

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 2, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

## WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I want to welcome to this Legislative Assembly 40 grade 8 students from St. Henry's School in Melville. They have on this cold day come here to visit us and a number of other places in the city. They are here under the auspices and the chaperoning of Mr. Garth Gleisinger, their room teacher, and also the intern in that classroom, Miss Linda Glessing. Their bus drivers are Mr. Hollick (?) and Mr. Miller. I am sure that all members of this House, as well as you, want to take this opportunity to welcome these young people to this legislature. Hopefully, they will be able to gain from some of the things which go on in this legislature. I am sure they will be very interested in listening to the remarks of their Premier who will be speaking this afternoon. So on behalf of all the people of this House, I want to welcome the grade 8 students from St. Henry's School in Melville.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### Congratulations to Agribition Winner

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that, in this week of Agribition and with the tremendous show we are having over there, I introduce to you and to this Assembly a very distinguished winner from Agribition. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to this Assembly the reserve grand champion winner of the ostrich races at the 1980 Agribition.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture is commenting on the previous introduction?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I would be pleased to comment on the previous introduction. I want to extend my congratulations and the congratulations of all the members on the great victory of the hon. member for Souris-Cannington. Mr. Speaker, I share with the hon. member for Thunder Creek enthusiasm for the activity which is going on in Regina. It is just an exciting week. I encourage all members to visit Agribition during the time when the legislature isn't in session. It's just a great show. They say, Mr. Speaker, it's one of the world's greatest agricultural shows. I think we should start leaving out the "one" and call it the greatest agricultural show in the world.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Investigation of Culture and Youth Employees

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of culture and

youth. Mr. Minister, in the last session of the legislature (and I think I am referring to approximately the month of April), two prominent civil servants in the Department of Culture and Youth by the names of Cecil Nobes and Glenn Tuck were suspended pending investigation of certain activities. Mr. Minister, I questioned the former minister of culture and youth in this Assembly as to the particulars and exactly as to what was going on in the department in relation to these two individuals' activities. I note the investigation must be complete since one of the employees is now back in the Department of Culture and Youth. I would, therefore, ask you for a definitive statement on exactly what happened during this matter.

**HON. MR. McARTHUR:** — One employee was disciplined in accordance with The Public Service Act. The second employee was also disciplined and dismissed. There are further investigations under way with respect to the second employee on the part of the Attorney General's department.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, were you satisfied with the investigation which, I take from the minister's answer, was conducted by your department, and does your department believe that it was proper for these individuals to have approved the grant for the pool in Dewdney about which, incidentally, the Premier talked at great length in his speech yesterday? Are you satisfied that the investigation was conducted properly, when two employees approved a grant and then owned major shares in the construction company that built the facility for which the grant was approved? Do you believe that that was proper, as must the minister since he reinstated the employee?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer shortly put is yes, I am satisfied. I want to inform the members of the House of the obvious. The investigation was not carried out by the members of the Department of the Attorney General. The investigation was carried out by members of the police. In this case, I believe it was the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the people who are experts in this area, with perhaps some involvement by the Regina City Police. I'm not sure of the latter, but certainly of the RCMP. They carried out the investigative report. They submitted the investigative report to the Department of the Attorney General's lawyers, who, in consultation with the RCMP, determine whether or not charges should or should not be laid. My latest information is that the department and the RCMP have recommended against charges being laid in this regard.

I take the position to the members of the House, I repeat again, that those decisions are made by the prosecutorial branch of the department and not by me. That has always been the position. And since I believe that they are very competent prosecutors, fair-minded and able in this area, I am confident in respect to the investigative matter.

On the second question the member raised, I think he said something about the propriety of people being involved in this kind of a matter — propriety as opposed to illegality. We've already dealt with illegality in the first part of the question. I think the propriety of the matter will have to unfold in the normal course of events with respect to employment and the like, and that the Department of Culture and Youth will deal with it at some appropriate time.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, I don't bring this supplementary question to you simply because the pool happens to be in your constituency or because you made such a big deal about it yesterday in your speech. Mr. Premier, does this question not bring up a matter which has been brought to you

many times in this Assembly: the question of conflict of interest for public servants? Mr. Premier, regardless of the legalities (two employees approved a grant and were major shareholders in the company that built the facility for which they approved the grant), since one has been reinstated the present conflict of interest guideline within the public service obviously does not work. Obviously it does not work, Mr. Premier. Mr. Premier, I'm asking if you believe that this is a classic example showing that a brand new set of rules for conflicts of interest within the public service is now necessary and probably essential?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a good point. The rules may not be what they ought to be. We are certainly examining them. As I understand the situation, the senior employee, the out-of-scope employee, is no longer in the service of the government. The junior employee, who is in the union and under the union contract, was disciplined in accordance with the provisions of the union contract. It may well be that the rules do not specifically prohibit that which was done, if in fact it was done. I don't deny it; I simply am not informed fully. And it may well be that it was felt that the in-scope employee did not in fact recommend grants to anyone, which is probably technically the case since grants are almost certainly recommended to the deputy by an out-of-scope employee. I have already referred to the fact that the out-of-scope employee involved is no longer an employee of the government.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, would you tell this Assembly whether or not the retention of the junior employee was based strictly on the fact that he was a member of the union? Had he been an out-of-scope employee would you have dismissed him also?

**HON. MR. McARTHUR:** — The only activity in which the reinstated employee you are referring to should not have been permitted to engage in, in terms of The Public Service Act, was his participation in an unauthorized activity for gain outside of the public service. This means, essentially, without the authority of the public service commission or the department, he was involved, as a shareholder or a partner in a business which he had not received permission to be involved in. There was no indication beyond that that he had participated in any wrongdoing.

### **National Marketing Plan for Beef**

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I see in the throne speech you have made reference to the national marketing plan or board for beef and that you would be pursuing this particular proposal. Would you indicate to this House what support you have for this proposal from the beef producing community of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, in terms of support from provincial organizations, I can't give the member for Souris-Cannington an accurate report. I report to him that department officials have been discussing with the various farm organizations the position that the Government of Saskatchewan put forward to the provinces and the federal government at a meeting in July, which was calling for a national beef marketing commission and a national stabilization program.

I do not have the response of the farm organizations available. I will seek that out and provide it to the hon. member. I noted that when the federal Minister of Agriculture was

speaking to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, he talked about beef stabilization. I don't know what he had in mind, but certainly we will be pursuing with the federal minister what the federal government intends to do in this particular area.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister give this House and the beef producers of Saskatchewan his assurance that he will not endorse any such marketing plan or board without the support of the majority of the beef producers of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I report to the hon. member that the proposal we put forward to the federal government was a proposal put forward to us as a provincial government by the Western Canada Cow-Calf Association.

I note as well for the hon. member for Thunder Creek that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, which speaks for about 70,000 producers in Saskatchewan, takes a position on stabilization and marketing with respect to beef. I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, which is made up of the major commodity groups in the province, takes a position on marketing and stabilization of beef. So the proposal we put forward to the federal government and the other provincial governments was based on positions put forward to us from a number of farm organizations. But specifically as it relates to the plan itself, it was based on a proposal put forward by the Western Canada Cow-Calf Association.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister didn't hear the question. The question was: will you give this House your assurance that you will not move for such a marketing plan or board without the support of the majority of the beef producers of the province, the producers you claim to represent?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the Speech from the Throne talked about the implementation of a national plan. If the federal government is to proceed with the national plan then I would assume it will discuss that plan with respective farm organizations. If it's a plan in keeping with our thinking, we'll be glad to share the discussions of such a plan with the federal minister. I say to the hon. member opposite that if the federal government doesn't implement some kind of a program for beef producers, we, as a provincial government may well have to consider a program for beef producers in this province because I don't think the industry will continue, based on the conditions under which they have to operate. If the province makes a move, we'll certainly be discussing the options that we're considering with the farm organizations before making any moves.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Assuming that the federal plan as the minister had indicated may not come about, will the minister give his assurance that he will not bring in a provincial plan without the majority support of the beef producers in Saskatchewan, the producers you claim to represent?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I certainly hope that the province will not have to implement a plan because I don't think a provincial plan will do the job that a national plan would do. I reported to the hon. member that if we feel it necessary to proceed, we'll certainly be discussing it with the farm organizations and we will see on the basis of our discussion what their support is before we implement any kind of program.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### Exemptions Under Conflict of Interest Bill

**MR. COLLVER:** — Thank you, the question is to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the response today by the minister responsible for education and culture and youth, a question pertaining to conflict of interest in the civil service. You will recall that last year when this bill came before the Assembly, you and your minister responsible assured this Assembly that all exemptions granted to civil servants under the section of the act mentioned by the minister would be tabled in this legislature. I ask the minister and I ask you, Mr. Premier, where is that list of employees of the Government of Saskatchewan who have been granted exemptions under that section quoted by the minister today, which we were assured would be tabled in this legislature?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't recall the incident to which the hon. member is referring. I'll take notice of the question.

### Increase in Land Lease Rates

**MR. SWAN:** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, I have letters from four of my constituent and the concern that they are raising is regarding the lease increases for hay land and pasture land over the past few years. Just by way of information, for one section of hay lease in 1978 the lease rate was \$248, in 1979 it was \$900 and in 1980 it went to \$1,152. Does the Department of Agriculture in your government feel that increases of this magnitude are realistic at a time when the livestock industry is struggling to survive.

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose will be aware that there is formula applied in arriving at the lease fees for grazing leases and pasture leases and so on. The application of that formula has provided the kind of lease fee increases of the order the hon. member indicated. I think it's legitimate that there be a formula relating to costs of production and price. If the hon. member looks at what it costs to provide grazing and hay through ownership, through leasing from the private sector, or through leasing out in the market, compared to grazing leasing and pasture leasing from the provincial government, he will see that there is a significant subsidy for those producers who lease from the provincial government or lands branch as compared to the other sectors.

**MR. SWAN:** — Supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. As you are probably aware, prior to 1977 the lease rates were tied to livestock prices. In 1979 the cattle price increased about 17 per cent, but the least price increased by 232 per cent. How do you rationalize that kind of increase? What kind of a formula do you have?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not have the formula in my mind. What I will do for the hon. member is provide the formula for him. He can consider the components in the formula and then perhaps he can raise the issue at a later question period.

### Protesting Murders in El Salvador

**MR. PREBBLE:** — A question to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. The minister will be aware that late last week the leaders of all left-of-centre political parties in El Salvador were murdered at a single press conference when 200 El Salvadorian armed guards attacked the Jesuit high school in which the press conference was being held. My question to the minister is: will he, on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan,

officially protest these murders which have clearly been intentionally carried out by the Government of El Salvador and which are in total violation of human rights?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I certainly share, and I'm sure the government does (most members of the House will), the members' concerns about the reports which seem to be coming out of El Salvador. I will undertake to get the department to prepare a full report for me in this regard. Based on that report, if it so indicates, I will consider (when he says protest presumably he means writing a letter of protest) writing a letter of protest to the external affairs people in Ottawa outlining our shock at and concern with the particular circumstances there.

