

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 1, 1981

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Radio Time

DEPUTY CLERK: — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the standing committee on communication, I present the first report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee has had under consideration the division of the 525 minutes of radio time arranged for the current address in reply debate. Your committee recommends to the Assembly that time be shared as follows: 378 minutes to the government members and 147 minutes to the opposition members for the current address in reply debate.

Your committee further recommends that the allocation of time to the individual members be arranged through the usual channels.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kindersley:

That the first report of the standing committee on communication be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. WHITE: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and to members of the House, 12 visitors from the People's Republic of China, seated in the Speaker's galley. They are accompanied by Miss Florence Caldwell. They are professors, interpreters and, I believe, one individual involved in public relations. They came around the middle of September and will be here at the University of Regina for approximately two years, except for three months next summer when they will be at the University of British Columbia. Their fields of study are English, political science and American literature. It's rather interesting to note that they came from various parts of China and didn't know each other until coming over here. When they return to China, after the two-year period, they will be going back to their regular positions as teachers or interpreters and the likes of that.

We sincerely hope they enjoy their stay here and I would ask everyone to welcome them to the House.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the official opposition, I would like to join

with the member for Regina Wascana in welcoming our Chinese visitors to Canada and Saskatchewan. It's also rather interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that several of us came from several different parts of Saskatchewan and we didn't know each other until we came here.

MR. SPEAKER: — I put myself in the hands of the House. We're in oral question period time. Are the members willing to permit another introduction?

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this legislature, a group of 37 grade 8 students from St. Henry's Separate School, Melville. They are seated in the west gallery. They are here under the guidance of their two teachers, Garth Gleisinger and Paul Winichuk. The two bus drivers are Terry Schappert and Vern Ulmer. St. Henry's of Melville has a unique distinction that yearly it has brought at least one class to tour the Saskatchewan legislature, an example that others, I think, would do well to emulate, Mr. Speaker. I believe that of all the worth-while things there are to see in Saskatchewan the operation of this legislature and visiting the Legislative Building itself is a worth-while form of instruction. I think it's must for all young people growing up in Saskatchewan and for future Saskatchewan generations.

I am sure that all members of this House want to welcome St. Henry's students and wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAPMAN: — Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to join with the member for Melville to make a short welcome to the grade 8 class from St. Henry's School? One of the teachers is my son-in-law, Paul Winichuk, and it is a privilege to welcome him here today. I trust your visit might capture some of the excitement and the vitality of this legislature in the democratic process of Saskatchewan. Welcome to the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Mortgage Moratorium

MR. ROUSSEAU: — A question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, your announcement in the throne speech of The Home-owners' Securities Act, as well as your constant refusal to answer questions with regard to it, has given the impression to Saskatchewan residents (and I might add the press) that all mortgage renewals coming due in 1982 will be allowed a moratorium until 1983. Mr. Premier, are you prepared to admit today that only mortgagees in dire straits will qualify for these moratoriums?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, since my failure to answer in the past has apparently led people to given conclusions, undoubtedly, if I answer only in part, as I can only do because the Bill is not before the House, it will similarly lead to erroneous conclusions. Accordingly, I would like to leave all answers with respect to the details of the Bill until the Bill is before the House.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Premier, the question I asked you about the renewal of these

mortgages and the moratorium on them, applying only to people with financial hardship, those people in dire straits, is very simple. There are 50,000 mortgages in Saskatchewan. You indicated on Friday that only 5,000 of these mortgages would be facing financial difficulties. My question, which I am putting to you again, Mr. Premier, is: will they apply only to those people in dire straits?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think my previous answer is the one I would like to stay with. The details of the Bill will be made known when it's before the House, and I think comments by me will not be helpful.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Premier, the last time I looked you were the leader of the party and, supposedly, the most powerful man in government. Is the Premier serious when he expects this Assembly to accept that answer from the head of the party that is supposedly running this province? Are we supposed to take you seriously when you refuse to discuss proposed legislation which was in your throne speech, even though obviously you only put it there the day before? Now, when is the Premier, as head of this government, going to give us some answers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can take any view he likes. I repeat that I will discuss the details of this Bill when the Bill is before the House. It is unproductive, in my judgment, to attempt to answer details of a Bill which is not before the House and, accordingly, I will not be answering the questions direction to the precise contents of this particular Bill.

MR. COLLVER: — My supplementary question to the Premier is quite simply this. Are you aware, Mr. Premier, that one mortgage company at least, Norfolk, has ceased to offer mortgages to potential home-owners in the province of Saskatchewan as a result of the introduction in your throne speech? Are you further aware that continued stonewalling of this kind of questioning (in other words hinting at this legislation as opposed to putting forward the specifics) is going to cause a serious financial problem in terms of people getting mortgages and houses in the province of Saskatchewan? Is it your intent as the Premier of the province to cease all housing construction in Saskatchewan for the next few months until you make up your mind to tell this House what it's all about?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, there was a barrage of questions there. I will answer the last one. It is not the intention of the government to have mortgage activity cease in the province of Saskatchewan. I doubt whether that would be the result. In due course, my colleagues will table the Bill and we all will know what its contents are and we then can debate it in an orderly way.

Mortgage Renewals

MR. ANDREW: — A question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Perhaps we can get an answer from him. Last Friday you indicated, I think, through the Premier that there was something like 1,250 credit union renewal mortgages that would be looked at in this Bill. I think Sherwood Credit Union alone has 4,000 mortgages coming to renewal in 1982; Co-op Trust has some 3,000 coming for renewal. How, Mr. Minister, did you arrived at the figure of 1,250 mortgages held by credit unions that would qualify under the proposed legislation?

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I think if the records are checked you will find that no question was directed to me last Friday and no answer was provided by me.

MR. ANDREW: — Perhaps I could direct the same question to Mr. Premier, if he likes. Mr. Premier, how do you arrive at 1,250 homes as being subject to this proposed legislation and having mortgage renewals coming at a credit union? Where did you come up with the figure of 1,250?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the information was supplied to me and we believe it to be accurate and fortunately we will have an opportunity to debate all of these matters when the Bill is before us.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. The impression was distinctly left by the government opposite (and I know that no one in this Assembly is taking the responsibility for what the press writes), but the headlines read “Help for Home-owners.” There is a belief out there that your legislation announced in the throne speech is going to help all people in Saskatchewan whose mortgages come up for renewal. You now seem to be backsliding on that impression that was left. Would you today correct the record and indicate precisely to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan what number of mortgage renewals will be affected, and what criteria you use to determine that number?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of the defect in the record to which the hon. member refers. Accordingly, I am unable to correct it, and I say again that discussion with respect to the number of mortgages which might be affected, whether or not details of hardship are to be taken into account, are surely the details of a Bill and are not appropriate for debate in question period.

MR. LANE: — A supplementary question. On November 27, you indicated that it was your belief that 5,000 home-owners might be facing financial difficulty. That was your figure. Now, where did you obtain that figure and what criteria are you using for your variation of “dire straits”?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether I used any figure suggesting “dire straits.” “Dire straits,” I think, is a phrase used by his former colleague, now the Minister of Housing, and I believe also the Minister of Finance in Ottawa. The member for Qu’Appelle will be very familiar with the Liberal Party, his having been a devout follower of that party — he who was once adept at using such phrases (and still is, I may say) since there is little difference between Liberals and Tories whether at Ottawa or Regina.

I invite hon. members to read what I said. They will find the answer there, and it doesn’t need to be paraphrased by the member for Qu’Appelle.

MR. TAYLOR: — Surely you must understand that the members of the opposition, the mortgage companies in this province, the home-owners and the credit unions are waiting to see what’s in that Bill. I remember you distinctly saying that you wanted it passed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I want to bring the members to order. I think it’s quite clear that members must not multiply with slight variation a similar question on the same point . . . Order! I’ve listened very carefully over the time . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Order! I wonder if we could have order. As I was saying, it’s

not proper and it's not within the rules for members to multiply with slight variation a question on the same topic, whether the question has been answered or has been refused to be answered. So if the members can be guided by that rule I'd be quite prepared to let them go ahead with the questions.

MR. TAYLOR: — Very simply put, Mr. Premier, will you introduce that Bill this week so we can debate it in this legislature?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we'll do our very best to get the Bill before the House as soon as possible.

MR. COLLVER: — I have a supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, I would direct my supplementary question to the Premier. Is it true, as some have suggested, that the inclusion of this entire matter of foreclosures in the throne speech was an attempt to give a sop to the people out there who are facing financial difficulties now, and that you are withholding information on the Bill because by March or April of next year interest rates will be down and there will be no need for the Bill? Is it true that you have no intention of bringing the Bill forward whatsoever and you're just trying to make the government look at though it's interested in helping the people of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we have every intention of bring the Bill forward and, as the member has already anticipated by his question, though I would use somewhat different words, we intend to introduce the Bill in order to be of assistance to people who may be facing foreclosure. That may, in the words of the member for Nipawin, be deemed a sop. We regard it as some measure of assistance. It will not solve all the problems. We hope that when hon. members have an opportunity to debate the terms of the Bill they will make a judgment for themselves as to whether or not it is useful to persons who might be facing foreclosure.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Last week, in reply to a question I put to you where I indicated that 50 per cent of mortgages in Saskatchewan are handled by credit unions, you replied:

I would think that the figure would be a good deal closer to 20 per cent.

Are you aware Mr. Premier, that in Saskatchewan over 50 per cent of the mortgages are handled by credit unions? The figures are: the banks have a total of \$560 million in mortgages at the present time; credit unions have over \$750 million, representing well over the 50 per cent figure. Would you be prepared to admit that you have been misinformed by the minister who has been feeding you the information you have been giving to us in reply to our questions?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member's information is right, mine is wrong, and if mine is right, his is wrong. I don't think there is much point in our speculating on who is misinforming whom.

MR. ANDREW: — A question to the Minister of Finance. On October 1, 1981, you sent a press release to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa to give him your advice on what he should bring in his budget. You indicated that there should be direct financial assistance in the upcoming budget to ensure that home-owners with modest incomes are not forced to spend more than 30 per cent of their gross income on housing. Could the minister advise if that is one of the criteria we will be seeing in the proposed legislation, that the restriction will be: provided you are not spending over 30 per cent

of your income on housing?

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, in that the present dilemma faced by mortgage holders is a direct result of the policy of the federal government on high interest rates, I feel it is incumbent upon the federal government to take some action, and I so advised Mr. MacEachen before his budget. As has already been said, when the Bill is presented to this House, as soon as possible, all of that information will be available. It can then be adequately debated.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary question to the Premier. You have just made a rather flippant comment about whose information is right or wrong. Let me advise that we checked today with the credit union movement. It would indicate that, in fact, your figures are wrong. If you bring in the legislation, as you have indicated in the throne speech, there will be serious problems for the credit union movement in the province of Saskatchewan. First, have you as yet initiated formal discussions with the credit union movement as to the effects of this Bill? Second, what have you advised the credit unions as to the criteria which you are going to use to determine eligibility?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague the Attorney General has a meeting scheduled with some officials from the credit union movement tomorrow.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary question to the Premier. You refused to answer earlier my question as to your use of the figure of 5,000 home-owners who might be facing financial difficulty, and I gave you the chapter and verse of the citation. Would you indicate now exactly the criteria you are using to determine those who are in “financial difficulty,” using your phrase of last November 27?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have no further information to give to the member. I attempted to answer his question; he obviously was not satisfied with my answer. He is perfectly entitled not to be satisfied but I don’t have anything to add at this time.

