We're talking now about the competitive sector . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If I were in the province of Alberta today, I would be the first one calling for the PWA (Pacific Western Airlines) to be sold to the people of Alberta and have done so. But Mr. Attorney General and Mr. Speaker, I've done so in Alberta, I've done so . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I didn't do it when I was . . .

MR. THATCHER: — Have you ever flown them? They're worse than Air Canada!

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, the point is economically, we have got to do something with those corporations in the competitive sector. We don't believe they should be there and, therefore, we said the best possible way to do that would be to sell them back to the people. But we couldn't sell them to the people because then only the rich could buy and the poor couldn't buy; so we said transfer to the people because the people have already paid for them with their tax money.

Now for the information of those individuals across, we will continue to press for that kind of corporation in our province. We will continue to press the Government of Saskatchewan, for example, to have legislation on the books that will encourage, through the taxation system, the ownership of shares in private corporations in our province by the workers of that organization. Where is the energy in that area? Where is the leadership in that area?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where is the leadership?

MR. COLLVER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, since everyone can get a copy of this and I don't intend to read it into the record here today . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, the reason for the little conference is on radio time and I don't understand just where we are going on radio time because of the unfortunate cut in Sask Tel wires. Anybody can get a copy of this book — which is our policy — any of the members opposite. We hope to emphasize, many of these members . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's too deep for them.

MR. COLLVER: — Well no, no. But I wouldn't want to go through and try to have to explain it. They can all read . . . and therefore, Mr. Speaker, we do not believe that the government of the province of Saskatchewan is in any way providing the leadership that the people of Saskatchewan should expect. We don't think the leadership that was emphasized so strongly in the October 18 election has been exhibited in any way in the last four months. We don't believe that the government is allowing local people to make the kinds of decisions that they should be making. We don't believe the government is in any way indicating to the people that they are prepared to answer any of these serious, moral questions that have been asked all over the province of Saskatchewan as to where we are going and where we are drifting in our society. Therefore, I move seconded by my seatmate to the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) that the following words be added to the motion:

That this Assembly has no confidence in the government and condemns it for its failure in the Speech from the Throne to:

1. Indicate moral leadership to the people of Saskatchewan.
2. Recognize the individual worth of each Saskatchewan citizen.
3. Allow local people in populated areas to make the decision on uranium development in their areas;
4. Recognize that inflation and its effect on the disadvantaged as the number one economic problem of our day.

Debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, in entering this debate, I first want to extend my congratulations to you for being selected once again as the Speaker in this legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I believe you discharged your duties in the last legislature with impartiality and ability, and I am confident that you will do the same in the future. I appreciate that some hon. members in this House may not agree with that judgment, but with respect to those who do not agree, I don't have a great deal of respect for their judgment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I want to tender my congratulations, too, to the mover and seconder of the motion, the hon. members for Wascana (Mr. White) and Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter). I was impressed with the contributions to the debate of each of them, and I am proud that our party can attract members of their capacity and ability. I know they will make a first class contribution to their constituencies, to this legislature and to the province.

I want to congratulate, too, the new members to this House. I believe there are 19 of them in all who were not members of the previous legislature, and that's a rather surprising number of new faces considering that it was an election which returned a government. It is not surprising when a government is overturned that there be a large number of new members, but it is surprising when a government is returned to office that we would have as many as approximately one-third new faces in the House. In looking around me, I see that there are in fact only four members, less than 7 per cent of our total number, who have served in this legislature as many as 15 years. The joys of public life are many, but security of tenure is not one of them and I want to point that out to all hon. members. I think of constituencies like Prince Albert-Duck Lake or Saskatoon Sutherland, which in the space of two years have been represented, in each case, by three different members of three different political parties. I mention these facts only because it indicates what an uncertain profession we have embarked upon and I think we should keep this in mind generally, but also when we are thinking about the appropriate remuneration for members of the Legislative Assembly. We should not assume that it is a job like other jobs since, perhaps for good, perhaps for evil, it most certainly is not.