**MR. PREBBLE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister will also know (and it's unfortunate that the member for Thunder Creek seems unconcerned) that over 8,000 citizens of El Salvador have been killed this year, largely at the hands of death squads acting on behalf of the government there. My question to the minister is: will he consider writing the federal Minister of External Affairs urging Mr. MacGuigan to withdraw Canadian recognition of the military Government of El Salvador and to protest continuing United States military aid to El Salvador, given that such aid, in the amount of \$6 million this year, is clearly being used to finance police repression?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can add very much to the answer I gave the first question; I will get a report from my department officials regarding this particular matter. If the report seems to substantiate that which is written in the popular press, certainly I would be prepared to consider writing a letter protesting the violation of human rights. The question of treatment of political parties and individuals is something which this government believes should be the concern of all.

As for the question of formal recognition, I would be a little more reluctant to get into that. I think that is a responsibility of the external affairs people dealing on a nation-to-nation basis. I would not want to rule that out as being a part of the protest for the time being but I will not give my commitment to the member in that regard at this particular point.

**MR. COLLVER:** — My supplementary question to the Attorney General is quite simply this. At the same time as he is expending the people of Saskatchewan's money on his officials to study this problem, will the minister also study the imprisonment of hundred and hundreds of officials in Russia by the Russian government — the Russian Communist government? Will you also study that and have a report and send a letter if the report proves to be the same thing?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I indicate again that this is not a question of taking on particularly one government or another government. Where there is a violation of rights, the people of this Legislative Assembly, I would like to think, have a concern, wherever that violation takes place.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan supports the international declaration of human rights, which the United Nations has promulgated, the federal government has supported, and some of the individual provinces have agreed to subscribe to. We have subscribed to that and wherever it is violated, whether violations affect people in Russia or otherwise, as signatories we would be obligated to express our opinion on them.

### **Woody Lake Forest Fire**

**MR. HARDY:** — To the minister responsible for renewable resources. About 250,000 acres of our prime timber was lost in a Woody Lake fire last year and a 10-mile front of it crossed over the Manitoba boundary and destroyed about the same number of acres in Manitoba. The Government of Manitoba has strongly criticized the efforts that allowed the fire to cross the border. In addition, the Government of Manitoba routinely conducts an inquiry into any major fires in the province. Will the minister indicate if the Government of Saskatchewan has conducted or will conduct an inquiry into the Woody Lake fire?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the member opposite, the government, as a normal procedure, has an internal post-mortem on all fires that happen in a big way, and does look at the problems that have been encountered in trying to learn from any experiences. That is a part of the procedure, always has been, and will continue to be a part of the procedure.

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Can the minister tell this House whether or not consideration has been given into strip cutting or any other improved methods that might help save our forests in the event of another fire?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the detail that the member is talking about in terms of the type of cutting practices that are used, maybe by somebody else, in regard to saving forest fire damage. I don't think cutting practices are going to stop forest fires and will have a significant effect on the slowing down or stopping of forest fires. If the member has some information that we're not aware of, we'd be very happy to receive that information on how clear cutting will improve forest fire situations.

### **Demand Meters for Electricity**

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the minister responsible for SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation). Mr. Minister, in light of the power increases over the last couple of years, many rural Saskatchewan communities are voicing deep concern as it relates to the financial burden that demand meters are placing on their facilities. Would the minister indicate to the Assembly if there are any immediate plans to remove these demand meters from such facilities?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I'll take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker.

### **On the Orders of the Day**

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **ADDRESS IN REPLY**

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

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate yesterday, I had an opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, the hon. members for Yorkton and Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. I am proud of them, just as I am proud of the many, many members on this side of the House who do a creditable job, and of members opposite. I know that the two members, the member for Yorkton and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, will continue to make an excellent contribution to this Assembly as they have already done in this debate.

I extend my congratulations again to the Leader of the Opposition who has had his tenure extended as the member leading the official opposition. We did our best to see he kept his job. We are happy to see that he has, in fact, kept his job.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I welcome again the three newest members for The Battlefords, Estevan and Kelsey-Tisdale. I know that a number of members opposite would understandably be disappointed at the defeat in last week's by-election of the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan. Mr. Devine, I know that members of the Liberal Party will be saddened by the fact that their undeclared leadership candidate, Mr. Ralph Goodale, could not be in this House. I confess that I have some sympathy with them, not a great deal, understandably, but one necessarily must sympathize with person who have fought elections and lost them. I would have enjoyed, in one sense of the words, having the Leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan, Mr. Devine, in this House so that he could outline for us his programs and entertain us with some of the things he is reported to have said when I read the press. I know it is likely that the press must be stating views other than his, since I doubt whether Mr. Devine or any other responsible political leader could be expressing the views which are attributed to him in the press.

Down at Estevan, I think it is fair to say that it was an epic battle and the best man won. I am delighted to welcome the new MLA for Estevan, Mr. Jack Chapman.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I am equally delighted to welcome our other new MLA, Mr. David Miner, the member for The Battlefords.

They are competent men, as members opposite will soon know, as we already know. We are proud of their electoral victory. We are going to be equally proud of their performance in this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I would also like to welcome the new member for Kelsey-Tisdale, Mr. Neal Hardy. I was pleased to note his entry into the question period this afternoon. I know he will continue to work for his constituents as all hon. member members attempt to work for their constituents. I congratulate him on winning a seat. As I indicated yesterday, the fact that he has won a seat in the Assembly puts him in the front rank of leadership contenders in his party, should that leadership come under review.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think it reasonable and fair to comment on some of the remarks made by the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, suggesting somehow that 60 per cent of the voters in that constituency rejected the NDP. That I suppose in one sense is true, but it is more accurate to say that approximately 65 per cent of the voters rejected the Leader of the Conservative Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!



**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — That is altogether startling considering the fact that the Leader of the Conservative Party in contesting Estevan in 1980 got about 36 per cent of the vote (under 36 per cent), when the former member for Estevan, Mr. Larter, in contesting the same seat for the same party in 1958, got almost 55 per cent of the votes. A drop of about 19 per cent! We on this side of the House would have liked to have been successful in the constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale, but all in all we look at those by-elections with some satisfaction. We went into the by-elections with 44 seats; we came out of the by-elections with 44 seats; our leader is in the House and no other party can make that statement.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — The member for Nipawin has caught my eye. He points out that he is a party leader and he is in this House, and to that minor extent I will qualify my statement.

Mr. Speaker, I say in all sincerity that we on this side of the House respected the former member for Estevan. We are naturally pleased with the political colour of his replacement, but we have to say that the former member for Estevan served his constituents well and has every right to be proud of his public service in this province. We are sorry that he is lost to this House but we take no responsibility for that loss. Members opposite must take full responsibility for the fact that the former member for Estevan is no longer in this House. They must ask themselves whether or not this sacrifice of a good MLA was necessary in all the circumstances.

The government has lost two fine MLAs and cabinet ministers through retirement, two men who have served in this Assembly with distinction for a combined total of 41 years: the minister of highways for 28, the minister of mineral resources for 13. Good years, progressive years, mostly CCF and NDP years, very good years indeed. Both ministers will be missed — by us and by their constituents. But their legacies will be with the people of Saskatchewan for years to come. Our excellent highways, our strict but necessary safety regulations — Eiling Kramer is the man most responsible. The land bank, FarmStart, our innovative policies on resources, PCS — their success story is John Messer's success story.

I, and I am sure all the people of Saskatchewan, understand the desire of these men to move out of the political arena into lives which are a bit more orderly, just as I am sure they understand the desire of the former minister of culture and youth to step down from the cabinet and concentrate on his duties as an MLA and a family man. I understand their decisions; I regret them. I wish teach of them well in their new endeavours.

Mr. Speaker, in beginning my remarks on the address and reply to the Speech from the Throne, I would like to refer to the Lieutenant-Governor's comments on Celebrate Saskatchewan. In the throne speech he said that his government is pleased with the renewed sense of pride our people have acquired as citizens of Saskatchewan and of Canada. And I say that the Lieutenant-Governor, when reading the throne speech, as he so often is, is entirely right. Our government is delighted with the success of our year commemorating Saskatchewan's 75th anniversary as a Canadian province. We have been pleased and gratified at the total support and enthusiasm shown by the people of Saskatchewan for Celebrate Saskatchewan activities all across the province.

His Honor mentioned a few numbers. Eight hundred and seventy communities held special events; a total of 3,600 projects and events registered with Celebrate Saskatchewan. Over 7,300 committee members have been actively involved in planning and executing these projects, and these are impressive numbers.

I mention one more number. During the two and one-half years since this government established its Celebrate Saskatchewan program, our entire budget was about \$7 million — and our program will be operating under budget. Nothing fancy. No gold medallions. But golden memories. Our made-in-Saskatchewan reunions will live in the memory of our people long after staged shows are totally forgotten.

But I don't want to talk just about numbers, impressive as they are. I want to talk briefly about what those numbers suggest, about our people, about our past, and, even more important, about our future as a provincial community within our Canadian nation.

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't like this portion of my remarks to appear particularly partisan. In fact, I'd like to compliment members opposite for the manner in which they took part in the Celebrate Saskatchewan celebrations. They, as we, recognized that Celebrate Saskatchewan was a political event but a political event involving all parties and all groups, not simply the government party. We tried hard to make those events genuine community events and, I believe, that we succeeded in making them that.

I'd like to take issue, however, with a statement recently made by the Leader of the Conservative Party. He said that we should return to the spirit of free enterprise which built this province. Now, I concede, out of hand, that free enterprise, by which I mean individual initiative, individual heroism, and individual courage, was a major part in building this province. That's true, certainly, of almost any pioneer society. But what makes Saskatchewan different, is the extra — the extra that Saskatchewan has. It was the spirit of co-operation, of banding together for the common good, which made this province what it is today. Certainly we had the individual, raw courage that broke these prairies but we also had that spirit of working together, that spirit of neighbourliness which makes Saskatchewan the distinctive province it is. It has been the fountainhead of our co-ops and our pools and our community organizations. It has been a spirit which said, 'In this vast and often hostile land, by myself I can do little; together we can do much.'

This is the spirit which built Saskatchewan. It came to us, by and large, from the doctrines of the Christian church which told us, and keep telling us today, that we are our brother's keeper; that we are, and necessarily must be, our brother's helper. That's a far more significant fact in our history than any idea of free enterprise, although that, in some aspects is clearly with us.

It is this spirit which made Celebrate Saskatchewan such a success. To make our year work, Saskatchewan people did what they've always done when they had a problem to solve or a celebration to get off the ground. They banded together. They formed committees. They worked together — and they worked together hard! And they had enormous success.

Celebrate Saskatchewan was a success story for the people of Saskatchewan. In addition to that, it has been a great deal of fun. Our purpose, essentially, was to honour our people, particularly our pioneers, but also those who are with us today, the distinguished citizens who are still alive, and to look forward to the province which we will leave to our descendants. We've honoured them by digging into our roots, by

remembering the strength and determination of our beginnings and, most important, be reaffirming and recapturing the unique Saskatchewan spirit that has always been the mainstay of our province.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is this. Celebrate Saskatchewan has been far more than a simple birthday party. Behind every family reunion, within every community parade and barbecue, alongside every local history that was completed (and so many were done so well), one profound theme emerged. That theme is the triumph of the Saskatchewan experiment in community living.