Waiting Period for Elective Surgery

MR. COLLVER: — My question is to the Minister of Health., to let the Premier off the hook. Is the minister aware of the waiting period in the city of Regina for elective surgery at the hospitals where elective surgery is performed?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question. Would the minister be prepared to inform this House, as almost everyone in this province has been informed, that the minimum waiting period for elective surgery at the least used hospital, which is the Plains Health Centre, is three months and the maximum waiting period for some specialties is up to 14 months? Would the minister be prepared to confirm that information to this Assembly?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I do know, from the paper, that elective surgery waiting time in Ontario is somewhere between two, three and four years. It is true that for some elective surgery the waiting time can be three, four or five months. I indicated to this House that in order to run an efficient hospital system you must have a waiting list; this is nothing new. I have said this on a number of occasions and I think you cannot simply have a hospital which is waiting for people to come in and has no

people to operate on or to service. Therefore a waiting list is an efficient way of running a hospital system. That holds true not only for Saskatchewan but right across this country and across the world. Those who run efficient hospital systems do have waiting lists.

Let me indicate to the member, however, that for emergency services most people are admitted immediately. Those who are emergency cases may have to wait a few days in order to get in. Those who have elective surgery may have to wait a few months or, in some instances, a little longer. But, in all cases, Mr. Speaker, the waiting list has gone down over the last number of years. It certainly has gone down since we formed the government in 1971, and it is one of the shortest in this country. Let's have a look at what the waiting list is in Edmonton, Calgary and some of the other larger centres in Canada. You will find out they are much longer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the minister has read the recent reports in the province of Saskatchewan of unhappy medical practitioners, lack of specialists, lack of nurses, lack of appropriate hospital times, lack of appropriate operating rooms and so on. More importantly, how many people in the province of Saskatchewan, over the last year, does the minister estimate had to go to Edmonton, Calgary, Vancouver or Denver for their elective surgery to try to solve problems over which they had no control because that elective surgery, although not emergency surgery, was necessary for their appropriate lifestyle?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, if we were to follow the logic of the member for Nipawin, what he is doing is damning the doctors of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yes.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Well, he's the one who's saying it, because they make the medical decisions, Mr. Speaker, neither the member for Nipawin nor the member for Saskatoon Buena Vista is medically qualified to make the decision as to who needs emergency or elective surgery. He shouldn't decide that; neither should I. That is a decision made by the medical people of this province. Let me say to the member for Nipawin, if any of those people went for elective surgery to Denver, they would have had to wait a heck of a lot longer than they have to wait here in Saskatchewan and, lastly, Mr. Speaker, never could they have afforded to pay for it.

MR. LANE: — Does the Premier agree with the statement of the Minister of Health, that a waiting list is the sign of an efficient hospital system?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that a waiting list is the sign of an efficient hospital system. Mr. Speaker, I believe that an efficient hospital system is measured by the normal criteria of the level of care which the patients get there. The member for Nipawin is fond of talking about Edmonton and Calgary and points south. I would suggest to him that he check the waiting lists in Edmonton and Calgary and he will see waiting lists far longer than in Regina or Saskatoon. He may then make a judgment as to whether or not those hospitals are efficient on that basis. I make a judgment of whether hospitals are efficient on the basis of the level of care which they give to their patients. It is certainly true that if a hospital is to serve all of the patients in the most orderly way, it . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm having a little bit of trouble with the member for Nipawin and so I think I will abandon my attempt to

answer this question.

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATE

Address in Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was move by Mr. Chapman.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, we're here for the next, I believe, five days to discuss and debate the throne speech. That speech, Mr. Speaker, showed very little in the way of new programs. It showed the ideas and the programs of a government that has grown tired, complacent and indifferent to the needs of the people. Ideas and imagination and programs, Mr. Speaker, are now replaced with buzz words. The buzz words here from the member for Estevan and the member for The Battlefords yesterday was "The NDP listens."

Mr. Speaker, are they listening? Are they listening to Mrs. Smith, widow, living on a half section of land, whose power bill this winter, in all likelihood, will be approaching \$400? Are they listening to my friend back home in Carievale, Alex Smith, over 78 years old, who waited eight months to have corrective surgery done on an artificial hip that went faulty — eight months for elective surgery, all that while in agony and pain? Are they listening, Mr. Speaker, to Mary Swayze, my neighbour in Carievale, compelled to look after her invalid husband because there was no room for him in a nursing home. There was no room for him in a nursing home — so she is compelled to look after him until they are both in such a state that they are admitted to hospital. And when they are in good enough health they will be sent home for her to look after him again. My advice to her, Mr. Speaker, was, "You tell me when the hospital wants to release Mr. Swayze; I will have the TV cameras there." I would advise anyone in a similar situation to do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, are they listening to the cattle industry? People out there in the beef industry are watching while the industry is falling in shambles. And our Minister of Agriculture comes up with a stabilization program which nobody wants. They are adjusting it and shaping it up every day in the hope that it will gain some acceptability.

Are they listening, Mr. Speaker, to small business — small business tortured with government red tape? Mr. Speaker, are they listening to anyone?

I want to make a couple of comments about what was said by the member for Estevan yesterday. He said a complete feasibility study by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation on a comprehensive rural natural gas distribution system indicates the cost would be \$1 billion. Well, I would like to see that study, Mr. Speaker. I would like to see that study. We have asked for it. It has never come forth. I wonder if it was through his connections with Sask Power that he got that study. But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, is that the kind of attitude that built the existing gas distribution system? Is that the kind of attitude that build the existing electrical grid? Is that the kind of attitude that built the telephone system in Saskatchewan? Is this the forward looking party that they would have us believe? I think not, Mr. Speaker. As one newspaper columnist said the other day, "The guardrail on the front steps tells it all" — old, decrepit, tired, no new ideas.

Then there was the member, Mr. Speaker, for The Battlefords who on page 70 of *Hansard* said, "I don't believe in free enterprise." The member for The Battlefords, representing probably a large number of grocers, cafe owners, hotel owners, people who make the Saskatchewan economy tick, said, "I don't believe in free enterprise." Well, I hope the people of Saskatchewan hear the member for The Battlefords espousing, "I don't believe in free enterprise." It only creates employment for 60 per cent of the labour force in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. BERNTSON: — This session, Mr. Speaker, in all probability will be the last one before the provincial election. And as such the thrust of my remarks today will expose the record of a government that has grown tired, complacent, and indifferent to the needs of the people of Saskatchewan. The people are ready for change, Mr. Speaker. The Progressive Conservative Party will be the vehicle for that change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. BERNTSON: — I will present to this legislature the positive, exciting, and realistic programs which the Progressive Conservative government will bring before this Assembly. Ten years in office, Mr. Speaker, has made this government old and tired. There is a growing mood for change throughout this province. People want a change in government. They want to put an end to almost 30 years of socialist, tired, old, ideas. The people of Saskatchewan are in a house cleaning mood. They want the halls in Regina swept clean. Mr. Speaker, we the Progressive Conservatives can give the people of Saskatchewan a government they can trust, a government that believes power comes from the people and not from the central planners, a government that is as good as the people of Saskatchewan, a government that seeks to widen the horizons of opportunity for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, 20 months ago our party made a commitment to this province. Last month at our convention we reaffirmed that promise. Our province can be one of the most powerful economic forces in Canada and North America in the years to come. The people of Saskatchewan will thread their influence throughout the world in industry and social and cultural endeavors. Saskatchewan will be the number one place to come home to, to build in, and to strengthen the family. We made a commitment that a Conservative government will make Saskatchewan number one. In a sense the task of which I speak is like that of a Michelangelo who saw his masterpiece released from enormous blocks of marble. Saskatchewan is a province of potential that cries out to be released. We need that same growth attitude and new skills now.

We need to free the people of this province to do the jobs that we know they can do so well. We need to make our province work in such a way that we will truly be a government as good as the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, as Leader of the Opposition, I've travelled the length and breadth of the province over the last several months. One of my primary responsibilities was in candidate recruitment. I want to point out at this time that everyone I talked to stood 10 feet tall among that crowd over there. Mind you, it's not hard to look 10 feet tall among that bunch of mental midgets. It has been a moving and learning experience to meet with the people from all walks of life in each city, town, village and hamlet.

During that time I've listened to people tell me of the kind of Saskatchewan they want. I have found in my travels that the people really do believe in themselves and in the future of our province. The people I have talked to tell me that the government is part of the problem, not part of the solution. When a government no longer has the vision to rise to the challenge that the people of the province see, then the time has come to change the government. For many months now Saskatchewan has been subjected to a government that is content to dwell on its past and one which does not understand that Saskatchewan and its people want to advance.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the record of the NDP. Then I want to extend a challenge to the Saskatchewan that a Progressive Conservative government would build. In the months ahead we will be given the opportunity to capture the destiny of our province. It will be for all of us a sacred duty, a call to contribute and to influence the direction of our province, to make a stand and spell out our concerns and our hopes for the future for what we believe to be right. Let's make no mistake. The next election is going to be the most important in the history of our province, for on its verdict, Mr. Speaker, will depend not only the future of this province but the future of our families, and the future of generations yet unborn.

The verdict will either mean the acceptance of a philosophy of life that makes us passive in the face of an all-powerful state, or we will rise to the tangible reality that we are makers of our own destiny. We want to shape our own future, and live in a province where the worth of the individual is enshrined, cherished and respected, where each and every one of us is faced with the challenge to use our own talents, skills and energies to the utmost for our own benefit and for the benefit of our communities.

We in the Progressive Conservative Party say that our future and the future of our children is in the balance. The next election is the most crucial. On its outcome rests the choice — personal liberty or state domination.

Mr. Speaker, we know there is something wrong with the Blakeney NDP government. Firstly, let me spell out loud and clear that the NDP government of today is not the CCF. The CCF was a party of social reform — a party concerned with people, a party controlled by people, and a party accountable to the people. The NDP of Blakeney is the party of big government or corporate socialism, the party of government control, the party of crown corporations, referred to by the NDP as “the family.”

The welfare they dole out to the crown corporations should make even the most radical socialist blush. The NDP in Saskatchewan have given new meaning to the words “corporate welfare bums.” The NDP spells out what you and I should do; the party has lost touch with the common man, and has lost touch with reality.

A former editor of the NDP's own newspaper summed it up nicely, and I quote:

The New Democratic Party has turned away from the fundamentals of democracy and free comment. Expediency rules the day.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a quote from the former editor of the NDP's own newspaper.

The Blakeney government is committed to controlling all the affairs of this province. They intend to be involved in every facet of our economic and personal lives to satisfy their lust for power. In 1978, Blakeney's NDP wanted to give a new deal to the people of Saskatchewan, but Blakeney deals from a stacked deck, Mr. Speaker — one set of rules

for his family, the family of crown corporations, and another set of rules for the rural families in Saskatchewan.

The NDP has an overall centralized approach — an approach based on the premise that central planners and political appointments made in the bureaucracy know better than the people of Saskatchewan what is good for them and for their communities, their schools and hospitals. And so it exerts more control, undermining locally elected officials, and every dollar in the form of a grant from Regina comes with the strings of a puppeteer.

It is a government with a central and elitist control all tied up in their thirst for power. They can no longer conceal from the people their desire for power. They have bungled their plans to take our freedom away, nepotism at its worst. Defeated NDP candidates and hirelings have become the elite. They are the bunglers, while the honest, career civil servants are frustrated and powerless. The flood of brown envelopes we are receiving from all sources reveals that gross mismanagement is running rampant. People do not reveal these things until the problems are so great that they can no longer be tolerated.

It is the government of big, massive borrowings, borrowings from American and European sources, borrowings used to fund the dole for the crown corporations, not to help people through difficult times or to help people on the road to meaningful life. It is the government of crown corporations with sophisticated, slick, expensive advertising campaigns for no other purpose except the purpose of brainwashing the people of Saskatchewan with the partisan NDP message. The money spent on advertising is wasted, except in the eyes of the NDP which will stop at nothing to deceive the people of Saskatchewan.