I want to, before I move into some other remarks, comment on a few of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. He said a number of things which I thought deserved a comment or two. We wondered about the particular position that the opposition was taking today. We listened in the question period and heard us upbraided for a program of gun control bringing in compulsion. We were upbraided by the leader of the opposition for bringing in such a program with respect to seat belts. We are not at all clear where they stand on these programs, and we are most assuredly looking for clarification on where they stand. I invite anyone to read the text of what the leader of the opposition said, and he said that we should not have brought in the program with respect to seat belts. I ask anyone to try to square that with what the member for Wilkie was saying about bringing in a mandatory program of gun control.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I'm sure that all hon. members were interested in the comments of the leader of the opposition with respect to where we get our political advice. We conducted an election. We did not get our advice from Nikolai Lenin or Machiavelli. I'm willing to get advice from wherever we can. I want to assure you of that, but when doing that we usually look for a proven performer. Lenin and Machiavelli have got a lot to be said for them, but performance in elections was not one of them. They didn't have to worry about that. So far as I'm aware neither of them was ever elected to any public office. They devised other methods, methods which might commend themselves to the leader of the opposition for all I know, but those are not our methods. Our basic election technique was to talk to as many of the voters as we could, and we did that. We talked to just as many of them as we could. Ask your candidate in Wascana what happened to him, and he will tell you that he was out-hustled by the shoe leather of the White team,

that's what he'll tell you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Not Lenin, and not Machiavelli but plain old Clint White and his team.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, I predicted at the outset of the election last fall that we would have tough campaign, a rough campaign, and it turned out to be accurate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's right. The leader of the opposition said he agreed, but unfortunately for him, the campaign isn't over. Unfortunately for him, he's still at it; allegations of civil servants being browbeaten but no names, no names; allegations of old people being hoodwinked but no names, no names — no, no dates — just blanket charges. Allegations again today about alleged problems in the cabinet, allegations that he wouldn't repeat outside this House. Ah, Mr. Speaker, wait till we watch our news. He will not say that he believes that, he will not say that he believes that. He is picking up some . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You better get some advice from Gary Lane.

MR. BLAKENEY: — He is picking up some rumors that are around the streets and repeating them in this House. And I say this to him or any other, if you want to level that charge against any member of our cabinet outside the Chamber, get yourself a lawyer if you want to name a name.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — What a bunch of mudslingers, Mudslingers, that's all you guys are. A bunch of mudslingers, every one of you.

MR. BLAKENEY: — We are not worrying very much about 'what about somebody else?' If any one of you has the courage to stand up and name any one of us, do it and be prepared to be in court. Do it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Such a despicable mudslinging performance! What a bunch of mudslingers. Twenty years out in the old political backwoods, but Gary knows better. Gary knows better, Gary is hoping that old Dick is talking to the press out there. Gary is saying nothing because Dick is talking to the press out there. Gary is just hoping that he says it.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, let me comment on one or two of the other comments of the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Nipawin. He spent a good deal of his time talking about the federal campaign. That's understandable. I don't know why he should feel that we are here to defend the Prime Minister of Canada. I have differed from the Prime Minister openly and publicly and I have tried, in differing with him openly and publicly to be constructive. I've tried to put forward my alternatives. The people of Saskatchewan have seen those and they will be the judge of whether or not we have put forward appropriate policies as constructive alternatives to those put

forward by the Prime Minister. I am rather pleased with the reception that I've received from the people of Saskatchewan and I would hope that all hon. members who differ from the points of view that I have put forward will put forward their positions in this legislature.

Some of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition hardly need an answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — He conjured up a picture of us browbeating the resource companies, breaking their spirit and after having broken their spirit, entering into agreements with them. Picture if you will poor broken IMCC (International Minerals and Chemical Corporation) Picture if you will poor beaten down Esso. Esso, that poor little subsidiary of Exxon, which everybody knows is a patsy, has been beaten down, by our government, of course beaten down by the Government of Canada. That is sheer nonsense. We know, you know, that our dealings with the resource companies have been tough. Admittedly they have been tough and we make no apology for that but at the same time we make no apology for reaching an agreement with the resource companies . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . and we have, I think, steadfastly pursued these policies. I'll have more to say tomorrow about our success. We have not knuckled under as members opposite urged us to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — We have pursued Bill No. 42. We lost in the court. We have then enacted Bill No. 47 which members opposite again today said they opposed and I want that on the record. You opposed Bill No. 47 and you presumably oppose the \$500 million or so we expect to collect under Bill No. 47.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — That should be made clear on the record. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot say that you want us to have the money but not pass the legislation under which we collect it. You have made your choice today, saying once again as the Leader of the Opposition did, that Bill No. 47 was an improper imposition on the resource companies. You have made your point. You have taken your position and let the public know that and let you, with all deference, live with the position you have just taken today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The other point made in the amendment about whether or not there has been public consultation with respect to uranium development, I want to say that this is not the only province in Canada that has uranium development. There's another