We've been schooled in adversity in this province, honed by the near-insurmountable obstacles of environment and of distant uncaring institutions of our great nation. Finally, we have been enriched by the unconquerable spirit of a pioneer people.

Mr. Speaker, in 1931 Mr. George H. Williams, once a member of this Assembly for the constituency of Wadena, and one of the pioneers of the farm movements in this province, said of our party:

We must decide whether we are really going to accept as our road the road to a social commonwealth, or continue to support a system of individualism and worship at the shrine of personal gain. Self or society? Individual wealth or commonwealth? Which road?

My friends, you have a right to a living from the fruits of your labor. You have a right to give your children the kind of future you planned for them when you brought them into the world.

In the 50-odd years since that statement, I believe that Saskatchewan has taken the right road.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Certainly we have had some false starts, taken some wrong turns. We have occasionally been stalled in our journey towards a more co-operative society. And in this imperfect world we will never reach perfection. But we have made a creditable start. In celebrating Saskatchewan one thing we have celebrated is a noble journey, well begun.

Now, Mr. Speaker, taking the success of Celebrate Saskatchewan, considering it, I would like to talk about some of the things this government is doing and will be doing in the future.

The triple theme of our year has been: honour our past, examine our present and look to the future. In honouring our past, we have been honouring those sturdy pioneer men and women who built the foundation for the society we have today. And while Celebrate Saskatchewan was in no sense a government celebration, I think it is fair to say that one important instrument the people have used over the 75 years in the life of this province, and before, to build a fairer, more equitable community is their provincial government. People in this province have always regarded their provincial government as their instrument to build a better society.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Any government exists by the will of the people and short is the life of any government which ignores that fact. Consequently the history of this government, our own government since 1971 and its CCF predecessors, has been guided by one central idea, that we must find programs and policies which are satisfactory to and enrich the lives of the people of Saskatchewan. That has been our guiding philosophy. CCF and NDP governments have been in office for 29 of the last 36 years. We have tried to make this our guiding philosophy. I don't suggest that other parties would have another philosophy. I am very sure they would mount very different policies in order to achieve their objectives.

The people have placed their trust in CCF and NDP governments and we have responded with what we believe are "people first" programs. We have been guided by the fundamental idea that it is the government's responsibility to do as much as possible to remove the large disparities, the gross discriminations, which do exist even in this past society. It is our job to do the best we can to achieve the best possible balance between the rights of the individuals and the needs of a caring, sharing society. Because of this basic commitment, we have introduced, in the past and currently, some broad, universal programs which would make it easier for the individual to cope with his society and allow him some sense of security as far as his basic needs were concerned.

Hence, good schools for all; community colleges; easy access to universities; province-wide, universal hospitalization; medicare, and hence increased social services; government insurance, and any number of programs whose basic purpose is to protect the individual and provide some equality in necessary services.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Government insurance.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Government insurance indeed, providing insurance to some of the people who would have to pay two or three times those rates at rates which they can indeed . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — . . . and hence an economic plan which takes the resources of Saskatchewan and uses them to finance the creation of these programs for people.

In the beginning we painted with a broad brush. Because there were so many things to be done, we could clearly attack a broad range of needs with a universal program like medicare or hospitalization. The watchword then was universality. And much still remains to be done to make sure that our programs remain alive to the realities of a changing society.

But now, Mr. Speaker, as we move into the 1980s, as we take cognizance of the lessons of our past, as we build on that spirit of Celebrate Saskatchewan that I spoke of, now is the time we can and should be creating programs and policies which go beyond universal programs, that do not have something for everybody but rather that help those who need it most. Now is the time for us, as a government and as a people, to look to the needs of some special groups in our province to ensure that the basic quality of life, the needs of some special groups in our province to ensure that the basic quality of life, which the great majority of us take for granted, is extended as best we can to all individuals and all groups. With that concept in mind, I would like to comment specifically on some programs designed to satisfy not only the basic needs of our people, but also needs which move beyond those basic needs and which are felt

strongly by some smaller groups in our society who particularly need our help. As it was in the beginning, the driving force behind these ideas is that people come first.

What does the opposition believe? They tell us that they believe the same things as we. But it's hard to find how they translate their broadly-stated beliefs into specific programs. They use abstract words like freedom, and individualism, and free enterprise, and government interference. Now, those are big words and those are strong words. But what really do they mean? What they really mean is this: they say that they want government out of the hip pocket of the citizen. That is what they say. Being translated it means that the strong have no concern for the weak; the advantaged have no need to look after the disadvantaged; the rich have no need to pay any attention to the poor. Because surely that is what it means when they say government should stay away from interfering with the rich citizens. We can only share in this society if rich share with poor; if the rich say we have a right to be rich and the government has no right to make us share, then they are saying others are going to be in perpetual poverty.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — The Leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan said that there are 67,000 people on welfare — the same number as farmers. That's one of the arguments he used during the recent by-election campaigns. Now he's making three or four mistakes in that statement, but that's about par for the course. There are not quite 70,000 farmers, and there are only about 67,000 people on welfare if you consider programs like our supplementary income program for senior citizens as welfare: only if you consider the family income plan as welfare — and I will come to that in a moment. I don't know whether he's saying that we have too many farmers. He's already said that.

He is already on record as saying that four out of five farmers should go, but I leave that for another occasion. Is he saying that we have too many people on welfare? And that, I think, is what he is saying. And keep in mind how he gets his number of 67,000. He is saying that people should be free of this welfare. Now I want to know, and I'm going to consider for a moment, which people he is going to free from this welfare burden. He says we have too many senior citizens. I leave aside that comment. But I suspect that they are the first target that he would cut off — 29,000 senior citizens who get the Saskatchewan Income Plan. Those are people whom he includes in his numbers to get 67,000. He wants to cut them off. But we don't call that plan welfare; we call it a just and deserving distribution of our resources to pioneers in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — We honoured them this year. We tried to say that we appreciated their contribution to making this province what it is. The would-be member for Estevan, the Leader of the Conservative Party, says that they are part of the huge welfare rolls. "We should cut them off. We should have them show a little initiative and look after themselves. Surely they don't want that kind of government interference. Cut them off."

Who else would he cut off? How about the 8,000 families that received the family income plan? These also must be included in his total to get this figure of 67,000. Should they be classed as what he calls recipients of welfare? Certainly they're getting help from their fellow citizens. We think a lot of people should get help from their fellow citizens. And these people should very much get help. These people are working people

who are working steadily at a job and who, because of their lack of skills or because of their large families, don't get quite enough to get along. We send them a little bit more money to augment their incomes which they get from working, and we say that's a good way to run society. We say that those people are proper recipient of help from their neighbours. We say that they should keep getting that money. Members opposite say, "Cut them off; that's the way to cut down that figure. Cut them off."

Now if we listen to the Conservatives we could eliminate these two programs and dispense with 40,000 people or so. All these people would be free of government interference. They would be free of being on what he calls welfare, but what I call proper payments to senior citizens and working citizens with special needs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — He would probably say, "I don't really mean those 40,000; I mean the 20,000 or so who are on the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan." He want to release those people from government interference.

Who are these people? They are 2,600 disabled citizens and their 650 dependents. Should those people be cut off to get the welfare rolls down as member opposite keep calling them? We call them lists of people in this society who need special concern and special attention.

How about the 2,600 who are in such ill health that they are unable to work, and their 1,700 dependents? What about them? Would he cut them off? What about the 1,000 mentally handicapped people who sort years ago would have been in a mental hospital but are now out in the community looking after their own personal needs, but are yet able to hold a job and still need some support from their fellow citizens? I don't know whether the proposal of the members opposite is to cut them off or put them back in the mental hospitals. In either case I say that that's a heartless policy and we, for our part, are proud of the fact that we are providing them with some benefits.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — We could mention the nearly 4,000 single parents and their nearly 7,000 dependents. They have special problems. Members opposite say, "Cut them off. Cut them off; that will handle the welfare rolls."

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, using words like freedom and individualism. We could take the advice of members opposite and cast thousands of people out on their own. Certainly this would lower the "welfare rolls." But I suggest to you that Saskatchewan people, who are justifiably concerned if people are abusing welfare, would be the first to revolt. God bless them; they'd be the first to revolt if we applied those heartless policies to their fellow citizens. Saskatchewan people have a conscience even if some members of the Conservative Party don't.

You know, the Conservative Party ran a by-election in Regina North-West a year or so ago by trying to stir up resentment against people of native origin. I am proud to say the people in the riding rejected it strongly and moved the Conservative Party from second place to third place.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Now their policy apparently is to stigmatize anyone who get any help from the government by calling it welfare and to stir up their fellow citizens against these many people who receive assistance.

I predict that Saskatchewan people will continue to reject that kind of appeal. They know we have an obligation to those less fortunate than ourselves. They want this province to act in a decent and honourable way. I suspect they will continue to support a party which believes that this government and those citizens who are doing well because of the rich resources of this province ought to assist those of our fellow citizens who are in need.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — In the past, our attention as a government has, as I indicated, been focussed on the basic needs of our people. That is why we introduced these broad, sweeping programs like community colleges, hospitalization, medicare, drug plan, dental plan and the rest. Now our programs need some finer tuning.

Under the umbrella of the universal programs I spoke of, we need to work with individual groups with special needs, people who have not fully shared in our province's opportunities and individual groups such as children with problems. We intend to emphasize working with families in their homes, to help their children participate fully in society, to help them prepare for independent living. Now this is not easy to do, but it's vitally important that we succeed. In many cases, problem families produce problem children unless those families can be helped with their problems. The vast majority of people want to be self-reliant, to help themselves. But paradoxically, they sometimes need help to help themselves.

The same concept of self-reliance applies to our expanding network of local home care boards. Already 36 of those district boards have been set up. Ten will soon be delivering services such as Meals on Wheels, handyman services, nursing care, and visiting homemakers. We believe that whenever possible, our seniors belong where they usually want to be — in their own homes, in their own communities, with their family and friends. Home care will, in many cases, make that possible.

Mr. Speaker, more and more families have either both parents or only a single parent in the work force. There is an increasing need there for day care services for children. We have conducted comprehensive public hearings to examine our day care program. We hope to expand it. I expect that later in the session my colleague, the Minister of Social Services, will be reporting to this Assembly on the results of that study.

for the 1980s, Mr. Speaker, we hope to develop a health system which is much more than hospital and medical insurance, dental care and a drug plan. The health system of the 1980s will make better use of community and family support services. It will place emphasis on education in the schools and in the communities. It will encourage participation in fitness programs and cultural and recreational activities as ways to sustain healthy living. Individuals and their communities will be invited to enter into a new partnership with the government and also with the health profession, the health institutions and all other acting in this field to meet the challenge of healthy living.

We've already made a good start. As I indicated yesterday, the dental nurses who work

in the dental plan spend a good deal of their time on prevention, on trying to fill little minds with good habits rather than filling little teeth and blob of metal.

And there has been a greatly increased emphasis on the importance of our lifestyle, of the need for exercise, of not smoking, of the non-use or careful use of alcohol and prescription drugs and the like. We have had programs like Aware program, the Feeling Good program, and there has been the federal-provincial program emphasizing participation — the Participation program. And on healthful recreation and companionship, there has been a good deal of emphasis, and this is so important for the emotional well-being of our senior citizens and others.