It is the government of high taxes, one which overcharges you for your power and gas so they can transfer these so-called profits into general revenue to squander elsewhere — hidden taxes, Mr. Speaker. In addition, they add sales tax to these overcharges.

It is the government of control, a government that has interfered and emasculated our local governments and bodies to the point where they are almost powerless. After all, who wants to sit on a local school board when the biggest decision of the year is whether we should paint the gym green, blue, or whatever. It is no coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that many local government positions are never contested. They have nothing to do but take instructions from Regina. Everything must be approved by the central planners in the department in Regina.

Mr. Speaker, you know for example that the land controlled by the NDP through the land bank is just over one million acres. Everyone agrees that there should be a way for government to assist in the transfer of land from one generation to another. There are ways to do this and we've made constructive proposals for the transferring of farms from one generation to the next. But why should the government end up owning the land? It didn't have to choose this method but it did, and for one reason important to the NDP — state control. We have a government determined to control everything. There has never been a system of state-owned lands that has not led to exploitation of the sharecroppers on those lands. This is a serious concern and make no mistake, there are those opposite who are anxious to exercise control over the people on these lands, dictating to them what they map put on the land and what methods they may use to farm. Family farms are the most efficient form of primary agriculture on the face of this earth, and they are for one simple reason: they are independent. They do the thinking;

they do the work and they reap the rewards. They are not sharecroppers, Mr. Speaker.

Further in the area of agriculture, we have recently seen the plan for beef stabilization. These farmers are in serious trouble, but the plan does very little to deal with their problems. In order to receive stabilization, they must give up their right to market their cattle to a central desk. They are locked in for six years, and we have seen how various ministers of agriculture from time to time changes the rules in the middle of the game. But they are locked in for six years. That one is going to come back to haunt this particular Minister of Agriculture. This is, Mr. Speaker, an unwarranted intrusion into farm management and serves only one purpose — it satisfies the government's lust for control.

We should point out clearly to Mr. MacMurchy, before he proceeds with any further intrusion into the management of the farms of Saskatchewan, the degenerate performance of the Russian farmers. In the past, we in western Canada prided ourselves on being able to feed a hungry world. Just who are we feeding today, Mr. Speaker? Primarily the Russians. Why have they had what seems like 65 crop failures in a row? Because, Mr. Speaker, they don't let their farmers think. They don't let them manage their own farms. In case you've missed the point, the Russians' refusal to let their farmers think is the major cause for starvation in the world today. Take this lesson to heart Mr. MacMurchy, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, and show a little humility in face of the fact that neither you nor anyone you could possibly appoint could understand the management of the farm better than the family that lives on it.

The NDP is a government of narrow politics where the party lines spill out into every activity, including the field of medicine. Look at what is happening to medicare. Spending ranks among the lowest of all the provinces. Doctors are leaving. Nurses are dissatisfied and frustrated. Patients are not getting the treatment they need when they need it. This is politics at its worst, at the expense of human suffering. What is the response of the government to these problems? Well, to pick a fight with the doctors; to advise that they see the patients less often; and to run off merrily and spend more money buying airlines, or squandering it on bathtubs for bureaucrats. I suggest the Minister of Health should drop down to that bathtub in Saskatoon and use it to clean up his act.

Put your money where your mouth is and get your health care standards back up where they belong. Think of your CCF roots, if you can remember that far back. More than anything else, I fear for this province under an NDP government, for it will control the day-to-day economic lives of the people of this province. It will do this without changing any existing legislation or policy. Any more powers taken by the government or the cabinet will only speed up the process. You ask me, "How will they do this?" Well, they will do it in at least five ways: direct employment with the civil service, direct employment through crown corporations, direct payments through welfare and social assistance, direct licensing of businessmen and farmers, direct leasing on a short-term basis of land through land bank and other short-term leases.

People who work for the provincial government are in some way or other dependent upon government and they are not free from partisan political pressures. I fear for the future of this province; under the NDP administration of Allan Blakeney, thousands of Saskatchewan citizens are not free to express their views openly. The people who in some way are dependent upon the NDP government are afraid. They are afraid for their jobs. They are afraid for their future promotions. They are afraid to speak out because, as we heard yesterday, they are the party that listens and the people would pay the

price. You have discussed politics with people — all of you have at one time or another — and you know this to be a fact. Anyone who in some way owes an allegiance to the government may support us at the polls, but he will not take out a membership or help openly or put up a sign or do anything that shows he supports any other party than the party in power.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, what is the difference between the direction of Blakeney's NDP government and the direction of the government of Russia or Poland? The only difference is the extent of the state control over the day-to-day lives of the people. Blakeney and his NDP government are facing a life and death struggle. They have had real power for so long and control over our day-to-day lives; they have tasted this power and they will not let go. Power corrupts and to keep this power the NDP will embark upon the most vicious and distorted, most vilifying election campaign in the political history of the province. They have already begun the deception.

As I said earlier, I want to tell you about the Saskatchewan a PC government would build. I want to tell you here today that our first priority as a government will be to strengthen the province's economy. We will begin this thrust into a new and dynamic era of growth by establishing a legitimate heritage trust fund that would divert a percentage of current and future petroleum revenues into the fund for the future. We would move rapidly toward making Saskatchewan a leader in energy production. Energy has become more and more vital to our future and there is no doubt that we in Saskatchewan can prosper from energy development and can play a vital role in Canada's future.

We would recognize that the economic health of Saskatchewan is very dependent upon agriculture as well. In recognizing the importance of agriculture, we would implement programs such as a comprehensive rural gas distribution system. We would encourage increased productivity through capital grants assistance, fuel cost reduction and a Saskatchewan family farm purchase program for young people just getting started in agriculture.

We would readjust our tax laws, both corporate and personal, to reflect the growing potential wealth in our province. To that end, a Conservative government would remove the sales tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. BERNTSON: — We would bring government closer to the people. Realizing that power comes from the people and not from government, we would restore the human factor in government — people first.

The programs of which I speak, Mr. Speaker, are not a set of promises; they are a set of challenges. They symbolize not what we intend to offer but rather what we can do together to build a new Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal briefly with the ravages of inflation. I want to tell you here today that I see inflation and the high cost of living as a very serious threat to future development. It would be our intention to battle the ravages of inflation. Statistics and economic theories are meaningless when governments cease to think in terms of human need. I give you my word that a Conservative government will always think in terms of human need.

There are those who claim that inflation, high interest rates and the cost of living are controlled by outside factors. These same people will tell you that there is nothing a provincial government can do to combat inflation and to reduce the cost of living. The people of whom I speak are the same group of people who have governed this province for the last 10 years. Today I want you to know that I emphatically reject the notion that the provincial government can do nothing to help reduce the cost of living. In fact, the NDP caused much of the increased cost of living in the province of Saskatchewan.

Today I make the public commitment that a Progressive Conservative government would play an active role in making Saskatchewan a good place to live, with a reduced cost of living. The Progressive Conservative Party has the boldness and vision and the determination to launch an energetic battle against inflation. Inflation has been an acute social problem since the Roman Empire, and here in Canada it has been an accelerating problem since World War II. The economist Milton Friedman has defined inflation as a form of taxation that has one very special feature — it's the only form of taxation that can be imposed without anyone voting for it. Mr. Speaker, inflation fueled by the NDP can be voted on and it will. The hardships imposed upon Saskatchewan by the NDP will be rejected at the ballot boxes.

In my travels throughout the province, I have talked with an ever-increasing number of people who are really afraid of this cancer we call inflation; we share that fear. Our society cannot long endure rates of inflation that now touch 12 per cent and threaten to soar higher. We can no longer continue to endure interest rates that would make the loan shark grin, and we can no longer endure government at any level that will pour fuel on the fires of inflation.

Saskatchewan has a history of people who came here looking for new opportunities. So powerful was that attraction that thousands came. They made the perilous journey seeking a brighter destiny on a distant continent. Saskatchewan has been living proof of the way our ancestors and succeeding generations surmounted the difficulties of the past. Every generation has struggled to preserve the old dream against new dangers, and now it is our turn. The danger we face today is the danger of inflation.

Let's talk of inflation in real terms for a moment — in family terms which even this tired old government can understand. Let's speak of housing before we are misled by the deception of the NDP's distracting the issue to their stand-by, the old health care bogey man. There is a housing crisis in Saskatchewan and there is no need for it. We, on this side of the House, believe that decent, affordable housing should be within the means of every Saskatchewan family. That is not true today, and while we know the federal government has failed in its responsibility to ensure reasonable mortgage rates for Canadians, we also know that much can be done right here in Saskatchewan.

The government has proposed some type of scheme for mortgage renewals but it won't tell us what the scheme is. Instead of help we have further uncertainty for home-owners, banks, credit unions and everyone, and there is no mention of the plight of the renters. Mr. Speaker, the money is available if only the government would rearrange its priorities. The government has loaned hundreds of millions of dollars, interest free, to its family — the family of crown corporations. Even private developers obtain low interest rates from the province, and I think specifically of the Cornwall Centre — it must be some sort of shirt-sleeve relative to the other family.

Surely the real families of this province should be treated with the same respect — at

least the same respect. Their priorities are more important and they cannot be left without help or hope while low interest and interest-free loans are provided for the family of the party. If the government does not soon act in a meaningful way the present crisis will grow. You cannot stand aloof and watch the dreams and the savings of families be destroyed. Above all, you cannot muddy this crisis with a farce of a program in which you spend no money while destroying what the credit unions built up over the years with the hard-earned dollars of the people of Saskatchewan. The banks will take care of themselves. They will survive your farce, but the credit unions will not. Rental accommodation is already extremely tight and is bound to become worse in the coming months if nothing is done. HUDAC (Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada) has projected that a further 1,000 people will be laid off in the housing construction industry in 1982. Mr. Speaker, that is 1,000 real families facing economic hardship.

These people and, indeed, all of the people in this province need not face this crisis if the government acts now to put its priorities on housing for real families. We have made proposals to help home-owners and first-time home buyers. We would be pleased if the NDP government would steal these programs now and help the people of Saskatchewan out of their present housing crisis. Spending on executive bathrooms and buses, and proposals to buy airlines are totally out of tune with the needs of the people. What good is it to spend money to buy four oil companies if your people are losing savings because of your neglect?

First of all and above all else, we must restore the human factor to government — people first. We are concerned about people, not theories of class conflict and exploitation that ignore the day-to-day world reality. That would be one of our main goals.

As I said earlier, statistics and economic theories are meaningless when governments cease to think in terms of human needs. When an elderly lady in Regina sees her lifetime savings wiped out because of increasing electricity and fuel rates, it's no comfort to her to hear the provincial cabinet ministers telling everyone that we are a have province. When a farmer in Kipling area goes bankrupt because of high interest rates, he is not interested in the government propaganda about a heritage fund Saskatchewan is suppose to have. When a mechanic in Moose Jaw cannot afford to buy a home because of high mortgage rates, he isn't too keen to hear a cabinet minister in Regina tell us we have a boom economy in Saskatchewan. When the Government of Saskatchewan announced rate increases in SGI and Sask Tel, all wage earners wondered what Mr. Romanow, our Attorney General, meant when he said that crown corporations are there to provide a service at the least possible expense to the people of Saskatchewan.

I pledge that a Progressive Conservative government will hold true to its word in restoring the human factor to government — people before crown corporation. The economic policies of a Progressive Conservative government would recognize the dignity of the individual. We cannot and will not tolerate economic policies that eliminate basic human dignity. The government of this province tells us that inflation is a circumstance out of its control. In the meantime, inflation robs people every day. An elderly person on a fixed income is forced to buy inferior food. Maybe he even has to give up the home and can't afford new clothes. Those are the tragic circumstances, Mr. Speaker. Those are the kinds of things that a heartless, technocratic government ignores. Economic statistics cannot show the stark reality of what inflation does to people.