province in Canada that has uranium development and has had it for many years and has a Conservative Government and presumably they have an exemplary record in having votes in Elliot Lake, in having environmental impact studies. That surely is the best evidence of what Conservative Governments will do, what they have done — that's always pretty good evidence. We have now moved to expand our development of uranium in this province. We have had a Bayda inquiry, the most exhaustive inquiry on the development of a resource, a uranium or any other resource, in the history of North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — We are proud of that. We do not say we're necessarily right. We could be wrong and I want to emphasize that but at least we have taken steps so that the public could have a voice, could outline their views and could have them assessed by a thoroughly competent group of people, have them commented upon and be the subject of public discussion. We believe that that is responsible government. We believe that we have acted rightly with respect to uranium development up until now. We acknowledge we could be wrong, but we do not admit in any sense, that any Conservative government anywhere at any time has ever done better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Leader of the Opposition outlined what he felt the obligations of the opposition were. I was pleased that he did that, because I was going to touch on one or two points.

He said that they should protect the minority against the majority, and I agree. The public deserves protection against majority governments, because with all the good will in the world majority governments will make mistakes and in any case need to have their opinions tested constantly. That is what a parliamentary system is all about. But we also need something else from an opposition. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition admitted it, acknowledged it freely. He said that they should stand up and say what they believe in. They should state their alternative programs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know and I know how these legislatures operate. A government puts forward its program in its legislation, in its budget. The opposition puts forward its program, by and large, in speeches and particularly in private members' resolutions, when they have an opportunity to state with precision and clarity, where they stand on the issues of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in opposition and I invite all hon. members to take the journals. New members will, perhaps, not be familiar with these little summaries — they are there in the stand — of the proceedings of our legislature. You can take the journals for 1970 and 1971 or any other period from 1964 to 1971, when we were in opposition. Look at the resolutions which we introduced — and don't think there weren't some pretty tough battles in those days. We had very firm objections to the policies of the government of the day — let there be no mistake about that — firm objections to their policies on deterrent fees; firm objections to their policies on, as we called them, gerrymanders, re-distributions. We put resolutions on the order paper with respect to an independent boundaries commission. We called for that — that this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the government the introduction of legislation to establish an independent electoral boundaries commission. That is a pretty positive proposal — a proposal that they introduce legislation to establish an independent boundaries

commission. Then we followed up — take any number here — school land taxes, another issue that we raised. We say:

That this Assembly mindful of the ever increasing burden placed on property owners by the steadily rising cost of education, recommends to the Government of Saskatchewan that it finds ways of shifting a significant amount of the tax burden for school purposes from property to taxes more closely related to ability to pay.

A pretty positive statement. I could go on. Another one here dealing with deterrent fees:

That this Assembly calls upon the government to immediately abolish hospital and medical deterrent fees . . .

Those were the sort of resolutions we put forward trying to outline for the people of Saskatchewan what our policies would be. And if you read the resolutions in the two or three years before we formed the government you could practically read our 1971 election program.

I now pick up the Votes and Proceedings for this current legislature, and I look at the sixteen resolutions put on the order paper by members opposite and I note that the first urges the Government of Canada to have a referendum — this is Mr. Lane, fair enough. Mr. Berntson — and I will use the names because they appear in the whites — Mr. Berntson condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Thatcher condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Rousseau condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Swan condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Andrew condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Muirhead condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Ham condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mrs. Duncan condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. McLeod condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Taylor condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Katzman condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Birkbeck condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Larter condemns the Government of Saskatchewan; Mr. Pickering condemns the Government of Saskatchewan and Mr. Garner condemns the Government of Saskatchewan. That certainly proves that while they are free with their condemnation they have not yet listened to the Leader of the Opposition when he says that they should state an alternative program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — There is nothing constructive about their approach. The Leader of the Opposition made clear what he was against, but if you know what he is for, you listened rather better than I did.