Yes, the 1970s have seen great strides, but much more needs to be done and will be done. Not all by the provincial government — by no means! In the great Saskatchewan tradition, much will be done by community groups and by local government and by churches and charitable organizations as well as by their government.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, society is changing. In education as well as in health and social services, this government is responding to the changing needs of our people. As in health and social services, we can now zero in more particularly on individual groups. Let me bring to your attention, and to the attention of all members of this House, some things that this government did last year to make education more accessible to all.

We greatly increased our grants for services to handicapped students — a particularly needy group. We funded Celebrate Saskatchewan projects developed at the local school level to the tune of \$30,000. We established an official minority language office, and a full-time multicultural education consultant to assist groups in this society who are trying to preserve their particular culture and their particular language tradition. We took steps to promote a more positive representation of women in our school curriculum. We gave increases in operating and construction grants to school boards — capital grant increases of 20 per cent. We provided more financial assistance to our post-secondary students and increased the grants to community colleges, to technical institutes and to the universities. University grants increased by about 8.9 per cent, which at the time it was announced was the highest in Canada, and I think is the highest or second highest still.

We have started new programs at our community colleges and technical institutes for emergency medical technicians, for telecommunications technicians, for visiting homemakers, for day care workers — all of this in one year, Mr. Speaker. Certainly much more needs to be done, but for a program for one year, most people would agree — pretty impressive.

We have embarked on some far-sighted programs to help native people, to help the urban poor and rural people so they can take advantage of the opportunities opened up by education. The community schools program in Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Regina will provide extra staff and resources for inner-city schools, and I think this is a frontier area. I heard on the radio today that we can anticipate that in a city like Regina perhaps 20 per cent of the people will be of native origin very shortly, and that many of these people have a different culture than we have and need special assistance to relate to urban Saskatchewan culture.

The Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Program will increase the number of native teachers in the province. We would like to hear what the opposition says about some of these programs. We funded the development of the Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native



Studies and Applied Research in Regina. This institute will support the development of knowledge about native history and native culture. We want the opposition to tell us whether they think those are good programs or bad programs.

We are starting a native career development program — co-operation with native people and with educational institutions and with unions and employers in the private sector, to train and employ natives. We think that's a good program.

In this Year of the Disabled, in 1981, we will provide more funding and improved services for handicapped students. We will increase services for minority cultures in the province to broaden educational horizons. We want, in the course of this session, to find out whether members opposite believe these are good programs or bad programs. We find sometimes they will tell us that they are good programs when they are speaking to one group; they will tell us they are bad programs when they are speaking to another group. Accordingly, we would delight in having them tell us what they think of these programs when there is someone recording what they say so that we have the opportunity to have it on the record.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you this record is a proud one. It's not enough, certainly not. There are people who still need help from their neighbours and help from their government. We hope to help them. We will stack our record on social services, on education and on health against the record of any other government of Canada, particularly any Tory government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want now to turn to an issue of vital concern to Saskatchewan and to Canada. I am referring to the constitutional resolution before the Parliament of Canada. There have been several significant developments in the constitutional discussions in the last six months. There was the referendum in the province of Quebec on May 20, in which a clear majority of Quebecers rejected sovereignty-association. On June 9 there was a first ministers' meeting which set in motion the new round of constitutional talks. There was the long summer of intensive federal-provincial negotiations carried on by teams, headed on the federal side by the Hon. Jean Chretien and on the provincial side by our colleague, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Riversdale, the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow.

We had the September first minister's conference where, for a number of reasons, governments failed to reach agreement on a package of constitutional changes. Now the process of constitutional negotiations has been brought to a brutal halt. We are faced with the federal government's decision to take unilateral action to patriate and amend the constitution. The Prime Minister seeks to have the constitution of Canada patriated, that is brought home from Great Britain, transferred from Great Britain to Canada — simple enough. I know of no one in Canada, not even members opposite, who disagree with that move in principle. It may well be that there are two members opposite who disagree with that but I will not plumb their views. They will have an opportunity to express them.

Mr. Trudeau seeks not only to patriate the constitution but also to change it in way which affect the rights and powers of all citizens and of their provincial governments. He seeks to accomplish this unilaterally, without the consent of the provinces. Mr. Speaker, this move clearly violates a well-established constitutional convention, an established rule of 50 years standing, which says that major changes to the

constitution which affect provincial governments require provincial consent. Our government deeply regrets Ottawa has chosen not to respect this convention. We object strenuously to unilateral action of the kind proposed, as do most other provinces.

I think it is abundantly clear that the Prime Minister is determined to proceed. When we became apprized of the fact that the Prime Minister was determined to proceed, we had to ask ourselves some tough questions. Do Canadians want continued confrontation on this constitutional issue? Would it serve Canada's interests or Saskatchewan's interests to plunge this country into a prolonged and bitter constitutional controversy? Can we afford, as a nation, to compound division with division?

Those are difficult questions, Mr. Speaker. How you answer them really depends upon whether the primary objection which you might have is the way the federal government is proceeding (the unilateral nature of their action, the process) or whether the chief objection is to what they are trying to do. If it's the process, then, however much one might object to it, the effect will be short-lived and will be gone in a year or so. However, if it's the content, then if we object to the content, we should say it now because we'll be living with it for 100 years. These questions have to be addressed not only in the context of the controversy over the constitution itself, but also in the context of the controversy over the federal budget and its energy program which have added to the regional tensions in this country.

Given these important considerations and notwithstanding our strong objection in principle to the process (the federal government's unilateral action), our government has decided to seek changes in the content of the federal resolution. These are changes which we believe would remove its most glaring inequities, produce a more balanced package, and make it more generally acceptable to all Canadians. No one through this process is going to overcome people's objections to the unilateral nature of the process; we might however, overcome some objections to the contents of the package.

We've deferred our decision to oppose or support the federal move until such time as we see what modifications can be made in the content of the proposed resolution. Mr. Speaker, the opposition has roundly condemned this position, a position we feel is in the interest of the people we have been elected to serve. They would prefer that we join ranks with the six provinces which arrived at a different conclusion and decided not to attempt to patch up (as they might say) the contents of the resolution but to state their objections firmly to the process and not deal with the contents but proceed to oppose the federal government in the courts.

I admit that option has a strong appeal. There is no question in our mind that what the federal government is doing is, as to process, improper. But over and above the real concerns which I have already mentioned, we had to examine some practical considerations. We had to ask ourselves what would be achieved by immediate and outright opposition.

Everybody likes to take a firm stand; it is so much easier than attempting to work through a compromise position. But what would come from taking a stand of immediate and outright opposition? Would Mr. Trudeau's resolve melt away before a concerted provincial opposition? Anyone who believes that has not lived in Canada these last 13 years. Anyone who believes that probably bet on the Hamilton Tiger Cats to win the Grey Cup!

You say, “Perhaps we don’t have to melt Mr. Trudeau’s intransigence. What about the courts?” Will the courts rule against the federal government? Perhaps, but perhaps not. Our government has learned through bitter experience that even the best of cases are not watertight. One can win in two courts in Saskatchewan, each time unanimously, and still lose in the supreme court.

Would the British parliament refuse to action on Mr. Trudeau’s request because it did not have the support of all or most of the provinces? Perhaps, but perhaps not. In short, it is impossible to predict with certainty if the various provincial countermeasures would succeed. And if they did not succeed we would be left for perhaps 100 years with a constitution based upon the federal resolution without any changes — a resolution which I say has great shortcoming and omissions. We judged therefore that in the first instance we had a responsibility to make every effort to change the contents of the resolution. We decided that we would fight to improve the federal government’s proposals rather than give free reign to our legitimate resentment. We would embark upon a positive course of action rather than immediately engaging in a further battle with Ottawa, a battle of which the ultimate outcome is unknown. Such a battle might still be necessary if changes in the contents of the resolution cannot be secured. But we will make that decision when the time comes.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the substance of what the Prime Minister is attempting to do is what is most important to the people of Saskatchewan and to the people of Canada. Two or three years from now what will really matter is what the constitution of Canada is and not how it came to be.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — And while other governments, for their own good reasons (and I do not criticize them), choose not to fight on those grounds, we have so chosen. We are very hopeful that our efforts will ultimately benefit Saskatchewan and Canada as a whole.

We have already seen some indications of flexibility. As you know, Mr. Trudeau has given a commitment to add a provision which will strengthen provincial control over resources, a provision obtained very largely (as member opposite suggested), by the federal NDP, certainly not by the federal Tories. When they might well have been able to obtain very, very substantial improvements, they have decided that they will simply oppose. I understand their course of action, but what will it produce? We will find that out in due course.

The provision proposed will enable provinces to levy both direct and indirect taxes on resource production and to pass laws in relation to interprovincial trade in resources. That is an important change and if enacted it will go a long way toward meeting the objectives which Saskatchewan and other provinces have sought in recent constitutional negotiations. It will solve most of the problems we encountered in the Cigol case (that was the Bill 42 case), and most of the problems encountered in the Central Canada Potash case, each of which we lost in the supreme court.

But it doesn’t go all the way. We will continue to press for additional assurances on resources. In particular we will seek assurances that the steps we take to regulate the production of a resource in Saskatchewan will not be struck down by the courts merely because the resource is sold outside of Canada — because as the lawyers say, it deals

with the subject of international trade. We will be pressing for that. We are well aware of the fact that changes would be desirable in the provisions of the constitution dealing with the declaration power of the federal government. We hope, certainly to get some of these changes.

Members opposite who suggest that a power to levy indirect taxes on resources is not valuable to Saskatchewan are the same members who were prepared to give away most of the money which we would have raised by that process to the international oil companies and the international potash companies.

The essential reason why we lost the Bill 42 case was that the taxes which we levied were deemed to be indirect taxes. Our right to levy direct taxes would reinstitute almost every word of Bill 42, the bill which was struck down by the supreme court.

Mr. Speaker, we are pressing for changes in other areas too. We seek major changes in the proposed referendum procedure for amending the constitution. The resolution now provides that the federal government can call a referendum on a proposed constitutional change without ever referring the proposed change to provincial legislatures for debate. And that's not right. On matters as important and complicated as constitutional changes, the public has the right to have some debate in parliament and also in provincial legislatures before being asked to vote. On matters as complicated as a constitutional change every person in every corner of Canada should have an opportunity to have the opinion of his legislator on that matter.

So we want the constitution changed, or we want the resolution changed, so the constitution will provide that if a referendum is to be used at all (and we don't favour referendums), it can be used only after parliament and the provincial legislatures have had a chance to consider a proposed amendment and have been unable to agree.

Also we want to make sure that the constitution provides for fair and impartial rules to govern any referendum, and that it allows referendums to be used in appropriate circumstances where an amendment is supported by the provinces but not agreed to by the federal government. Also, along with other provinces, we are seeking a strengthening of the equalization provisions.

The Prime Minister has indicated that he is agreeable in principle to moving in some of these areas. But we are not prepared to agree on the basis of a general commitment. We will need to see the specific changes before we are able to agree.