Take a close look at the record of the present government in Saskatchewan and you will see that it has been a significant contributor to the high cost of living. It has eroded freedom and economic well-being and used inflation as an excuse to justify its actions. We must battle that inflation.

Let me tell you how, Mr. Speaker. Here in Saskatchewan the government has a vast amount of control over utilities such as electricity, telephone, insurance, and fuel prices. Since 1978 it has significantly raised the prices of each and every one of them. Let us take a look at the record. Electricity rates are up. Natural gas rates are up. Saskatchewan Power makes huge profits. Telephone rates are up. Sask Tel Makes large profits — oh, well, there weren't any.

I want to touch on SGI for a moment. The NDP does not like it when we talk about SGI. I believe that for many years SGI provided reasonable service to the people of Saskatchewan. Public automobile insurance was something we could be proud of but the Blakeney government has allowed SGI to become a haven for mismanagement and political appointments. That is not good business. In the last two years SGI has lost over \$56 million. The people of Saskatchewan deserve a better performance from SGI than that. A Progressive Conservative government would clean up SGI. We would provide the type of excellence and quality that the people want. That, Mr. Speaker, is the way to deal with inflation.

The provincial government has changed the 19 cents per gallon gas tax (3 cents of which went directly to SGI) to a 20 per cent sliding tax (20 per cent of which goes to SGI). We are the only jurisdiction in the world where state-owned insurance rates are linked to the price of gasoline. A Conservative government would revert to a fixed levy on each litre of gas so that it would not aggravate the inflationary impact each time there was a price change.

What really irritates me, Mr. Speaker, is when I read in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, on June 27, that Saskatchewan drivers pay more for gasoline than the drivers in Toronto. We produce the oil; Ontario doesn't. Right now we are paying an average of 38.5 cents a litre or \$1.75 a gallon for gas. That is 40 cents to 45 cents more per gallon than that in Alberta. Do you know what the Premier has to say about all this? Well, he says, "No comment." If oil were free, gas would cost over \$1 a gallon in Saskatchewan just because of taxes. The Premier has no comment, nothing to say about it. I want you to know that the policy of the Progressive Conservative Party is to protect the people of Saskatchewan from those radical taxation policies.

Mr. Speaker, to protect the consumers, and at the same time battle the high cost of living, the Progressive Conservative government would establish a public utilities review commission. Now, I want you to know that the two major daily newspapers, the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix* and the *Regina Leader-Post*, have both endorsed this idea in their editorial pages. The public utilities review commission would protect every citizen from the needless profiteering of those utility agencies which are publicly owned. I contend that government agencies which furnish telephones, electricity, natural gas and insurance are offering a vital public service which must be regulated in such a manner as to provide the best possible service at the most reasonable cost to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to tell you that the Conservative Party does have

other definite plans to help reduce the cost of inflation. I want to take a few moments to tell you about the directions a Progressive Conservative government would take to achieve prosperity and security for all in Saskatchewan. A Conservative government would carry out the following measures to do battle against inflation.

1. We would have a 10 per cent, across-the-board reduction in provincial income tax. The \$56 million lost by SGI accounts for more than a 10 per cent income tax cut.
2. We would immediately put a one-year freeze on utility rates. As I stated earlier, we would create a public utilities review commission to police utility rate increases and protect the people of Saskatchewan from unfair and unjustifiable rate or premium increases.
3. We would establish a senior citizens sales tax rebate program to protect senior citizens from the ravages of inflation and to give them additional spending power.
4. We would remove the sales tax. This is the most regressive tax there is. It is a tax that falls heavily on the working person and this tax would be eliminated by a Conservative government.
5. Because we believe everyone should have the opportunity to have a home, we will implement a Saskatchewan housing initiatives program. This program would counter the impact of high interest rates by providing low-cost mortgages available to first time home-owners. Saskatchewan can become a leader in making home-ownership a reality for anybody who really wants to own a home.

Who says that the provincial government here in Saskatchewan can't do anything about the high cost of living? Only the tired and worn out NDP government does, that's who. The times require imagination, perseverance, boldness and leadership — not advertising, not salesmanship. I am proud of the programs the Progressive Conservative Party has to offer the Saskatchewan people in the battle against inflation.

Now, I want to turn to a very important part of our economy, the farmers. During this year's spring session of the Legislative Assembly, the Progressive Conservative Party called on the government to activate the legislative standing committee on agriculture to hold public hearings on the serious economic problems being faced by farmers and ranchers in Saskatchewan. Farmers and ranchers are caught in a cost-price squeeze that is putting them further and further behind the eight ball. The NDP government voted no to our motion. We must immediately reinstate the farm cost reduction program. This would allow farmers some shelter from the ever increasing energy prices.

A Conservative government would also implement a Saskatchewan family farm purchase program that would provide a once in a lifetime \$350,000 loan to young people just getting started in farming. That is how we would ensure that there would be another generation of independent family farms and not sharecroppers as is the situation under the NDP scheme. Those are the kinds of realistic programs which can make Saskatchewan a leader in combating inflation. The government exists to provide a climate for everyone to grow and develop according to his or her personal wishes. When a person's taxes get too high, or the cost of living gets out of hand, his or her freedoms and initiatives are eroded and the progress of society suffers. For these reasons, I believe that now, more than ever, Saskatchewan needs a government whose first priority is to see that everyone in Saskatchewan has a decent standard of living and

is protected from the ills of inflation.

A Progressive Conservative government will have the determination and the commitment to that priority. It is one of the greatest challenges we face in this province. This is a time for achievement in Saskatchewan. In travelling across the province you can't help but come away with a sense of "Yes, we can do the job." Saskatchewan has more resource wealth than most provinces, but fails to keep up with the majority of the provinces. The reason is the NDP government. Saskatchewan is strong but the government has grown tired and old and weak.

Saskatchewan can be great if only we give it a change. People all over Saskatchewan tell me they are ready for that challenge, and so are we. Mr. Speaker, I said at the outset that the dignity of man and the individual family unit must come before all else, and the design of government. The strength of the family is our greatest treasure. It was that bond which helped the early pioneers endure the hardships of this land. It has been the cornerstone of our growth and strength throughout history. The family influence should be our guide to the path of our future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to energy. Today, I want to state my convictions as clearly as I can in an effort to bring about a realistic and positive energy program for the province of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan should be a leader in energy production. It is not. Growing scarcity and costs of our traditional energy sources challenge our way of life, our province and its people.

In my experience, I have learned a lot about the energy situation in this province. Today, I would like to share with you my perceptions and most important, what a Conservative government would do about this challenge. These are not ordinary times for Saskatchewan. Energy is becoming more and more vital to our future. Yet, Saskatchewan is falling behind while consumers are being asked to pay more and more for energy.

The energy problem is unlike any other problem government has faced. It is highly complex, yet fundamentally political. It is absolutely paramount that a solution be found to guarantee Saskatchewan's future well-being in the energy field. Consequently, this problem deserves study by the best minds, leadership from leaders, and public co-operation, if there is to be any meaningful answer. Everywhere I go in Saskatchewan, there is a serious concern about energy. The basic concerns are: why do we have to pay so much for energy while we are a producing province? Why is our energy industry deteriorating when all around us there is growth?

Mr. Speaker, I want to service notice that a Conservative government would be totally committed to making Saskatchewan a truly productive province in the field of energy. Historically, Saskatchewan has been the second largest producer of oil in Canada. Until recently, it has been a profitable industry for the province. The industry is now in trouble and the causes are obvious. One is the NDP government in Regina and the other is the Trudeau government in Ottawa.

Let me first deal with the Trudeau government. On October 28, 1980, the Trudeau government brought down its so-called budget, which was really a front for a planned takeover of the energy industry in western Canada. The Trudeau government imposed a new tax on oil and natural gas producers of 8 per cent, virtually at the wellhead, which took away most of the profits that the producers would make producing in Saskatchewan. This tax increase was translated into an increase in your gasoline and heating fuel bill. The Trudeau government gave Petro-Canada the power to buy up

existing foreign-owned oil companies and to charge that to the taxpayers. The purchase of Petrofina has cost every Canadian more for gasoline but has not produced one gallon of new energy.

The Trudeau administration has also adjusted revenue-sharing agreements for oil and gas profits by federal and provincial governments, so that the government in Ottawa gains more revenue at the expense of the producing provinces. This will mean that several hundred million dollars will be lost in Saskatchewan in the next five to ten years.

Let's look at Pierre Trudeau's national energy program and how it affects Saskatchewan. Since 1980, gasoline prices have jumped more than 70 cents per gallon. But let's not ignore the problems created right here in Saskatchewan. I look at our neighbouring province of Alberta and see what oil and natural gas have done for that province. We have that type of potential right here in Saskatchewan. The similarities end there, though. Alberta has had a history of government and industry working together to develop the resources for its people. Saskatchewan, on the other hand, has been the victim of a socialist experiment that has severely hindered our potential. Ask Central Canada Potash; ask Burns Foods, ask industry in general. It's my belief that this province has all the potential, all the possibilities, if only it had a government.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to explain. Excessive government intervention by the NDP best explains why Saskatchewan is lagging in oil exploration and development. Our philosophy is one of government and industry working together to develop the resources in the best interests of Saskatchewan. The resource industry should never have a free hand in Saskatchewan, but they do need confidence and expect government consistency. Excessive regulation and intervention do not benefit anyone. The taxpayers realize this and that's why there should be a change in Saskatchewan.

For over a decade now, oil men have been leaving Saskatchewan because of NDP policies. Back in 1972 the NDP brought in Bill 42, which was an attempt to capture the gains of the oil companies. This scared off many companies.

When a rebound came in Saskatchewan drilling, it was not because of provincial policies but in spite of them. The taxation system on the oil industry in this province is a bureaucratic nightmare. As I stated earlier, all the people of Saskatchewan will benefit when government and industry co-operate for the public interest. I am informed that the wellhead price of natural gas in Saskatchewan is so low that the producer get an average ranging from 15 cents to 60 cents per 1,000 cubic feet compared with an average closer to \$2 in Alberta. Not only is that ridiculous but it is against the best interests of development in Saskatchewan. It is little wonder that 80 per cent of Saskatchewan farmers don't have natural gas though 85 per cent in Alberta do.

One cannot talk about oil in Saskatchewan without mentioning Saskoil. Mr. Speaker, this past year it has been reported that Saskoil's profits dropped and my immediate reaction was to wonder how the profits could drop at a time when most oil companies were chalking up record profits? It would seem to me that only the present administration in Saskatchewan would find a way to reduce profits at a time when others in the same industry were making higher profits. For the record, let's take a look at Saskoil's recent profit dip. Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation had a profit of \$3.99 million for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1979, a decline of \$2.9 million from the net earnings of \$6.8 million in the previous year. Why? I believe this came about through mismanagement, waste of funds, poor planning and so on. Surely with the ever-increasing demand for oil, it being a crucial part of our non-renewable

resources, the people of Saskatchewan should expect more from that particular crown corporation.