Members opposite have had an opportunity and the resolutions they put on this order paper to say where they stand. And, we are not claiming that all our policies are right. We know that there are probably some that time will prove are wrong — we can very definitely appreciate that members opposite, who have a different philosophy, will have different points of view. But we think that they owe it to the people of Saskatchewan to set out their alternative programs . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . set it out in the legislature, set it out in resolutions where it too can be debated. That book that the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, waves about is not part of the records of this legislature. And I can well appreciate why a person who professes to operate and espouse policies which are so self-contradictory as the ones in that book would not wish to put them on the order paper so that they might be the subject of debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, members opposite are saying that their resolutions came right out of the book. Well, the book then is not a program for government but a program for opposition and perhaps they know better than we what they need because we think that is probably what they are going to need for a long, long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, our government embarks upon this new phase of its life somewhat earlier than we had anticipated. As members opposite will know we were elected in 1971, returned to office in 1975. It is no secret that we intended to hold an election in June of 1979. Last September it became clear that there was likely to be a federal election on or about June of 1979. We felt that it was unwise to have a federal election and a provincial election which overlapped or followed each other very closely. Accordingly we called an election. We did not favor the alternative of a winter election. I have no comment whatever on whether or not winter elections are appropriate in other provinces and I want to make that clear but I do say that it is traditional in this province to have a method of campaigning which is very difficult to combine with a winter general election. For the most part our candidates wish to meet their voters and the voters wish to meet their candidates and this is much more difficult in winter than in summer or fall. So we called the election in October. I am pleased to say that the voter participation was gratifyingly high. I know that some hon. members felt that that would be the case.

I recall the Liberal Leader (Mr. Malone) indicating that he didn't feel that the farmers would participate in the election. Well, he may have been right, the farmers didn't participate in the election so far as he was concerned. I think it would be fair to say that some of the Liberal candidates didn't participate in the election. Be that as it may it was an election in which the public participated and participated generally and I don't think anyone can deny that. We continue to have just about the highest voter turnout in Canada and I think that is something of which all of us in Saskatchewan ought to be proud.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The 1978 election breaks the four-year pattern. I want to say now that my current intention is that the next election should be back on pattern in 1983.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — This is not a commitment and no premier should or can give a commitment with respect to an election date this far in advance. It is a statement of our present intention which we state now so that if there are any objections they can be put forward at an early date and can be considered. We would not wish people along about

'82 to be saying that we were afraid to go to the electorate if in fact we had announced now that 1983 was the preferred date. I simply want to put that of course . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition says, it is always open to a government to ask for a mandate from the people, and that is something which I have not heard any elected Conservative government object to, nor take any steps to change. Now I think the point made by the Leader of the Opposition is a good one and we should not assume that we have up until 1983, for example, to overhaul our election machinery.

Turning to immediate questions, I think there are some things which we will need to do about our election machinery at this session. Two elections have been based upon The Representation Act of 1974. Inevitably some constituencies have become disproportionately large and the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) represents the largest one and one which is clearly too large. Some of the others are now significantly out of the proportions which we had previously hoped. We propose once again to set up an independent boundaries commission headed by a judge to draw up boundaries as fairly and as impartially, we trust, as the previous boundaries commission headed by Mr. Justice McGuire.

There are some technical questions to be considered and I think this House is going to have to address them and I want to give notice of that. We can go with the current act which in effect will mean that the raw material will be the Stats Can Census of 1976. That does not strike us as going to be satisfactory since it will mean that some constituencies, notably the Qu'Appelle's and the Rosthern's and the Biggar's will still not adequately reflect the population growth. There are other possibilities and I think we should say enumeration lists of provincial elections, enumeration lists of federal elections and these, I think, ought to be considered by this House and we will be putting forward proposals. An hon. member has said a permanent voters' list; we have not given detailed consideration to that although it is something which from time to time has come up for consideration. We will need to consider the provisions of the Election Act to see whether they work fairly and impartially. I invite anyone who has proposals to improve The Election Act process to send their suggestions to the chief electoral officer or to the Attorney General or to the Leader of the Opposition so that they may be part of the process of redrawing our election laws.