Mr. Speaker, if we are not able to agree on changes which we consider essential, Saskatchewan will have no option but to oppose the federal resolution, even though this might precipitate further acrimonious confrontation. But we hope that won't be necessary. We continue to believe that a broader consensus in Canada is possible, that we can search out and find an acceptable compromise and acceptable accommodation, because compromise has been the basis of Canada for 100 years.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, those of us in office must lay aside our sense of grievance, however justifiable we may feel it to be. We have an obligation to seek, with diligence and patience, the accommodation so clearly needed to strengthen the unity of our country. Mr. Speaker, that is an obligation that the Government of Saskatchewan will try to discharge. We will soon be appearing before the special joint committee on the constitution in Ottawa to reiterate as forcefully as we can how unacceptable the resolution is in its present state and to impress upon that committee that committee the need for

significant changes. But if we fail, if the federal government is not willing to be flexible and accommodate changes to make the package more acceptable to Saskatchewan and others, we will have no course open to us but to oppose the resolution. And we will oppose it with every instrument at our disposal.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should qualify that. We wouldn't want to use all instruments. I don't support what I see happening in western Canada now — some of the proposals put forward by what I call the new breed of Tory who is half for Canada and half for separation. Tories like the former leader of the Conservative Party, the member for Nipawin, or his supporter, the member for Swift Current, who believe we should leave Canada; or Tories like the former MP for Calgary, Mr. Carl Nickle, who has been calling for and organizing for separation; or like the more than 2,000 who a few days ago met in Edmonton to trumpet the cause of western separation.

Tories, ex-Tories, and perhaps ex-Liberals, may be comfortable with that talk of separation. You have seen the reports in newspapers a few weeks ago about armies to be raised in the West to fight the East. I want to say that this sort of talk should be laid aside for the time being. We should talk about getting a broader consensus in Canada. We should be aiming at unity and not at division. Certainly that is the policy of the New Democratic Party. We have our problems with Ottawa — goodness knows! We have fought with Ottawa as steadfastly as any government in Canada. We've won some of those battles and we've lost some of those battles. But above all, we stand for fighting our battles within a united Canada. We stand against western separation and for a strong Saskatchewan in a strong united Canada.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to some other subjects of particular concern to Saskatchewan people.

Saskatchewan's approach to economic development, geared to Saskatchewan ownership, to diversification, and to opportunities for young people, is clearly evident in our policies for agriculture. Over vehement objections from old-line parties we've introduced some far-seeing policies. Policies like the farm ownership legislation which limits to 10 acres the amount of land that can be owned by any non-resident. Policies like land bank which has leased land to 2,700 farmers who otherwise might not be on the land. Policies like FarmStart which makes loans available for intensification through livestock operations.

FarmStart has seen many young farmers get on the land: 2,000 new beef operators, 500 new dairy operators (that's over half the dairy operators in Saskatchewan), 500 new hog producers, 65 new poultry operations, 70 new bee operations. This program and its ready acceptance indicates that Saskatchewan people are pleased with FarmStart. The demand for the program is growing almost faster than we are able to meet it. So far in 1980 we've had 800 new applications.

We're pleased with what FarmStart and land bank have done for the Saskatchewan farm situation. Member opposite don't like these programs but the farmers who have retired with cash in their pockets like these programs. The young men who want to get into farming and know that their only hope is land bank like these programs.

I recall the Pelly by-election. I certainly have not bought any land bank land. I haven't leased any land bank land. But there are a number of Conservative candidates around

this province who can't say that. In the Pelly by-election, the candidate who was going from community to community attacking land bank took a little while out from his campaign to sign his land bank lease. He thought it was a good program, and he was right. It is a good program. He knows that a loan program to assist young people to buy land . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm looking opposite me and I don't see anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. member for Thunder Creek that I have not secured any land bank land. I want to point out, however, that there are 2,700 farmers who have secured land bank and who are very glad that they have secured land bank land. They know that a loan program offered by the Tories is already in place through the farm credit corporation. The great bulk of them looked into the possibility of getting land through the farm credit corporation and know that they could never have had land that way. That's why they came to the land bank. That's why they leased land from the land bank, and that's why those 2,700 young men are farming in Saskatchewan today. There have been 2,700 land bank leases, 4,200 FarmStart loans, 7,000 new farmers.

In the last half of the 1970s the trend to reducing farm numbers in Saskatchewan has slowed dramatically. From 1966 to 1971 (this period will be known to some members opposite) the number of Saskatchewan farms dropped by 2 per cent a year. From 1971 to 1976 that number fell to 1.6 per cent a year. From 1976 to 1980 it fell to about 0.5 per cent a year. And we believe that land bank and FarmStart have been a major factor in levelling out that trend.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — And the impact of those programs is clear. Based on the 1976 census (some of these figures were given by my colleague, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) 7 per cent of Saskatchewan farmers are under the age 25; 5 per cent of Manitoba farmers are under the age of 25; 4 per cent of the Alberta farmers are under the age of 25. So, if young people in Saskatchewan have not been able to get land, how many more young people in Manitoba haven't been able to get land, and how many, many more in Alberta have not been able to get land? They haven't been able to get land because there are no programs there like land bank which allow a young person with limited resources to get on the land and commence farming.

These 7,000 young people who have been assisted by land bank and FarmStart have brought with them other young people who are able to get land, probably because their parents were in farming. Once again, there is excitement and vitality in rural communities. Anyone can feel that. We see young faces and children again. You meet young people in the Pool meetings. You meet young people at the rinks and the community halls and the curling clubs. You go to places like Glaslyn or others and see many, many young people around the rink and you didn't see a few years ago.

We placed our faith in farmers and they have more than justified that faith. In a year in which it didn't rain until July, I say farmers have put in a very impressive performance. The province's total production, including all crops this year, is up over last year in spite of the fact that we had serious drought. Our production went up from 537 million bushels to 563 million bushels. But there was a drought and we had to mount a drought assistance program. We built that program on the advice of farm representatives and operated through local co-operation. We certainly did an outstanding job in providing assistance to cattle operators who were hit by the drought. In all, \$12 million has been laid out by the provincial government to assist with feed shortages caused by

the early drought. That is an impressive — and impressive! — performance.

We're very disappointed, on the other hand, with the performance of the federal Liberal government. Their herd-maintenance assistance program changed its criteria three times — perhaps I lost count, perhaps more — but certainly three times. They cut their level of support from \$70 a beef cow down to \$35 a beef cow. At the last report that I had, still no money had been paid out. They cut off their shared-cost assistance in moving feed and fodder at August 31 when people were still trying to gather in feed and fodder for the winter. They left the cattle people to fend for themselves after August 31. Nor are the cattle people the only ones who are asked to fend for themselves and to wait for their money. Hog producers are still waiting for the changes which have been promised for the past seven years in the federal hog stabilization program. You'll recall that we started a program to bridge the gap — The Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program, SHARP. We started it in 1976 and scheduled to end it in 1980 with the firm assurance in our minds that there would be a federal program in place. Four years later there's still no federal program. So, we've announced the continuation of SHARP beyond January 1, 1981. We have, therefore, assisted cattlemen and hog producers in this year of difficulty.

The challenges which lie ahead for Saskatchewan agriculture are broader challenges. They centre around the need for increased production, and all the ramifications which go with that, in the environment and energy management and the rest. They also centre around the continuing struggles of Saskatchewan farmers to preserve orderly marketing and an effective transportation system.

During the past 10 years and more, farmers have been fighting three great battles, all interrelated, in connection with marketing and transportation; the battle to save the branch lines, the battle to preserve the wheat board and orderly marketing, and the battle to save statutory grain rates, the Crow's Nest Pass rates.

In the battle to save the branch lines, great victories have been won. The branch line butchers, the people who advocated tearing up hundreds of miles of branch line and closing thousands of elevators and replacing them with a few dozen inland terminals, people like the member for Thunder Creek who used to come in here and say that those branch lines were obsolete and those country elevators were obsolete and that what we needed were inland terminals and unit trains — these people have been fought back. And they're very nearly beaten in some areas. Farmers and rural people, helped by the Government of Saskatchewan but who got very scant help from members opposite, have saved hundreds of miles of line in dozens of rural communities.

There are still battles to be fought but the picture is much, much brighter than it was only a year or two ago. That redounds to the credit of farmers in Saskatchewan and redounds to the credit of MLAs on this side of the House who stood beside their farmers, and says very, very little for some of the MPs representing the party opposite and some of the MLAs representing the party opposite, who, at hearing after hearing at Hodgeville and elsewhere, were found not even to be there when their constituents were fighting to see if they could keep their branch lines. So that battle is partly won.

The battle to keep the wheat board is still going on and it's going on in the trenches. The Winnipeg Commodity Exchange and its open-market allies in the Conservative Party are keeping up a relentless attack. Farmers know that the stakes are high. The commodity exchange naturally wants to make large profits on open-market speculation. It will carry on undermining the wheat board in the hopes of slicing that

high-profit melon. And it will get help from the Conservative Party, that freedom-of-choice party, that party that wants to undermine the wheat board, that party that endorses the statements of Mr. Mazankowski and Mr. Hugh Horner, when he was saying things which suggested that the wheat board ought not to be the exclusive marketing agency.

So this battle is going on and going on in the trenches. But it's the assault on the crowrate which is the hottest battle right now. The assault is led by the CPR and its allies in the Conservative Party. The Conservative Party and the CPR started out life together. The Conservative Party and the CPR started out life together in each other's pockets. It was hard to tell the difference between the Conservative Party and the CPR in the early 1870s and the 1880s and it's hard to tell the difference between the Conservative Party and the CPR in the 1970s and 1980s.

It's clear that western farmers have a hard, tough fight on their hands. Mr. Speaker, we know where the Tories stand. They stand where they've always stood: with the grain trade, the grain exchange and the CPR against the small farmer. We know and the farmers know where the New Democratic Party stands. I say this for the benefit of the hon. member for Bengough-Milestone: we stand for a grain handling and transportation system which has the needed rail capacity to move prairie grain to ocean ports, which has a strong system of branch lines, which preserves and protects the Canadian Wheat Board as a marketing agency for Canadian grain and which preserves for farmers the statutory grain rate, the crowrate. That's where we stand. The farmers know where we stand.

Let me turn now to another Saskatchewan success story. I talked about the great success of Saskatchewan farmers in this year of drought. Let me turn to another success story and that's the success of public enterprise in Saskatchewan — our 17 commercial Crown corporations.

Members opposite will mention The Automobile Accident Insurance Act . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Member opposite will mention this and it is very interesting, you know, they will also mention the power corporation. Each of those is an effective monopoly and each of them levies a charge on the user and each of the, therefore, can make such profit as it wishes. And if The Automobile Accident Insurance Act levies a charge which turns out to be too low in attempting to get a break-even figure, there is a great cry that they are breaking a loss and that's bad. If the power corporation levies a charge which produces a profit, there's a great howl at that because somehow they are making a profit and that's bad.

Members opposite are certainly going to be remarkably hard to please in this regard, but I'll move on to some of the corporations which they cannot possibly argue about. Take together, this family in 1979 held nearly \$3.5 billion in assets — and that's the book value. They generated over one billion dollars in revenue, returned a profit of well over \$100 million, and employed 11,500 people. Most people in this province share my pride in that performance — this made-in-Saskatchewan success story. But not members opposite; not the member for Bengough-Milestone and certainly not the absent leader of their party.