The province of Alberta gets a good return on its oil and Saskatchewan should be getting a good return on its oil as well. The record of Saskoil is clear. It's a clear case of government intervention and the people not benefiting. It is clear proof that my philosophy of government and industry working together is a much better way. That, I repeat, is the climate a Conservative government would bring to Saskatchewan. I also want to say that it is absolutely essential that the non-renewable resources of Saskatchewan, in particular oil, should not be given away or wasted on political whim or surely Saskatchewan will face an empty heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I want to show you and this House the stupidity of the energy policy made in Ottawa and here in Regina. There is no other way to describe the mess we are in today. In southeastern Saskatchewan (remember, this is only in the Southeast) there is the capacity to produce 45,300 barrels per day. In November of 1981 we are producing 30 per cent of that capacity, 13,600 barrels per day. Because we are producing at 30 per cent, we are losing \$518,000 per day in taxes to the two levels of government, \$325,000 to Saskatchewan alone. Because we are producing at 30 per cent, we are importing foreign crude at twice the price. We are paying an extra \$630,000 a day to import the oil that could be produced in southeastern Saskatchewan. The total burden to the taxpayer is \$1,148,000 a day. That, Mr. Speaker, is the direct loss. Add to that the loss of jobs, of service, of equipment, and the economy loses at \$2 million a day because of the utter stupidity of the programs of Ottawa and Saskatchewan. These figures are only for the Southeast. So you can begin to understand the magnitude of the impact of a realistic energy policy on the economy of all of Saskatchewan.

It is important for us to realize the gravity of the energy economic situation faced by Saskatchewan. The accumulation of resource revenues is essential to our economic stability and our preparation for the future. If we intentionally withhold the production of non-renewal resources, leave them in the ground and do not begin to build our economy for the future, we run the risk of losing a decent future altogether. If we nationalize the non-renewable resources, if we purchase Gulf or Marathon properties, we lose in four ways. We have spent heritage money on what is ours in the first place; we have not protected the resources from Ottawa; we've put an increasing tax burden on other Canadians, because federal taxes are not paid, which is important because it encourages other provinces and the federal government to look with envy on our resources and provides them with renewed arguments to take over our resources. We will have no non-renewable resource wealth available to build a renewable industry base.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time in Saskatchewan's history when all objective evidence should indicate tremendous potential in the resource revenue. That is why I am astonished at the total failure of the present government in Saskatchewan to bring about that development.

Why has all this happened? It has happened because the Premier of Saskatchewan has spent too much time trying to build his statesmanlike image in central Canada, playing the darling of the eastern press. He has forgotten or ignored the needs and problems of the people of his own province and of western Canada. Perhaps he no longer feels that this is his province; perhaps he is ready to move on. He has spent so much time

undermining the efforts of the other western Canadian premiers that the Trudeau government has been able to sneak in all its constitutional, energy and economic policies. Trudeau's dream is to force western Canada into a centralist mold.

What can be done to remedy the situation? On the provincial scene several things could be done.

1. Royalty charges could be set to reflect the geological risk in Saskatchewan.
2. Incentives should be offered to encourage all small Canadian entrepreneurs to search for oil in Saskatchewan. To expect to discover any major finds is a dream, but to ignore the possibility of the discovery of further deposits is equally as foolish.
3. For the common good of both Saskatchewan and Canada, there is great need to get on with the development of our substantial heavy oil deposits. What is needed is a fair distribution of economic return among the explorer, the producer, the refiner and the government, and to get on with the job. The time is now.
4. Every encouragement and incentive should be given to our citizens and our industries to develop energy substitutes for our depleting reserves of oil and gas.
5. Tax laws and regulations should be amended to encourage energy substitution and conservation in every aspect of our daily lives, to become energy efficient in every possible way. We should develop the Saskatchewan heavy oil reserves. All of us realize that while the demand for oil is going up, oil is not like grain. Oil runs out. We must develop alternate fuels. Government cannot go on a blind course or this will mean serious problems. We, on the Conservative side, realize this, and hope that those on the other side take heed.

We, in Saskatchewan, must control our energy destiny. I believe the people of Saskatchewan will respond in a positive manner to the Progressive Conservative energy proposals. If we do all of this in Saskatchewan, some day we can look back and say that we earned our rightful place and our rightful destiny in Canada. We will have made a Saskatchewan that will surely be a great place to live.

I'll turn briefly, Mr. Speaker, to northern and native problems. Mr. Speaker, northern Saskatchewan, DNS, is a government unto itself, totally controlling every service and facility in the North, stifling the development of local government, stifling the development of the northern economy. In the words of Justice Noble, "It has run amuck."

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the next few moments to speak on the government's record as it relates to the first citizens, the native people. As is commonly known, the NDP government has wasted many, many millions of taxpayers' dollars on its misguided efforts. What isn't commonly known, except by the natives themselves, is how little of this money actually gets into the hands of the people for whom it was intended. Mr. Speaker, very recently seven northern local housing groups were cut off funds, leaving houses incomplete and people unemployed. This government will once again fault the local housing groups. However, I am suggesting that is not the fault of the northern natives, but the real problem and the cause is the incompetence of the DNS in providing the proper training and the resources to assure the success of these groups. Lack of adequate preparation is so widespread that it appears the real plan is to ensure failure, to keep northern natives untrained and unskilled and to keep them dependent

on government. This would no doubt continue to guarantee professional and high-paying jobs for the government's appointees at the expense of the native people.

Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that only 3 per cent of the timber harvested in northern Saskatchewan is harvested by local northern residents, again a dismal failure by this government to meet the needs of our northern population. After 10 years in power it is more than coincidence that our native people continue to have the poorest housing and conditions, the highest alcohol and crime rates, the lowest education standard, and the highest unemployment in the province. The NDP has done almost nothing to improve these conditions. This is not to say that this situation exists because the people, both native and non-native wish it, for there is general concern on both sides. This situation only exists because of the policies and attitudes of this government to squander resources, both human and monetary.

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan is committed to a program that will reverse the deplorable situation and that will greatly enhance the economic and social conditions of the native people. More specifically, our party is committed to co-operate with the native people in northern Saskatchewan to develop their own future in a meaningful way and erase the dismal failures to date. The native people of Saskatchewan are fed up with government policies made without their consultation, and continually being told by politicians and hacks what is good for them. Our party is committed to involve native people in making policy which directly affects their lives. We believe that native individuals are ready and eager for real economic development. We also believe, like the rest of Canadians, they require very little governing and could take advantage of the existing economic system given the proper resources, not mere government handout programs which this government has continually done, programs of building structures and governing bodies that oppress local initiative.

On a matter of equal importance, we wonder at the integrity of a government or political party that would create and implement a program aimed at creating government bodies and superstructures geared at governing native people in the North of this province, while at the same time pretending to champion the native cause and the issue of the constitution. We condemn this government's failures and promise we will do all that can be done to create meaningful and beneficial change.

Mr. Speaker, this government shows no real understanding for the problems of the people of Saskatchewan. It has shown no regard for our future. In the field of education there are not enough funds. There is money for bathtubs, for Norcanair, for Marathon Oil, for advertising the crown corporations, but not enough for education. Let me quote an article in a recent paper, November 3, 1981. Speaking at the university's annual fall convocation, Dr. Kristjanson said:

Reconsideration is warranted in view of large numbers of people wanting to attend university and society's current and projected needs for high-level manpower.

He noted that, despite predictions to the contrary, enrolment at the university has been rising and is now at an all-time high. It has been forced this year to reject the requests of a large number of fully qualified high school graduates for admission to the colleges of nursing, commerce, education, pharmacy and engineering. These are the colleges whose graduates are currently required by the employers of the province. He added that in the colleges of law, veterinary medicine, medicine, and dentistry, it has also been forced to reject a large number of candidates in spite of the fact that their records

suggest that they would have been capable of successfully completing the course requirements.

He said that in these professions, manpower requirements appear to be reasonably well met, and that it would be very costly to expand enrolment. Nevertheless, we must remain a bit uncomfortable about decisions which have the effect of denying capable young men and women access to educational opportunities of their choice.

In colleges such as arts and sciences, where enrolment quotas do not apply, it has been necessary to limit registration in certain courses and programs.

The combination of denying students their first or second choice of a field of study, and increasing the size of classes or sections of classes is hardly an acceptable response to a statement of interest in university education by our citizens.

Dr. Kristjanson went on to say that there is no evidence of an oversupply of university graduates in our society. He said:

In some technical fields there is considerable evidence of growing manpower shortages which will become more serious. There is much evidence that we need more highly literate, sensitive individuals, capable of critically considering both the goals of our society and the methods by which the goals are pursued. The university should continue to be a place where these attributes and skills are developed and encouraged.

He stated that some of the inadequacy of our responses to our responsibilities and opportunities is a product of inadequate financial support. Human resources are essential to develop natural resources. The human resource is most important.

It is today's students who must solve our problems tomorrow, and that requires the best training we can afford. Education surely comes before airlines, bathtubs, bus lines and advertising. Perhaps if the NDP spent more on educating Saskatchewan students here at home, they would not have to spend so much time recruiting people from Queen's University.

The senior citizens of our province have not received a fair deal from this government either. The attitude of the NDP has been to treat our senior citizens like children, and they resent that attitude.

I'm proud to say that the Progressive Conservative Party stands for the rights of every elderly citizen. We make that commitment because we believe that the elderly deserve that respect and dignity. What we, as a society, do for the elderly is not a matter of charity. Those who have built our communities have a right to security in their retirement years, and they have a right to continue to be active and involved. All too often we have the NDP government talk in platitudes about senior citizens. Let's take a real look at the truth.

I find it simply unacceptable that senior citizens should have to pay a fee for prescription drugs in this province. I find it totally unacceptable that senior citizens are subjected to ever-increasing utility rates. A Conservative government would guarantee that no senior citizen would see his lifetime savings taken away because he decided, or needed, to live in a nursing home.

Mr. Speaker, the hollow promises by the NDP to our senior citizens must become a thing of the past. The promises to senior citizens by the NDP remind me of the attitude of a would-be king in one of Shakespeare's plays, who for a kingdom said that any oath may be broken. Make 1,000 oaths to reign for a year. But it should be remembered that at the end of the play the people who lived by those words lost the throne.

A month ago, I heard from an elderly grandmother who was worried about her high gas and power bills and was thinking about giving up her telephone to save money. High officials with 10 telephone lines have no right to continually jack up her utility rates and ask her to sacrifice her life line to her children as part of the battle against inflation. The elderly who cannot make ends meet do not have seats on the NDP side of this legislature. The Conservatives will be their voice in this House.

Senior citizens who are heating half their homes (closing off half their homes) because they cannot afford winter heat do not have any friends on that side of the House. Mr. Speaker, let it be noted that there is hope and a sense of dignity for all senior citizens with the programs the Progressive Conservative government would implement.

What kind of family life is it when children are forced to move out of the province to find work, leaving grandparents to grow old without the comfort of their children or the joy of their grandchildren? What kind of a family life is it when grandchildren grow up without the love of their grandparents? Mr. Speaker, that is the reality for too many families with their roots in Saskatchewan, and that is the legacy of 30 years of the socialist experiment in Saskatchewan. The NDP believes in a philosophy of failure, a creed of ignorance, a gospel of envy, and the equal sharing of misery.

I am going to touch briefly, Mr. Speaker, on crown corporations. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1981, there was an editorial in the Regina *Leader-Post*, with the title, "Blakeney's Scare Tactics an Injustice to the Electorate." The editorial dealt with the scare tactics the NDP is using in a futile attempt to scare the people of Saskatchewan (just as they have unsuccessfully attempted with medicare) into believing the Progressive Conservatives would dismantle crown corporations. Mr. Speaker, for the record I would like to quote from the *Leader-Post* editorial:

There were suggestions from the Premier that Tory sympathizers were somehow anxiously waiting in the wings to swoop down and peck away at the entrails of dismantled crown corporations following a Conservative win. But Blakeney didn't stop there, asserting that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation might also be one of the targets for privatization. To bolster his argument he pointed to the examples of other provinces, most particularly Tory Alberta, where there are still investor-owned power utilities.