A particular matter for consideration will be whether or not the spending limitations work as we wish them to work. Maybe a committee would be a way to do it. We will need to consider that. We will need to consider the remuneration of members of the Legislative Assembly. Early in the life of the last legislature, provision was made for setting up remuneration and providing for annual increases and these annual increases, as members will recall, came into effect in July of 1976, 1977 and 1978. There was an annual increase built into the law. The last annual increase has applied and we will have to ask ourselves whether we will, for this legislature, introduce a similar proposal which will provide for an annual adjustment — modest as was the one during the last legislature. If past practice is to be followed, we should review that. And that will be up to the House to decide.

During the last legislature, a committee headed by Mr. Justice Hughes made recommendations respecting changes in the Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Plan. The legislature did not have an opportunity to deal with those and it's our intention to propose changes in that act for consideration by the House during this session.

Fewer and fewer members are able to combine their work as a member with other part-time employment. Some members, not a large number, but some members are called upon to make very significant financial sacrifices to serve in this legislature. Under these circumstances, a review of allowances and superannuation seems to me entirely appropriate. It's up to the House to decide.

Yes, we have a number of things arising out of the 1978 election. We had a good victory for the New Democratic Party in 1978. Just how good it was, I think, is not always appreciated. I've been looking over the elections for the last seven elections for the 25 years. The figures are somewhat distorted by our landslide win in 1971, when the lead in popular vote over the nearest opposition party was a full 12 per cent and the lead in seats was 30, 45 to 15. But if we exclude that election, when a government was being overthrown, then the 1978 election gave the NDP the highest percentage of the popular vote and the largest majority of seats for any election for 25 years.

Even compared with the 1971 landslide the figures are impressive. In 1971 we had a lead in popular vote over the next party of 12 per cent. In 1978 it was 10 per cent. In 1971 we had a lead in seats, a majority over the combined opposition parties, of 30 seats. It is now 27 seats and those, by anybody's standards, are impressive figures.

We are grateful to the electors for the mandate they gave us and we are going to try to govern in a way which is worthy of that mandate. We propose to set out, in a workmanlike way, to carry out our election program to get on with the job of building a better Saskatchewan.

We on this side of the House believe that Saskatchewan never had seven better years than they did from 1971 to 1978. We believe that the prospects for the next seven years are even brighter. Nobody can be sure; certainty is not part of our world but certainly the prospects are bright, the opportunities are many, and I am confident that we as a people in Saskatchewan can seize these opportunities. I am confident that we can build a stronger and better Saskatchewan. I am very confident we can do that and I think we can do it ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I see somebody up in the booth dealing with the matter of radio time. I do not know what happened to the Leader of the Opposition today. If in fact the radio was off as opposed to the light, as I understand it probably was, and if in fact it is not going to be rebroadcast, if it was not picked up in a way that will permit it to be rebroadcast as I suspect it was not (although that I do not know), then I will ask if arrangements can be made so that when I continue my remarks tomorrow the radio will be off. I think it is reasonable and fair because apparently it happened through no design of anyone, I assure all hon. members and I think that we could . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — The Lord spared us.

MR. BLAKENEY: — The member for the Battlefords suggests that the Lord spared us. Well it may well be that the Lord is even more forgiving and therefore we can shut off the radio for me tomorrow.

I want to talk a little bit about my constituency since tomorrow I want to deal with broader governmental subjects.

I talked about what this province has enjoyed by way of prosperity and opportunity during

the last seven years, and certainly we have done that. Members will think of their own constituencies and what has happened in their own constituencies and I think any fair-minded person would say that a great deal has happened and that much of it are things of which we can all be proud. That is certainly true in Regina and certainly true in the constituency of Regina Elphinstone which I represent.

In 1971, Regina was very nearly the boarded-up capital of Canada. The main streets of Regina were lined with places of business, which were boarded up, which were not operating businesses.