Members opposite have a great deal of difficulty with the fact that Saskatchewan people could put all this together and make it work. Members opposite simply don't believe that we in Saskatchewan have the talent and the ability to manage these enterprises, large and small, as well as their Conservative friends from other provinces.



That is very troubling to them so they pick and poke. They twist and turn. If a Crown corporation makes a profit, that's bad. If a Crown corporation doesn't make a profit, that's bad. The member for Souris-Cannington was critical of our making a profit.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I think the member for Thunder Creek has demonstrated over the last couple of days that he has the ability to interrupt this Chamber and to ignore the rules of this Chamber. I believe the rules are quite clear that members shall not be interrupted. Now, in the past I have allowed the members to make certain interjections across the floor. But I don't think the members appreciate the rules if they try to dominate the Chamber when they don't have the floor. I am not stopping the members from making the odd comment across the House. I don't think that has ever been done, but I think we should try to adhere to the rules of the Assembly.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that these interjections are extending my remarks a good bit, and much as I try to raise my voice over them, I think the effect will be that I will speak longer than would have been the case. I regret that but I am not fully in charge of the situation, as you will have noted.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Or the party.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes, well, I don't know whether I am in charge of this party but my bet is that, assessed against the leaders of the other political parties in this province, I will judge that my position is at least as secure as theirs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — It is interesting to note that if a miner works for IMC he is classed as a solid citizen by members opposite, if he works for PCS he is a bureaucrat, somehow a burden to the public. We heard that yesterday from the Leader of the Opposition who mentioned the member for Estevan, who manages a huge power plant. He is a bureaucrat. If somebody else manages a car agency, he is somehow a hard-driving businessman, who is better and more competent.

What galls them, Mr. Speaker, is that these 17 corporations are successful, are publicly owned, and are headquartered in Saskatchewan. Members opposite cannot accept that philosophically or politically. At the risk of increasing the discomfort, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a few facts about Saskatchewan's Crown corporations.

First, let me begin on one of the Crown corporations which was a favourite target. Sedco. Let me talk about Sedco. It was a development agency charged with the responsibility of helping establish or expand new job creating investment in Saskatchewan. It was designed to provide money for privately owned enterprises which have promise, but which are risky. Sedco's job is to bridge that gap. Sedco has done a remarkable job. Members opposite wish to believe that Sedco is a failure, but the people who are getting financial support from Sedco believe that Sedco runs a first-class business-like operation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Members opposite will now, or ought to know, that Sedco has some 400 accounts. Members like to spread the idea that Sedco somehow has equity participation in this 400. Sedco doesn't have participation in 400, or 300, or

200, or 100, or 50, or even 25. It has some holdings in a very small number of companies where it seemed prudent that if you are going to take some very real risks, that you had an opportunity to share some profits. That seems to me to be a pretty sound, business-like proposition. It will not happen in many cases, less than 25 out of 400 accounts. I give Sedco credit for protecting the public interest and trying to protect the public purse.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Let's talk about these corporations — the utilities. Reference has already been made to AAIA. I say when AAIA didn't charge enough, there were shrieks that it is bad management. If the power corporation happens to make a profit, there are further allegations of bad management.

What is the Tory story about these Crown corporations, particularly the utilities of power and telephones. The Tories say not that they lost money, but that they made too much money. I want to point out that in 1970 (and the member for Thunder Creek may recall that period) the power corporation made \$20 million. It had total assets of \$600 million and a construction program of less than \$40 million. Now we have total assets of not \$600 million, but \$1.4 billion, well over twice as much, and a construction program which is three times as much. But the member for Thunder Creek says we shouldn't be making even twice as much in profit. He says our rate of return should go down and down, well below what it was in 1970. Mr. Speaker, the facts are there on the record. In 1970 on \$600 million of gross assets it made a profit of \$20 million. He now is complaining that on \$1.4 billion of gross assets, a profit of \$40 million is far too much. Now, a simple application of mathematics will show that if the profit is far too much now, it was far, far too much in 1970 and I hope he said so.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Traditionally, much of this profit has been held with the utility to cut down the amount of borrowing (the borrowing which is always so upsetting to members opposite, and which was again criticized by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday) and some of it goes into the provincial treasury to lower taxes. All of it stays in Saskatchewan; all of it is right here helping Saskatchewan people.

How would the Tories operate these Crown corporations? The answer of course is that the Tories do not believe that Sask Power should be a Crown corporation. Year after year, and yesterday again, there was criticism of the capital borrowing of Sask Power. Now, every power utility in this country borrows: Sask Power borrows at a lower rate than a fair number of others. There is no criticism of Calgary Power and Northwest Utilities when they borrow. Everybody knows they have to borrow, but when Sask Power borrows, members opposite say it should borrow. Now what would be the result? It would be that Sask Power couldn't operate. Sask Power couldn't operate unless it borrowed, and members opposite would be happy with having Sask Power not operating because they would be very happy to see Sask Power gone, and the power provided (as it is in Alberta) by private power companies who are friends of the Conservative Party.

Members opposite suggest that Saskatoon can sell power cheaper. They certainly buy it from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation; they must be getting a very favourable deal; they don't generate any. It may well be that the city of Saskatoon makes no contribution, no small subsidy, to provide power in rural areas at lower rates. Now I

know the member opposite would not want members in rural Saskatchewan to get power at lower rates, but the Saskatchewan Power Corporation operates on the principle that we should try to give people in remote areas of this province a little bit of a break on the power corporation rates. I know the member for Rosthern opposes that, but we support it.

Utilities also need a good flow of cash in order to keep abreast of technological change, and that is true for Sask Power and Sask Tel. And I'm proud to say that Sask Tel is in the lead in technological change. It has one of the largest experiments in the world in fibre optics. And it is partly experimental, we'll acknowledge that forthwith, but we believe it is going to work out and work out for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

Sask Tel provides telephone rates at, I believe, as cheap a rate as any utility rate in Canada. The only competitor could be a publicly-owned one in Manitoba or Alberta. Certainly no private telephone utility provides service at the rates we provide it for, and notwithstanding the Tory story that they are all badly run. They may be badly run, but I tell you they are a lot better run (at least judged by the rates) than is B.C. Tel or Bell Telephone.

Members opposite are particularly upset about the resource corporations, and about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan particularly. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan made, in the year ended June 30, \$116 million on an investment which together with accumulated profits, perhaps totals \$500 million — a return of 21.6 per cent, virtually none of that potash is sold to Saskatchewan people. So don't tell me we are taking out of the public. We are selling potash competitively with private companies all over the world and we are making a good return.

I know that the Tory leader says that we could make as much money putting the money in the bank. When they tell you that you could make as much money putting it in the bank and you can make a return of 21.6 per cent ask them which bank. Ask them which bank is paying 21 per cent.

I say the present is strong for the potash corporation and the future looks bright. By 1990 we will expect to have spent over \$2 billion to increase the efficiency and to expand production from 5 million to 12.5 million tons. The expansion is under way.

As you can see in the frequent employment ads in the papers, there are careers in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan offering opportunities to young people for top jobs, head office jobs, research jobs. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is farming out its research, contracting out its research as potash companies do, but it is contracting them out here to the Saskatchewan Research Council and to other bodies in Saskatchewan. The spinoffs are coming from the head office ownership of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Good jobs are available here in Saskatchewan and we have made it happen.

The Tories have consistently said that the province shouldn't be in the potash business. That's their policy. I am going to ask them again this year whether they are still of the opinion that we shouldn't be in the potash business. That's not our policy. Members opposite are not so enthused about saying we should get out of the potash business now. I believe that time will prove that our policy of getting into the potash business, having a potash head office in Saskatchewan, having a head office of the largest potash corporation outside of the Soviet Union here in Saskatchewan, is going to be a policy which will be greatly to the benefit of Saskatchewan people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Reference has been made to SaskOil. I would like to say a word about SaskOil. SaskOil has taken a position in heavy oil. SaskOil is investing heavily in heavy oil at a rate which is much faster than would be ordinarily justified by its light oil production. Heavy oil is a project which is not going to pay off in year one, year two and year three. Therefore, the profits of SaskOil will not increase significantly until heavy oil starts to pay off.

Members opposite should know this. Members opposite should state whether they believe that we should invest heavily in heavy oil or leave that to the private sector. We, for our part, believe we should invest in heavy oil and we believe that just as the potash investment took a year or two or three to pay off, this one may take a year or two or three to pay off, but it will be very much to the benefit of Saskatchewan people.

Let me tell you about this heavy oil project with SaskOil, Petro-Canada and Gulf being partners. We believe that we have discovered a pool which should give us about 10,000 barrels a day of heavy oil. This will, in due course provide a good cash flow to SaskOil and will provide about 10 per cent of what we would need as the feedstock for an up grader if it were an up grader of the size of 100,000 barrels a day.

Now I can't obviously refer to all of the Crown corporations, or even most of them at this time. But we are proud of the Crown corporations. Are there problems? Of course there are. No range of businesses of this magnitude can make progress without problems.

What troubles me, Mr. Speaker, as I listen to those on the opposition benches, is that they have no interest in addressing the real problems; problems of growth and problems of inflation that beset any corporation like that, problems of development, problems of appropriate investment choices. They don't criticize on that basis. They don't even criticize on any broad policy. For example, they are criticizing the power corporation because it needs, in the words of the Leader of the Opposition, "a financial infusion." And he says that's bad. Every power company in Canada needs a financial infusion. But somehow it's bad for our power company to need a financial infusion and good for private companies.

they have said that the people who work for Crown corporations are bureaucrats. People who work for private potash companies are not bureaucrats. People who work for private power companies are not bureaucrats. That level of criticism is not appropriate to an opposition which has an obligation to mount alternative policies and indicate what their policies would be on investment in Crown corporations and the broad operations of Crown corporations. Rather than effective criticism, it's a clumsy attempt to destroy the whole Crown corporation idea.

They take the view that we should not, here in Saskatchewan, be doing things ourselves but that we should be standing back and letting other people come in to develop our resources and tell us how it's done.

Their view is that it is wrong for Saskatchewan people to aspire to control their own affairs. They wish to shake the confidence of Saskatchewan people in the idea that we can, by acting together through the instrument of our provincial government, help shape, direct and improve our economy and provide services which wouldn't otherwise be provided.

I believe the idea that we can do it ourselves is deeply ingrained in the history of Saskatchewan. We, on this side, believe that Crown corporations, co-operatives and private businessmen in Saskatchewan all have an essential role to play if Saskatchewan is to remain free from effective economic colonial status. We, on this side, believe that here in Saskatchewan indeed we can do it ourselves.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Now what do Tories believe? I have already indicated. What's their economic plan for Saskatchewan? Where do they stand on public enterprise? With the people of Saskatchewan or in favour of the Joe Clark privateer idea? I'll tell you what they don't believe, Mr. Speaker. They don't believe that Saskatchewan people can do it themselves. They would have us cast ourselves on the mercy of Canadian Pacific and the oil and the potash multinationals and the private insurance industry — all very good friends of the Conservative Party. I say the people of Saskatchewan won't buy it. The people of Saskatchewan are proud of their family of Crown corporations. They want to keep them. They won't let the Tory privateers take them away.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I was going to address to you a few words on the national energy program. I will seek another opportunity in this House to address those issues. I was about to say in this House what I have said in many other places, that we have serious objections to the proposals put forward by the Government of Canada. We will certainly address them and continue to address them.