A few points are worthy of clarification in this regard. The first is that the Saskatchewan Progressive Conservative Party has not suggested dismantling SPC, nor for that matter have the PCs suggested the same for any other natural monopoly, for the obvious advantages of scale and the added cost of competition dictate against duplication. Secondly, one would be hard-pressed to point to the instances in this country where a provincial government has moved to privatize a government-owned utility, whether an electrical company or a telephone system, once established. That has been the case no matter what political party has inherited such crown corporations.

Not only have Conservative governments continued to operate such power as well as

telephone companies, they were also the governing party when the country's largest power utility, Ontario Hydro, was set up in 1906. As for Alberta, the possibility of that province having a direct stake in electrical power generation has been raised recently by Alberta's Conservative economic development minister, Hugh Planche, as well as PC backbenchers. Provincially-owned power companies set up under Liberal administrations in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Manitoba have survived and grown under other succeeding Conservative administrations. Similarly, government-owned telephone systems dating back to the early days of the century in Manitoba and Alberta have not yet met their demise, just because the government of the day happened to be Conservative.

The Premier's shading of the facts regarding the PC's plans for SPC is clearly an indication that Allan Blakeney is shedding his diplomatic finery that he has worn around the constitutional conference table and is donning grubbier partisan apparel as a provincial election approaches. When that election comes, the role the crown corporations play in this province deserves to be an important campaign issue. However, it is in the best interest of the electorate and the Premier's reputation that the debate take place without resorting to unwarranted scare tactics. Mr. Speaker, there is no place for the politics of fear in Saskatchewan.

This afternoon I want to make it perfectly clear to the people of Saskatchewan that a Progressive Conservative government will revitalize and improve the crown corporations of this province in such a manner as to provide the best possible service at the most reasonable cost to the people of Saskatchewan. A Conservative government would make the crown corporations accountable to the people. After all, they own them. Under our government, crown corporations will be the servants of the people and not a hiding place for the political has-beens and appointments and rejects of the government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, every taxpayer in Saskatchewan has a right to know why SGI has lost millions of dollars and why utility rates are raised when Sask Tel and Sask Power already have large profits. The people of Saskatchewan know that it is not fair when the government expands PCS and will not permit Central Canada Potash to expand. An editorial in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* was headlined "Potash Ruling Distressing" — and of course, it was. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the NDP government to refuse to allow Central Canada to expand its mining operation is outrageous.

Premier Allan Blakeney was often heard recently on the radio praising the contributions of business to Saskatchewan's economy and yet refusing expansion in the potash industry. In fact, on the day the government refused permission for the potash expansion, the NDP Minister of Industry, Norman Vickar, sent out a press release which would make interesting reading for his colleagues. He stated:

We all need to remind ourselves often that the entrepreneur is the backbone of the Saskatchewan economy. Every day, in some way, the lives of the people of Saskatchewan are touched by the private sector. Businesses create jobs right here. They generate tax dollars and they support community groups. I'm also proud of the role government has played in furthering this business development.

My question is: how proud is the NDP government of its decision not to allow expansion of Central Canada Potash?

An editorial in the *Star-Phoenix* stated:

Obviously the potash corporation is showing its greed and the provincial cabinet is satisfying it. (The same editorial went on to say:) Since when did the provincial cabinet appoint itself as financial consultant to privately owned potash companies?

The president of the North Saskatchewan Building and Construction Trades Council says he is livid over the provincial government's roadblock to expansion at the Colonsay potash mine, which comes at a time when the number of unemployed tradesmen is high. It seems the NDP has one set of rules for the private sector and another set of rules for crown corporations. When government acts as both regulator and operator in a particular industry, it puts the private sector at a disadvantage and you know who suffers; we all do. Simply stated, the potash ruling was distressing news.

Mr. Speaker, the people can only have answers to these questions if they have real input and accountability from their crown corporations. Vindictiveness can have no place if we are going to build a great province.

Mr. Speaker, the province of Saskatchewan has long suffered the consequences of the Trudeau government in Ottawa that does not understand and doesn't care about us. For a brief period we enjoyed the refreshing government of Joe Clark. He brought with him understanding and concern for the needs of the people of western Canada. Mr. Speaker, the only reason we suffer from the Trudeau government in Ottawa today is that there have been five NDP MPs from Saskatchewan, proxy Liberals, vote with Trudeau against western Canada to defeat the Conservative government and Crosbie's budget. If they had voted with western Canada, we would not have Trudeau as Prime Minister today.

Look at what we lost. We have no mortgage assistance as there was in the Crosbie budget. Marc Lalonde's greed makes the 18 cent a gallon tax look like the utmost in restraint today. Not only did Lalonde raise taxes faster than proposed by Crosbie, he levied taxes to pay for non-existent imports. He wouldn't give it back because he said it would be confused with a decrease in prices.

Remember, we had a western minister for energy before Lalonde — in fact, a minister of energy from Saskatchewan, Mr. Ray Hynatyshyn. But the NDP voted against him, against Saskatchewan and against the West; Liberal proxies voted for Trudeau. We had a western minister of transport, but the NDP voted against him. Instead we have an Easterner in Jean-Luc Pepin, who admits he knows nothing of transportation, and no VIA Rail service.

Trudeau and Pepin are preparing to dismantle the statutory crowrates for grain. NDP protests ring hollow. It was the Saskatchewan NDP members in Ottawa who had the deciding votes, who voted out the western government and cast their ballots with Trudeau. Saskatchewan is now suffering the consequences of their treachery.

Mr. MacEachen has removed the provision for income averaging annuities. Taxpayers must now pay the tax up front. Perhaps, Mr. Tchorzewski should go out to his constituency of Humboldt and explain to the retiring farmer with only a half section to sell that he must now pay \$40,000 to \$50,000 in taxes up front. Explain the justice of that. Your protest should have been two years ago to your brothers who represent Saskatchewan in Ottawa.

Mr. Tchorzewski, who so fondly advocated closing loopholes, should remember that it's not only the rich who are hurt by MacEachen's greed. Theories on social justice and taxation ring very hollowly indeed when you begin to look at the actual circumstances of farmers and businessmen in Saskatchewan. Now the Conservative MPs from Saskatchewan in Ottawa are carrying on the fight to have these provisions changed — a fight that would never have been necessary if the NDP representatives from Saskatchewan had remained loyal to their province. The members opposite may not like it, but we know that the NDP has fallen a long way from the CCF party of the people of rural Saskatchewan. The NDP has become what one MP called "nothing more than the little red rump of the Liberal Party in Ottawa."

You have turned your back on your heritage. You are a party of technocrats, a party that bows to Trudeau and his central control. The NDP is the party that sits on the fence when our province is under attack by Ottawa. It is the weak link in the western front; it is the party of expediency. The people of Saskatchewan will pass judgment on you shortly. I am sure they will give you what you have coming. Screw up your courage. Take your licking now.

Our party has proposed a number of programs to encourage growth in the economy. Others among my colleagues will refresh the memories of those opposite on these matters of economic common sense and will layout our policies for progress.

At this point, however, I want you to understand the philosophy of our party relating to the economy and to understand the logic of our proposals and benefits that will result in progress. Unlike the NDP, which spends all of its effort to Canadianize industry, we will place job creation front and centre in Saskatchewan. Our people have the talents, skills and energy to take up this challenge for their families and their futures. We are concerned about growth and stability in employment. We will listen to everyone. Let me emphasize for the members opposite (who aren't listening to anyone these days) that we will listen to organized labour. We know it is deeply concerned for the hourly wage earners of the province about long-term employment, working conditions, and planning for a strong, healthy economic environment. We can co-operate because we believe that it is in everyone's best interests. We don't believe that it is necessary to get in bed with foreign firms as the NDP has done in uranium. We can develop from within. Not only is job creation going to be the main emphasis, we are concerned that there are quality jobs for our young people who are entering the market and for people who want a greater challenge.

Jobs must be challenging and hourly wage rates must reflect productivity. Education, training and upgrading must be available and must be tailored to the job market. We believe that each and every community in Saskatchewan has the capability to grow, to improve and to provide a challenge for its young people. Growth must be encouraged on as broad an industrial and geographic base as possible. This cannot take place using NDP schemes hatched in the minds of the technocrats in Regina to direct the growth or, more often, the death of these communities. We believe that the role of government is to provide advice and assistance where it can and when it is asked. No predetermined central plan should be imposed on communities which do not want it or want to develop along independent lines.

My colleagues will develop our approach to government for you in the days ahead and you will see that it is reasonable and that it is truly designed to reflect the needs of real people and real families. The potential that we know in our hearts is there for

Saskatchewan will be realized.

Mr. Blakeney has threatened in recent days to raise taxes further. They are already too high. There is no justice in raising them further. We have promised a number of specific tax cuts, tax cuts which must be paid for. The money is available. The province will receive \$5.6 billion (and these are our Premier's figures) in the next five years from oil alone. Other resource revenue will grow as well. Also, we would not spend money on foolish ventures of very little benefit to the people of Saskatchewan. We must turn to expansionary programs that create jobs and new wealth. The NDP has proven that it does not know how to create new wealth. It does not understand productivity. It does not understand the needs of the people. A new approach must be taken where government, business, labour and education co-operate to build a better economy and community for all Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan needs a sound receptive approach by government to ensure growth of the economy. Our young people should not have to leave the province. Trust them. They will do a good job. Let them build the business and the industry of Saskatchewan, and they will surprise you with their achievements. Allow men and women the dignity of a challenge in their jobs and you will see the pride and quality in their work. Expect of business a full, fair share of taxes for public purposes, deliver to them fair treatment in return, and you will be amazed at their productivity.

If you want to stem the ravages of inflation, don't line the people of Saskatchewan up for a forced march to an economic tune played by the Government of Saskatchewan. Trust people. Trust them to do what they believe in, and you will find it also to be the best for Saskatchewan. Government can encourage participation, can identify opportunity and provided general services, but essentially it is the energy, the talent and the foresight of the people, who by drawing on government will ensure the future of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the motion which has been presented by the member for Estevan and seconded by the member for The Battlefords isn't quite the one we would have prepared, so with that in mind, I will offer an amendment. I would like to move, seconded by the member for Maple Creek, that the following be added to the motion:

But that this Assembly has no confidence in your advisers and condemns them for their failure to deal with the most serious concerns facing Saskatchewan, namely:

1. The need for development a strong agricultural sector;
2. The development of a strong small business sector;
3. The concerns and needs of senior citizens;
4. The lack of adequate assistance to home-owners and potential home-owners;
5. A total lack of commitment to post-secondary education;
6. The aspirations of the native community in Saskatchewan;
7. A complete failure to adequately deal with the economic plight facing

Saskatchewan in terms of high interest rates, inflation, and the cost of living.

MR. SPEAKER: — I find the amendment in order and debate continues on the motion and amendment concurrently.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to join this debate. I rise with a good deal of relish because there a number of comments I want to make, as you might imagine. But before I deal with the remarks (I was going to say of the hon. member for Souris-Cannington, but at least delivered by the hon. member for Souris-Cannington), let me offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion, the hon. members for Estevan and The Battlefords.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Their contributions to this debate are a source of pride to me and to our party and the voters of their constituencies. I take pride, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that our party is not only able to attract candidates of that calibre but also able to elect them and then see them sitting in this House.

I want to congratulate the hon. member for Souris-Cannington and welcome him to his third session as the now somewhat permanent Leader of the Opposition. He was offered to us some time ago as a temporary leader. He is now getting a track record which is equal to a fair number of others. The spirited way in which the hon. member read the remarks which were given to him — well, perhaps not entirely spirited, but . . . Having regard to the material he had to deal with, I think we all congratulate him on what he did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure a fair number of his colleagues must be asking, "Why aren't we looking at Eric a little more carefully? Maybe he's the man we need!"