Just think what has happened to Regina in those seven years. The city government has a new city hall, has a new police station, has new sewage facilities, an enlarged transit garage, many new buses, new Ring Roads — all done by the citizens of Regina and all done by the council of Regina and all done with provincial help.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Nobody in anyway is suggesting that the provincial government did these things. We are suggesting that we backed up a local government making decisions at the local level and they made those decisions and they achieved a great deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — In recreation we have the Agridome, the Lawson Pool, Douglas Park and several community rinks and improved park facilities. Taylor Field is being rebuilt as the home of the Saskatchewan Roughriders and for other recreational uses.

In manufacturing and distributing we have seen major expansion in IPSCO. We have seen a major expansion of the Co-op Refinery. I have been at official openings of no less than three northern telecom plants — the first plant, a tiny plant in 1971 and two expansions where they went from 7 or 8 employees to 80- or 90 employees, all indicating considerable help in that secondary manufacturing sector. Big, big warehouses have been built by people like John Deere, people like Sears, people like Federated Co-ops and other businesses. In some cases those warehouses are serving the entire West. We certainly believe that a great deal has been done to make Regina a distribution hub for the three prairie provinces.

Canadian Western Agribition had its first show in 1971 and I, as Premier, had the honor to be there at the first show. It has grown from that tiny beginning to one of the greatest livestock shows in the world. I previously paid tribute to the founders of this and I particularly paid tribute to my predecessor, as Premier, who had a major part in setting up Agribition. He and other cattle men put it together and it's a great show. The new facilities, including the Agribition Building, the Agridome, the Ag-Ex Pavillion, and the Ag-Ex Pavillion Link. All receive substantial provincial financial assistance, all receive financial assistance. Agribition has meant a great deal to Regina, particularly to the hotels and restaurants in Regina, of which there are many new hotels and many new restaurants since 1971.

Downtown Regina is undergoing a transformation. The Cornwall Centre is a major urban development project which will ensure the continued commercial viability of downtown Regina for many decades to come . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and that project, too, was sparked by the Government of Saskatchewan. Other major

developments are going on in downtown Regina, the Royal Bank development and others. Rail line relocation is under active consideration. It's awaiting a decision by the federal government. It may or may not come to pass, but it is another possibility for downtown Regina.

In all this, the needs of a constituency like Elphinstone, which is not in downtown Regina, were not neglected. The rejuvenation of downtown Regina, with the hundreds of jobs which will be there, means that constituencies which surround the core area, constituencies like Elphinstone, are better places in which to live, are places where people can live and walk to work or go to work with a very short ride and it, in a very real sense, adds to the strength and stability of constituencies like Elphinstone. The NIP (Neighbourhood Improvement Program) is doing great things in the Albert-Scott area, and I want to acknowledge the important contribution which has been made to the Elphinstone constituency by a number of community organizations there — the Albert-Scott Neighbourhood Improvement Association, the North-Central Community Society, the Riel Elder Society and others. It's a community very much alive, aggressively seeking to make Elphinstone an even better place to live.

Now, Reginans have made this possible, Reginans have made this possible, but so has their provincial government. Let me give you just one statistic, one only. The grants made by the province of Saskatchewan to the city of Regina in 1971 were \$900,000; the grants made by the province of Saskatchewan to Regina in 1978 were not \$900,000 but \$18,800,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Twenty times as much, a 2,000 per cent increase. Now, Mr. Speaker, that gave real muscle to the council. The great bulk of that money was in effect money without strings attached. They made decisions, they made decisions at the local level, and the fruits of those decisions are all over Regina to be seen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — What is true of Regina is true of many, many other urban centres; this is by no means distinctive, this is characteristic of what has been done by this government to see that local governments, urban governments, have real local autonomy, have the ability to make decisions and have the wherewithal to carry out those decisions. Mr. Speaker, we're proud of what has happened in Regina, and we're justly proud.

Mr. Speaker, a number of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition deserve a somewhat more extended rebuttal, which I hope to give tomorrow along with other comments which I wish to make on matters which, I believe, are of concern and interest to the people of Saskatchewan. I will resume my remarks tomorrow and accordingly, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:58 p.m.