It may well be of interest to hon. members that the minister, the Hon. Mr. Messer, has already been in consultation with the ministers of energy from across western Canada, laying out a strategy of how best to deal with the federal initiatives. There is a meeting scheduled for Regina later this month of the four energy ministers who will be addressing this problem. We are pleased that we are able to co-operate with our fellow western provinces in attempting to work out an energy policy which is more appropriate for western Canada. We have continued to do this with our colleagues, particularly in Alberta, for many years, and that co-operation continues. We are pleased that we have been able to weld these links with the province of Alberta on matters which are of vital concern to western Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined for you a good number of the programs of the government. I have pointed out that we believe the government in Saskatchewan is offering programs which the people of Saskatchewan want, not only in the area of people, programs like education and health and social services, but also in the area of economic development. I must only conclude that hon. members opposite agree that our programs are good programs. They certainly have offered no criticisms. I think for the first time in 20 years of history in this province they have not offered an amendment to the Speech from the Throne. They have not suggested in any amendment that they were going to outline any additional or alternative programs. They have, again I believe, for the first time in the 20 years that I have been in this House, decided that they did not wish to criticize the Speech from the Throne except in words and did not want to commit themselves to anything in writing. I can only say that this is a high compliment to not only the Speech from the Throne but to our government and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I take great delight in supporting the motion. I don't have any amendment to say I will not support.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COLLVER:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a great pleasure to follow the Premier of Saskatchewan in anything. I suppose I could say, in the light of the past history, it is a great pleasure to follow the Premier of Saskatchewan in everything — I'm afraid.

First of all I am going to tell you that I am going to address my remarks on two major fronts, just to introduce them and then congratulate a few people and do the usual things MLAs do. The two major fronts I am going to attack, I believe, Mr. Speaker, are the most urgent ones facing the people of Saskatchewan today. The first is the hypocrisy indicated by the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan in its dealing with Ottawa in the past six months — the absolute and utter hypocrisy. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this province, as a lawyer, took not the Hippocratic oath, but the “hypocritic” oath in his dealings with Ottawa over the last number of months. He attempted to explain why he has taken this position over the last few months. He is going to try, he says, to work out with Ottawa a better deal on the repatriation of the constitution, a better deal for the province of Saskatchewan. In fact, he knows full well, in his own remarks that I intend to cite, that at no time has he or his government or any other western Canadian government, since 1970 when Mr. Trudeau came on the scene . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 1968? Excuse me. I thought 1970 was when he came on the scene as that great centralist, but I'll take the words of the ex-minister of social services.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that neither he nor any other western Canadian premier nor any other western Canadian government has ever been able to achieve one single concession for western Canada out of that central government, and he knows it. I am going to use his own words to prove it.

The second area generally, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to address my remarks to today, hopefully to stimulate a few thoughts across the way, is on education. There are a number of teachers who are members of this legislature, primarily across the way. But, Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy with which this socialist government treats the people of Saskatchewan in their absolute failure to educate our children is beyond the comprehension of any thinking human being in this province.

The deterioration of the standards of excellence in the Saskatchewan schools in the last ten years has been so blatant that now the universities in our province and the technical schools find that they have to re-educate the children who are entering those schools before they even have a sufficient tool to learn at the basic university level or at the basic technical school level. And, Mr. Speaker, I intend to give evidence of that.

Now that, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment is the most hypocritical of all of the socialist philosophies. Winston Churchill suggested many, many, many years ago that socialism was shared misery. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that Allan Blakeney's socialist government in Saskatchewan shares a number of other items — he's a great sharer. They believe in sharing — shared ignorance, shared poverty, shared sickness, shared incompetence. Mr. Speaker, the point is that what Mr. Premier was saying today about the Crown corporations indicates his abysmal ignorance of what's going to happen in the future to the province of Saskatchewan as a result of direct government intervention in everyone's day-to-day life.

And now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trudeau has decided to play the same game — overtax the oil companies, suck the money out of western Canada and plop it into Petro-Canada whose head office is in Ottawa, and put this money to work in a Crown corporation, stealing from some (mostly the small independent oil companies which, Mr. Speaker, have already left Canada, have already left the West, have already left Saskatchewan, have already left Alberta). And what we're left with are the branch offices of the multinational corporations with their head offices in Toronto and New York, and Petro-Canada and SaskOil with their head offices in Regina and Ottawa, controlled by government, by the few. Shared misery, shared poverty, shared ignorance and shared average-down.

Because Mr. Blakeney sees that the left wing of the Liberal Party has now totally grasped control of Canada and totally grasped control of the Liberal Party, he senses that he will now be able to move forward as an individual, as a politician, to make a unity of the left and have his ideals perpetrated on the people of Canada.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Pretty smart man, eh?

**MR. COLLVER:** — Yes, if you think that kind of winning is smart; if you think that kind of hypocrisy is smart, he's a pretty smart man.

Mr. Speaker, I don't even think that I need to comment on what the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan has said today. I thin the Premier of Saskatchewan should comment himself on what he said today. I ask any member of this Assembly to weight the Premier's words today in light of the Premier's words in 1977 — January, '77 — in a speech he gave to the Canadian Club in Toronto.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's look at Mr. Blakeney's own words, "A western view on resources," he entitles his first paragraph. I'll give you just the headline excerpts:

"The resource benefits have been historically provincial" — not one single concession in reality, and the Premier knows it. The so-called statement on resources in the amending document is overridden by all of the other things that he has already mentioned which he hasn't got concession on. "If oil, why not iron ore and steel products," he said. "Federal court action unique in Canadian history" (because it attacked the NDP on Bill 42 and on potash). "Court cases critical to financial future of province." These are just the headlines. "New look urged at provincial rights in some key areas." He urges in 1977 a new look. And here's what he said in 1977:

As a start I recommend to the federal government that it re-examine its position toward provincial rights in some key areas:

1. Resources and resource taxation;
2. Cultural affairs;
3. Communications.

Did he mention communications today? No. Has the Saskatchewan government won any concessions from the feds on communications? No. None. Witness the Minister of Telephones own remarks on the great debate of last spring. Blakeney says:

To fail to do so will not only serve to strain the bonds of confederation among the nine predominantly English-speaking provinces at a time when such strains could be immensely dangerous, it will also make the battle against the separatist idea in Quebec very much tougher by offering to the people of Quebec only an unattractive, unresponsive, centralist alternative. In the fight to keep Canada intact to give such hostages to fortune would be unnecessary, if not foolhardy.

Those are Blakeney's words. Now he goes on.

The alternatives must not be Mr. Trudeau's centralism or separatism. Those have never been the alternatives for this nation. The regional and cultural pressures which threaten Canada in 1977 have always been with us. Our ancestors dealt with them wisely and skilfully in 1867. We would do well to look back to the Fathers of Confederation who framed this country just because the centralism built into the Act of Union in 1840 were not working. The framers of our constitution understood that Canada was unique in the world, and that for the country to survive all regions would have to compromise a little.

He said he urges the federal government to implement changes in its centralist policy, to implement changes in its cultural affairs. And what was he referring to in 1977? Compulsory bilingualism when it came to cultural affairs. In 1977 the Premier of Saskatchewan was adamantly opposed to the bilingualism and biculturalism proposals then being implemented by the federal government — oh yes, adamantly opposed. Today he's in favour of them. He says they are all right.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I'm making here is the Premier of Saskatchewan has, because of his theoretical consideration, because he fails to understand that there is a position, not with CPR, not with Imperial Oil, not with Exxon, but also not with Trudeau, and not with Blakeney, that exists among the vast majority of Canadians. And this position Mr. Speaker, is the one that the vast majority of western Canadians want. What are the alternatives that western Canadians have today, given what's happened to our country in the past 10 years, but most importantly what's happened to Saskatchewan and the West in the last year.

I would like to quote first of all from Mr. Trudeau in *Maclean's* magazine of this week.

"I saved Quebec," said Trudeau with a shrug. "Somebody else will have to save the West."

Mr. Trudeau believes that of his policies of centralization, of confrontation with the dreams and aspirations of western Canadians. He admits that it's going to require a saviour to save the West. He is causing the problem and that is typical of that kind of hypocrisy. He is causing the problem and he says "I am going to create the problem; somebody else will have to save the West." For what? To save the West from what? Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, to save the West from a Canada that no longer exists — a Trudeau Canada is not the Canada of our forefathers. A Trudeau Canada is not the Canada that my ancestors fought for in great wars and that our pioneers tried to build. Oh no, not Trudeau's Canada. Trudeau's Canada is a completely different country. Trudeau's Canada is the kind of country that my ancestors ran away from and that the ancestors of every member of this Legislative Chamber (except for one and maybe two) ran away from. Our ancestors ran away from oppressive, dictatorial governments. That's why we



are here.

There are many in our native population who have said frequently they wish we weren't here. Our ancestors came to this country, giving up their own country by the way, giving up their own beliefs, their own ideals of that country, because they said, "Our country no longer is the country of our forefathers. It is no longer a country of freedom. It is no longer my country." And they came to the New World. Even the minister from Shellbrook knows that is ancestors came for the same reasons. Even the Premier of the province emigrated to Saskatchewan from Nova Scotia for the same reasons . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Speaker, so did mine. The Premier said that his ancestors came up as United Empire Loyalists because they wanted no part of the then United States of America and so did mind in 1787, landing in Simcoe. But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in the intervening 200 years is that the United States of America has retained a semblance of freedom, has retained a sense of direction and a sense of fair play, and has gone opposed directly to the kind of policies that Mr. Trudeau is perpetrating in this country. that's the difference — the difference I think, in the last 200 years is Pierre Elliott Trudeau in Canada who is completely thwarting the aims, aspirations and dreams of western Canadian to develop as they see fit in western Canada.

And the Premier of Saskatchewan usurps his responsibility by running away from that issue in the last six months merely because suddenly, ideologically he is closer to Mr. Trudeau than he was before. Suddenly he sees in Ottawa the same people who built the CCF and the NDP in Saskatchewan. The same ideas are coming to the fore: use the tax system to steal from the industry and they buy them out; break them, buy them out and then, Mr. Speaker, end up with the business and say that because sales were great in any one year, we made 21.6 percent on investment. I ask the Premier of Saskatchewan to compare that to the private sector in the province of Saskatchewan before federal incomes taxes.

I think the Premier will find that if he compares it to IMC before federal income taxes, if he compares it to the other private potash mines that still exist in Saskatchewan, he will find that his 21.6 per cent on investment is peanuts. It is peanuts! The point is, you see, Mr. Speaker, that the private sector did infinitely better than his Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. The only reason they did well is because of the huge demand and limited supply of potash. But that's changing. The money which the Government of Saskatchewan paid out for those potash mines now rests in New Brunswick, in Montana, and in Australia, where it is developing new mines and competition against the Government of Saskatchewan. Russia is currently developing a potash mine on the Dead Sea which is going to make the potash mines in Saskatchewan look like the smallest, tiniest little pond . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I don't know, but on the northern stretches — I guess it's the Caspian Seas. One of those seas . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is it supposed to be dead? Well, my biblical background may be weak but almost everything else is too.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is the Russians are developing a huge potash mine, whether it's in the Dead Sea, the Red Sea or the Caspian Sea — I don't know which particular seas they are developing; it's somewhere over there in that part of the world — that is going to make the Saskatchewan mines look paltry in comparison.