The party of the hon. members opposite is always a little slow in the realization of the talent they have. They're always out looking for something else, some savior. Political obtuseness is not something new to the Conservative Party. I think it has been interesting to watch the members opposite for the last two years in their unswerving resolve to rendezvous with obscurity as they move to yet another position which is totally indefensible in today's society. They used to tell us that Nutana in 1978 was a fluke. After all, Saskatoon is tough. We can't really blame any Tory for not being able to win a seat in Saskatoon, because there's a long list of them who have failed.

But they said, "Just wait, we have a leader. You just wait, we'll find a time." So we waited, and indeed they did have a new leader with a bold, new vision. And we waited until the time that they chose the seat for the candidate whom they chose — Estevan. Then the people of Estevan passed judgment. Then, unhappy with the choice of the electorate of Estevan, the Conservatives chose another battleground — the courts. Even that proved to be barren ground. So the hon. member for Estevan sits on our side of the House, and the Tory leader remains up in the gallery or wherever he is.

But still, Mr. Speaker, the Tories trudge on, and their strategists continue to take for granted the hon. member for Souris-Cannington. They shouldn't do that; he's a good man. I don't suggest that he hasn't any shortcomings. I think those of us who listened to

the speech this afternoon should spot one or two, but at least he knows how to get elected. That's pretty important, and more than some of the Tory leaders know.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to make a few comments on some of the remarks of the hon. member for Souris-Cannington. I don't want to take too long, but I do want to touch on a few of them.

The member opposite said that the Conservative Party and their policies, their new vision, was going to make Saskatchewan a great place in which to live. We on this side believe that Saskatchewan already is a great place to live.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Then he went on to talk about the fact that our party has been in office for most of the last 30 years, and he pictured the people of Saskatchewan (in his own words now) as "passive in the face of an all-powerful state." Well, he's going about a different Saskatchewan than I'm going about. The people I meet are not passive in the face of an all-powerful state. They are very, very able to articulate their own beliefs. They are very, very able to make judgments. And because they are very, very able to make shrewd judgments I have no doubt that the members on this side of the House will be on this side of the House again, Mr. Speaker, after the next election. Those few of the members opposite who are left will be still to your left, Mr. Speaker.

I think, Mr. Speaker, of the banquet we had on the night of the opening when we paid tribute to all of those volunteers and noted the fact that in Saskatchewan we have more volunteers working at more community projects than anywhere in Canada. What do members opposite call these people? What do members opposite call all those dynamic communities with all those people? They say they are passive — passive in the face of an all-powerful state. What rubbish, Mr. Speaker. That sort of thing is rhetoric without reason.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The member for Souris-Cannington talked about the cattle industry and said, "Yes, the cattle industry is in trouble" — and we acknowledge that. And we have brought in a beef stabilization program, which he has said nobody wants. I know who doesn't want it because I know who voted against it, not once but four times and they are the members opposite. This beef stabilization program that nobody wants is attracting meetings at which my colleague, the member for Last Mountain Touchwood, is in attendance, at which 250 to 300 farmers are out there finding out what they don't want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — It is certainly not the answer. We know that we should have a national program, notwithstanding the fact that it would be fought tooth and nail by every Tory in Ottawa. Members opposite applaud the fact that they want no national marketing system of any kind. We know, of course, that a provincial program is not the full answer but at least it's a start. It's something along the line of imagination, boldness, and leadership which the hon. member talked about but then did not illustrate with any of his remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think the part of the speech I enjoyed the most was the one which said, “Well, you know, this crowd is the NDP. They are not the old CCF which we used to love so well.” Mr. Speaker, I have run in six elections, three under the banner of the CCF and three under the banner of the NDP. I don’t think those members opposite loved me any more the first day I stood that the last day. I’ve often talked with Tommy Douglas and said, “My, oh my, isn’t it great. I remember what they used to say about you, the Tories and Grits” — and it’s all in the books, about how he was going to burn the churches and take away the farms. Yes, Russia revisited — we have that again today. Now, because he is not longer in office, he has been converted into a saint, complete with golden garments. Why, Mr. Speaker, are they promoting this transfiguration of Tommy Douglas? I’ll tell you. They are trying to create the impression that the things Tommy Douglas introduced, and which they opposed so bitterly, so knuckleheadedly and so wrongly, are now things that they agree with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Some of us can remember the Liberals and Tories and what they said about medicare, for example, I remember the conservative group who characterized themselves as SOS (Save our Saskatchewan). They were bitterly opposed to medicare and they lost no opportunity to vilify Tommy Douglas in every way they could — and Woodrow Lloyd. Now they are saying this group over here is not the good old CCF!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Well do I remember Tommy Douglas introducing a proposal to distribute natural gas across this province, and a proposal for a publicly owned airline. A couple of points here, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite are saying that they love Tommy Douglas and his Saskair . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I take this opportunity to remind the member for Qu’Appelle that during his absence this afternoon the House was in fairly good order while the Leader of the Opposition was speaking. I would like to remind the member for Qu’Appelle that we should extend the same privilege to the Leader on the other side of the House who wishes to speak now. I am sure the members of the House can see the validity of a ruling of that kind. It is completely in line with the rules under which this House is supposed to function.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: — What is your point of privilege?

MR. LANE: — I have just been threatened by the Minister of Labour that if I don’t shut up for my own protection . . . That is the threat . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! There is a lot of that goes on in this House. I suspect if the Minister of Labour in fact did issue some words of that nature in order to try to quiet the House down he is thoroughly as ineffective as I am sometimes in trying to quieten the House down, with the member for Qu’Appelle, by the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to modulate my voice because obviously when I allow it to rise a bit it upsets the members opposite. May I say that in those good old days of the CCF we had an air line. We had a public air line . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, all of which were held up for admiration by the member for Souris-Cannington this afternoon. Yes, indeed .

We are not the good old CCF of which he was so fond, but we are a different, new group — a new group, for we are going to start an air line of which he was very, very critical. May I advise him there was an old air line — Saskatchewan Government Airways. If you liked that old CCF air line, why don't you like the idea of an NDP air line? It is so different, I know.

So under the old CCF air line the secretary of that corporation was a fellow by the name of Blakeney. Now, the new NDP air line is going to have somebody who presumably at least has some association with Blakeney. But somehow the one is very different from the other. A better line will have to be developed that that to justify the fact that hon. members opposite have opposed every forward step in this province since the formation of the New Democratic Party, and opposed every forward step in this province since the formation of the CCF. It doesn't do them any good to say that the things they opposed in the 1950s and 1960s they now love, because they are opposing everything that happened in the '70s and '80s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I have a couple of short comments about what I can only call the very, very intemperate remarks of the member for Souris-Cannington when he was talking about local governments. When he suggests that our school boards, city councils, town councils, and municipal councils are not really making decisions but are just some puppets on a string guided — indeed totally limited — by decisions coming from Regina, he does a great injustice to those people who are serving their communities well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — They deserve not the calumny of the member opposite but the support of the member opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had some opportunity to meet some of the people up around Canadian Western Agribition. They are around, and some of them are pretty able-looking people. I wouldn't want to meet them in a back alley if I were saying the things about them that the member for Souris-Cannington said. He may be big enough to tell those ranchers who are operating on leased land that they are nothing but sharecroppers, that they don't run their own ranches. He may be big enough to tell one of those ranchers, "If you have leased land then you don't run your own operation; the government runs it for you." But I will tell you, I wouldn't try to tell them that — not the fellows I have met up there. They might take a little unkindly to that because it is rubbish and members opposite know it is rubbish. There are no more independent breed of cattlemen in this province than the ranchers who are operating on these farms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — If there is a second group who is very nearly as independent, it is farmers out there who are operating on land bank land or under other kinds of land. There is no justification whatever for suggesting that ranchers or farmers who are

operating on leased land are in any way dictated to about the conduct of their operations by this government. There has never been a shred of truth in it and there isn't today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, any attempt to suggest that these are Russian state farms will be rejected with the contempt that sort of suggestion deserves.

Mr. Speaker, there was some reference to a legitimate heritage fund. I'll have a bit to say about what heritage funds there would be if we followed Tory policies. I'll have an opportunity to say a bit more about that later.

Let me just touch on one or two other things. The member said that he was going to abolish sales tax. Members opposite are applauding that. I simply want to suggest to all the universities, hospitals and schools for which the hon. member has been shedding crocodile tears that if the sales tax goes, they can expect their budgets to be slashed. The university budget will be slashed; the hospital budget slashed; the school budget slashed. There is the good old Reaganomics which we see in the United States, which the good people of Manitoba saw and at the first opportunity rejected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly will repeat a good number of these points tomorrow because they should . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hope I will have a little more attentive and intelligent audience than I have in members opposite, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to make one point again with respect to crown corporations. It is suggested by the *Leader-Post* and others that there is no danger to crown corporations if members opposite become the government. I agree that there's no danger but I put it on different grounds: there's no danger that members opposite will become the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Note their approach to our corporations. We're going to have a little test this year because last year they said the power corporation made a profit and that that was a rip-off, and the AAIA (Automobile Accident Insurance Act) suffered a loss and that that was bad management. I suspect that this year the reverse is going to be true. I suggest this year that the power corporation is going to suffer a loss and the AAIA is going to make a profit. I suspect that this year these people are going to say of the power corporation, bad management and of the AAIA, rip-off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I suspect that that will be the case, and we will then find out just what their dedication to crown corporations is. We will find out whether, in fact, their position with respect to utilities isn't that they can't be run right: if they make a profit, that's bad; if they make a loss, that's bad. If that isn't an attack on the power corporation and the AAIA, I'd like to know what is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I read in the *Leader-Post* the suggestion that no utility has ever been (I'm paraphrasing it so perhaps not putting it perfectly accurately) divested. I recall Saskair (Saskatchewan Government Airways) being a crown corporation and a utility in 1964. I remember in 1971, when we finally turfed out the government with which the hon. member for Qu'Appelle was associated, there were no public utilities. There was no Saskair; it was privately owned. Now there is indeed a utility which had been divested by a government. That's one in this province. Ask members opposite if they can recall whether or not Hydro-Quebec owned the gas utility. Ask whether Hydro-Quebec owned a gas utility, and ask who owns it now. Where did Gaz Metropolitan come from? I'll tell you where Gaz Metropolitan came from. It was owned publicly and it was converted to a private utility.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, it's not credible to do that in Saskatchewan, though.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — No, well, it was Mr. Duplessis's government; it was the Tory government of Quebec; it was the alliance that the Tories had with Mr. Maurice Duplessis . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We don't have an alliance in Quebec. We are in the unhappy position of not doing very well in Quebec, but we have some friends. But they are all in the Conservative Party; they don't do well either.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on just one or two other points before I say a few words about my constituency. I want to say something about the commitment of the Conservative Party to people of native origin, and I want to say something about that in comparison to what we can see in the province of Manitoba, which has a northland very much like we have, which has a native population very much like we have, and until a few days ago had a Conservative government for four years. And I want to ask any fair minded person whether or not the Conservative policies in the North of Manitoba were as fair and as humane and as progressive as the policies which we offer to native people in northern Saskatchewan. I want to ask that question as fairly and as reasonably as I can.

I acknowledge, with the hon. member opposite, that some projects which are engaged in by native people in northern Saskatchewan display a lack of adequate preparation of native people to assume the jobs. Surely, that's true. We are trying to do some things, and sometimes we may be moving faster than the situation requires. But how much better is that than doing what has been done in Manitoba — deciding that no one was prepared for anything, and therefore having no projects to which native people can direct their attention?

I say to Tories that when it comes to talking about native people, what they do speaks so loudly that I can't hear what they say.