Mr. Speaker, the only reason I am devoting so much attention today to the Crown corporations, which the Premier raised, is that I couldn't see any reason for the

Premier's hypocrisy in his dealings with Ottawa. I thought for a minute that because the Attorney General decided to speak to the Liberal convention here in Saskatchewan there had been a general coming together of Liberals and NDP, that the Premier had political aspirations to lead the Liberal Party. I had heard some wag say some place that the Premier of Saskatchewan had ambitions to be Prime Minister of Canada and the only way he could do that was as a Liberals, so it would be important for him to seem to come close to the Liberals. I had heard that, but I couldn't believe it. I couldn't believe that was the motivation for this man who has been Premier of Saskatchewan and a relatively honourable one.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the only thing I could attribute it to was the sudden shift by the federal Liberals to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I still have lots of time. In the middle of remarks, when you get passed little notes — I'm not going to read those little notes. Yes, I was educated in Ontario and Alberta some years ago. I don't think Alberta's system of education is a whole heck of a lot better than the system in the province of Saskatchewan today. They are having problems similar to those we are having in Saskatchewan. but Saskatchewan is supposed to be the leader in education. I intend to make more remarks on education later.

Why would the Premier suddenly change his attitude? The only reason I can see is that the Prime Minister decided to attack the oil industry with Petro-Can, and in the best interests of his theory the Premier of Saskatchewan now wants to stand with the Prime Minister. Yet his own Crown corporations have not been successful, his own incursions in the area.

Let's take SaskOil for example. He says that he and SaskOil and Petro-Canada and Gulf Oil have discovered a heavy oil deposit which produces 10,000 barrels a day. That sounds like a lot to a normal person. It sounds like a tremendous amount, but it is one of the tiniest production levels in heavy oil which you can imagine. The cost of getting that out of the ground and through their plant will be so high that the margins on that oil will be terribly, terribly small. Mr. Speaker, 10,000 barrels a day in heavy oil is peanuts, absolute peanuts, compared to what is going to be produced out of Cold Lake, compared to what is being produced out of the Syncrude projects and what is going to be produced out of those other Athabasca tar sands projects. Mr. Speaker, 10,000 barrels a day is nothing! He makes it sound like a tremendous amount. How many conventional oil wells has SaskOil found? None. How many fields have they found? None. What makes us think Petro-Canada will be any better? Nothing. So what are we left with? The Government of Canada taking the same position as the Government of Saskatchewan — seizing western Canada's resources and putting the power in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, that's what the Premier of Saskatchewan says he's going to try and compromise with. There is no compromise with Ottawa. Read the Premier's own remarks.

Here's one from 1975: "Amount of Resource Profit Key Issue in Dispute" — Premier of Province of Saskatchewan. Read that article about what Mr. Blakeney had to say about Ottawa.

Ottawa Said Not Inclined to Bail Out Saskatchewan. That was a headline in the *Leader-Post*, 1976. Read what Mr. Blakeney had to say in that article about Ottawa and how much intransigence there was, how flexible they were. Blakeney Raps Federal Meddling in Calgary — February 1977. Federal meddling — I invite the press, I invite the members of this legislature, I invite anyone to read what the Premier had to say about the intransigence of Ottawa in 1977. Today he says they're flexible. That's absolute

nonsense.

What has happened is the Premier of Saskatchewan is selling out to eastern interests. His own former resource minister, who I think is going to be appointed to a very key position in federal government circles . . . I hear from the member for Thunder Creek, but it surprises me that members to my right have not yet questioned this government. They know that our party is attempting to put forward a different kind of alternative.

Why is this party to my right not questioning the Government of Saskatchewan on the terrible precedent it is establishing in having members outside this House still minister of the Crown? Where is the tradition that allows the former member for Kelsey-Tisdale to continue as Minister of Mineral Resources? Where is it? We don't have a Senate we can pull him from in Saskatchewan. Where is the precedent that allows the member for North Battleford, who is not here, to continue on as Minister of Highways? Where is the precedent?

**A MEMBER:** — Diefenbaker had it.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Never! He pulled them out of the Senate. He never once pulled them out of the air.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, where is the possibility of questioning these ministers who are no longer members? How do you question them about their departments? How do you question them about their resignations? Questions may come to your mind as to why they resigned. Where do you question them? Not in this Assembly. yet they are still minister of the Crown in this province. That is absolute utter nonsense. And the only reason that is so is that they're dancing between the federal Liberals in order that Mr. Blakeney's key left-hand man, Mr. Messer, can get appointed to some key, big position with Mr. Trudeau.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the Premier of Saskatchewan has sold out the people.

Where, Mr. Speaker, is the fight against Ottawa? Oh, we're going to compromise now. Here we are, back in 1977 — Premier says Ottawa Should Ease Tensions. Here's another one: New Oil Levy called Provincial Irritant — Allan Blakeney, 1977, December.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a real dandy. I want you and everyone in this Assembly to get it because I'm not going to read it for you. Get a copy of the *Commonwealth* dated April 23, 1980. I want you to read an article on page 12 by Allan Blakeney called, In His Own Words. Just read through that article about what Mr. Blakeney has to say about intransigence of the federal government, about how Mr. Trudeau has never listened, about how his government has never listened, has never bent to the wishes of the province. Today, in this Assembly Mr. Blakeney suggest that somehow a compromise is possible. The stand that six other premiers have taken in Canada says, "We know what this man is like. We know what his centralist government is like. We must stand up to him." This government says, "We must compromise."

Now Mr. Speaker, let me say this: Western Canadians are faced today with four alternatives only:

1. To accept Trudeau's rape of the West, to accept Trudeau's kind of Canada;

2. To build a real federation of provinces in Canada with real rights at the provincial and local levels and real powers and real taxation powers to be able to deal with the problems of people at the local level.
3. To split off an independent western Canada. There would be 5 million people in one of the largest land masses in the world, one of the smallest countries in the United Nations and the buffer between the two major states, the two major super powers.
4. Western Canadians could seek union with the United States of America.

Those are the only four reasonable alternatives which reasonable people can face today in western Canada. If you accept Trudeau's Canada, you accept a dictatorship. If you accept Trudeau's Canada, you accept the continual and continuous continuation of what has happened to the West for 75 years. If you accept Trudeau's Canada, you accept a rejection of the crowrate. You accept discriminatory freight rates. You accept discriminatory customs tariffs and excise duties. You accept continuous export taxes on our resources. You expect and accept compulsory bilingualism. That is Trudeau's Canada. If you accept that, you accept continued dictatorial policies from Ottawa. You accept farm policies made in Ottawa. You accept a continuation of the control of the financial institutions of our country in Toronto and Ottawa. That's what you accept.

I, for one, believe that that's not Canada. It certainly isn't the Canada I was born in. It isn't the Canada that my ancestors came here to create and isn't the Canada that any member of this Assembly knew when they were young or should have known yesterday or today. I, for one, reject that alternative out of hand. Trudeau's Canada is not Canada. It's something different entirely.

Alternative number 2 is the preferred option for any reasonable western Canadian — a strong, united Canada, a federation of sovereign states, a federation in which local and regional provincial governments have the power to create their destiny. That is not true today. It has never been true for western Canada. Under Trudeau Canada will never be true in the future because the population carries control the country and have done since its inception.

I say that alternative number two is the best possible one for us. If I believed that there was any hope of creating that kind of Canada today I would disband the Unionest Party immediately — today.

But, Mr. Speaker, we'll see; we'll see. You laughed last February 599, and then all these things came true. All these things like the budget and increased gas costs to every one of your consumer right here in Saskatchewan — increased gas costs to every citizen in the West, double practically in Medicine Hat, for example.

The rape of western Canadian . . . Watch the small, the medium oil companies and exploration companies disappear. You're watching now from Estevan. You're watching now in Lloydminster. Alberta is seeing it right across their province. They're going to the United States where they get a deal by which they can make a reasonable return on their investment for the gamble they have to take. These are the people who find the oil — not the Gulfs, not Shell, not Texaco, and certainly not Petro-Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that's the Canada I want, but I don't see how it can possibly happen.

The third alternative is ridiculous. The third alternative, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to say, is

absolutely ridiculous. What is the reason that the people of western Canada believe that eastern Canadians are doing them in? The reason, the political reason, the real reason is that we have had to watch jobs and opportunities for our children and our grandchildren march to Toronto, march to Hamilton, march to Windsor, march to Montreal, but not develop here. If our children wanted to be in anything different from agriculturally based or resource-based industries they had to move east. They couldn't stay here. That's what it is all about — developing secondary industry and manufacturing industry here in the West. That's what it is all about — building a sufficient capital base in Saskatchewan and in Alberta and in Manitoba and in British Columbia, so that we can create these industries here.

The people of western Canada and of Saskatchewan, in particular, are looking at this as their last chance. If the people in this Assembly don't know that then they haven't talked to anybody in Saskatchewan. The people here believe that this is our turn, that it's our turn to develop these industries, that it's our turn to get this capital base. When they watch Trudeau come marching in and yank the rug right out from under the private sector, only leaving the government sector in the West, they know that these jobs and opportunities are not going to be created.

Mr. Speaker, I predict again as I did last February, one year — one year from now — given the same course of action by the Government of Saskatchewan, given the same course of action by Pierre Elliott Trudeau, one or the other of the alternatives that are no good will happen. On year.

Either western Canadians are going to decide for an independent western Canada, which I think is terrible, abysmal . . . I think we would be a small country between two superpowers. I think we would be resource rich and population poor, and we wouldn't have our dreams and aspirations realized at all because we wouldn't be able to develop the manufacturing base and the secondary industry jobs here in western Canada, which is what it's all about to begin with. The industrialized countries of this world would step all over us as they have every resource-based economy in the history of the world.

But one or the other is going to happen. Either they're going to choose separatism or they're going to choose our cause or they're going to lay back and accept the rape by Trudeau. I say, Mr. Speaker, far more than any man or woman in this Assembly I stand for a united Canada, strong, with strong provincial governments. But that will never happen and therefore I say, how are you going to make Mr. Trudeau and his centralist group understand the dreams and aspirations of western Canadians? How are you going to do it? You have to have an alternative that is not only believable but is acceptable to the people. You have to have an alternative in which their standard of living is not going to go down, as it was in Quebec, but in which their standard of living is going to go up. You have to have an alternative that you can point to and say there is an alternative we can take, Mr. Speaker; that is what I intend to continue doing. I intend to present an alternative which is possible, that the people of western Canada can take. If they decide this alternative is possible, I say to you that that is enough pressure to bring Trudeau to heel. If it's not enough pressure, then there isn't any hope for western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal more to say on this throne speech. I also intend to make an amendment condemning this government. I am very sorry the member to my right choose not to do so. I believe it is traditional that a motion of no confidence should be presented. I certainly will be presenting a motion of no confidence.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:53 p.m.