I will, Mr. Speaker, refrain from commenting too freely on the Joe Clark government — the government that couldn't count, the government that had no one who could count up to 120, and that raised interest rates. I think in nine months it was four increases in interest rates by a party whose leader in this province bled all over the carpet about how high interest rates were until it was even redder than its natural shade this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the members opposite stand condemned as the party of high interest rates, because no one has ever achieved four increases in interest rates in nine months in the history of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin displays an unusual and uncharacteristic naiveté if he expects that the Bank of Canada sets interest rates in this country rather than the Government of Canada. There is no question whatever that the interest rates are a policy of the Government of Canada . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, we have the member for Nipawin, and points south, speaking of Wall Street. It may well be that we should defer to his knowledge of the country to the south.

I will not engage in a debate with him. He will have an opportunity to enter this debate in a short time. I will, Mr. Speaker, say a few words about my constituency and then I will beg leave to adjourn. I have had the opportunity to represent the area of Regina, which I now represent, continuously for 21 years. The boundaries were not exactly the same but virtually the same piece of ground I now represent, I've represented for 21 years. They've been the most enjoyable years of my life. I commend elected office to everybody, particularly I may say, to the Leader of the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan.

I look back on those 21 years representing Regina and I see some very important advances in this city. I listed many of the recent ones last year — a new city hall, a new police station, new sewage facilities, new buses, new ring roads. Again, let me emphasize that every one of those projects were projects of the city of Regina, with assistance from the provincial government. In recreation I note an Agridome, a Lawson pool, Douglas Park improvements, improvements to Wascana Center, community rinks, expansion of Taylor Field — all done by the city with the provincial government's help. In manufacturing we've seen expansions of Ipsco and the Co-op Refinery. We've seen Regina become a hub for distribution across western Canada — new warehouses by John Deere, Sears, Federated and others. The list of advancements goes on.

Last year I mentioned Canadian Western Agribition and I'll say just a word or two about that. This year the show is under way in Regina, and the organizers tell me that they have about 5,000 head of livestock there competing for \$100,000 in prize money. The importance of this show is worldwide. We have 20 nations represented at Agribition. Some of the shows about the world in the last year have suffered declines in the number of entries because of the relatively depressed state of the cattle industry, certainly in North America. Not so Agribition, which has had a record entry, the highest in history, and has had to turn some away. In 10 short years, Agribition has moved from a tiny show with big ambitions to one of the largest in the world — one of the top 10 in the world, the top 5 in North America, and certainly the biggest show in western Canada.

From the beginning the Government of Saskatchewan has been a key player. My predecessor, the Hon. Ross Thatcher, was the first person who gave his blessing and assistance to Agribition. He did not live to see the first show. We picked up where he left off. We have given support to Agribition, some key support during the mid-1970s when new facilities were needed, and we continue to give Agribition our full support.

I look back at Regina over the last year and I see a great change in downtown Regina. I was pleased in August to participate in the official opening of a facility which is a major part of that transformation — Cornwall Centre. Now that project is going to do a great deal to solidify and energize the core of Regina. The announcement of further buildings, after the opening of Cornwall Centre, makes clear that this is going to happen. The core of Regina will be anchored. That will be a matter of great interest to my colleague, the member for Regina Centre, in whose constituency that development is. But it also is a matter of very considerable interest to me, whose constituency is close

by, to my colleague the member for Regina North-East and others.

We are proud that this will provide a place where our constituents can find employment relatively close to their place of residence and where Regina residents can gather and congregate. And it's very important indeed that we see that the cores of the cities do not deteriorate. I gave a couple of figures at the occasion of the opening of the Cornwall Center, I looked at the land and building taxes paid by businesses on the 18 block Cornwall Street (that's downtown block in Regina), taking from the street to the lane on each side, and I noted that the land and building taxes paid by those taxpayers were greater than the combined land and building taxes paid by the Northgate Mall, the Southland Mall, and the Golden Mile Plaza combined. I looked at the land tax — land tax only, not including buildings — that is paid by the Hudson Bay Company on its property in downtown Regina, and noted that it was higher than the land tax paid by the Southland Mall — all 30 acres of it. That tells us something about how important downtown development is, and how important it is that no downtown core be allowed to deteriorate.

Mr. Speaker, I am not now wishing to debate with the hon. member for Regina South whether or not those relative taxes are appropriate. I do want to say how important it is that the downtown core be preserved because it is a major source of tax revenue for the city of Regina, and indeed the downtown core of every city in this province is a main source of tax revenue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the people in my constituency have shown a great ability to come together in organizations to serve that constituency. A prime example of that spirit of co-operation is the North Central Community Society. It's latest venture is the North Central Health Resource Centre on Dewdney Avenue; it just started up in September and by all reports it is doing an outstanding job for the citizens in that area of Regina. It is providing assistance to a great number of people who need assistance and who find it difficult to find assistance from ordinary social agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on with a number of stories about my constituency. I like to think of the story of the Dewdney pool. When the city didn't have enough money to get the pool repaired, the citizens in the area said to the city, "If you give us some materials we will complete the pool." The citizens did so, and provided a swimming facility for the children in Regina Elphinstone by the work of the people of that constituency — volunteer labour. This is very common, I know, in small towns but it is not easy to organize in the city, and I am glad to know that the citizens of Regina Elphinstone were able to do it and provide that facility for the young people.

I know that as other people enter this debate there will be many more examples of the way citizens in their communities co-operate with their provincial government to provide services which are of great value to the people of Saskatchewan. I don't regard this as government interfering; I don't regard this as government meddling. I regard this as the good people of Saskatchewan using their municipal government, their provincial government and their voluntary organizations to provide them with valuable services. I know my colleagues will have many examples as the debate goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I have more to say about the Speech from the Throne and the address of the hon. member for Souris-Cannington, and, accordingly, I beg leave to adjourn the

debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Tabling of Kamsack Inquiry Report

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I am not sure whether this is a ministerial statement or something before orders of the day. Perhaps the best way to handle it, with the permission of you and the House, would be to do it under ministerial statements. This has to do with the Judge McClelland report dealing with some of the affairs of the town of Kamsack.

I beg the indulgence of the House to make just a few remarks in the course of tabling the report. I table one copy now with the Clerk, and one copy with the opposition critic, Mr. Muirhead, the member for Arm River.

Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1981, the council of the town of Kamsack passed a resolution pursuant to section 423 of The Urban Municipality Act requesting that I order an inquiry into certain matters pertaining to the good government of the town of Kamsack.

On June 30, 1981, I signed an order directing Judge R. H. McClelland to conduct a judicial inquiry into those matters set out in the town's resolution. I have been pleased to table the McClelland report today. Mr. Speaker, I received a phone call three or four days ago from His Lordship Mr. Justice McClelland advising my office that he would be arriving at 8:30 a.m. to deliver copies to me and to the town of Kamsack on this date. The report was delivered to me and to the town of Kamsack today, and officials in my department have tentatively reviewed the conclusions and recommendations which are as follows:

1. The first matter set out in the town council's resolution was a request with respect to the conduct of the mayor, Philip Mydonick, as to his duties outlined in sections 61 and 62 of The Urban Municipality Act. Judge McClelland concludes that while Mayor Mydonick was removed from office as a result of a court order in an action brought by the former mayor, if he had remained in office his conduct would have been subject to review by the electors rather than the court. He made no other findings with respect to this allegation.

2. With respect to the allegations of impropriety in the assessment of certain town lands, Judge McClelland concluded that with respect to one particular assessment the town lost nearly a year's taxes as a result of the town administrator's failure to enter the plan of survey in the 1979 assessment roll. However, there was no evidence suggesting that the town administrator gained financially. His error was understandable in the circumstances. To quote from the report:

No improprieties were proven in connection with the assessment of any properties named in the allegation.

3. The third matter investigated by Judge McClelland was an allegation that a councillor voted on a motion in which the town was attempting to purchase property,

and that the councillor had an interest in the property. Judge McClelland found that a charge had already been laid against the councillor in question under The Urban Municipality Act.

He went on to state that in the circumstances, the councillor might have had a duty to find out whether he had an interest in the property in question before his committee dealt with the matter. To quote from Judge McClelland's report:

He should have explained that he had an interest in the property as a shareholder in the company and refrained from voting on any motion dealing with the property.

4. The fourth allegation was that a councillor violated section 40 of The Urban Municipality Act by performing certain electrical work for the town. Judge McClelland concluded that the councillor could have been convicted of a violation of The Urban Municipality Act, but the time within which a prosecution could have been commenced has now expired. Furthermore, there was no evidence that the councillor overcharged for any of the services he performed. When contracts were let, he was the lowest bidder.

5. There was an allegation that the town engineer provided council with grossly inaccurate cost estimates on airport construction which prevented the council from making a fair decision on the airport location. Again, Judge McClelland concluded that the evidence did not support the allegation.

6. There was an allegation that certain councillors voted on motions pertaining to the airport location without disclosing their interest. Judge McClelland concluded that if both the town council and the property owner had adopted reasonable attitudes, a satisfactory solution may have been reached with respect to this problem.

7. There were allegations that a certain property owner was not treated fairly by the town in her negotiations to acquire certain lands. Judge McClelland concluded that if both the town council and the property owner had adopted reasonable attitudes, a satisfactory solution may have been reached with respect to this problem.

8. The eighth allegation was that a certain businessman was not treated fairly by the town in his negotiations to develop a shopping mall. Judge McClelland concluded that this was not a legal question and that, in any event, the evidence did not disclose categorically that the council acted unfairly.

9. The ninth allegation related to certain improprieties in the evaluation and sale of land to Kamsack Manufacturing, Inc. With respect to this allegation, Judge McClelland's only conclusions were that it was clear that the town did not attempt to ascertain the market value of the property. The council desired to have the business located in Kamsack and tried to make the deal as attractive as possible. To quote from Judge McClelland's report:

This is a case where the results of council's action were generally applauded, but the means employed were criticized.

10. The tenth allegation was that a councillor or councillors were shareholders in Kamsack Manufacturing, Inc. Judge McClelland concluded, and I quote:

There is no evidence to support this allegation.

11. It was alleged that certain council members voted on motions respecting the sale of land to Kamsack Manufacturing, Inc. without disclosing their interest therein. Again, Judge McClelland concluded, and I quote:

The evidence does not support this allegation.

12. There were allegations that a certain council member kept industry and commerce reports that were mailed to him hidden for two years and that these reports were used by council members and their business partners to their own benefit. Again, I quote from Judge McClelland's report:

On investigation, this allegation proved to be groundless.

Mr. Speaker, those were the 12 specific allegations that were referred to Judge McClelland. In my appointment of His Lordship, I advised him that he could look into such other matters which fell within the scope of section 423 of The Urban Municipality Act and the resolution passed by the council of the town of Kamsack. In fact, Judge McClelland did look into some such other matters, which fell generally into the heading which he has described in his report as "Other matters which created ill will and dissatisfaction between council and certain of the citizens of Kamsack." Because of the conclusions of Judge McClelland, as I have summarized them, his recommendations were very brief.

He recommends that Mayor and councillors must conduct all council and committee meetings in a civil manner and according to accepted practice. As Judge McClelland states:

Disregard of the simple rules of conduct was responsible for much of the animosity which finally resulted in council's request for this inquiry.

The second recommendation of Judge McClelland is:

Members of council should be properly instructed as to the meaning of sections 40 and 41 of The Urban Municipality Act. (He does refer in the report, also, to this being the job of the town solicitor.) Section 40 deals with disqualifications of council members and requires that council members disclose their interest in, and not vote on, matters in which they have an interest. Section 41 provides for council to pass a by-law requiring all members of council, and certain town employees, to file a declaration outlining their and their spouses' interest in all lands in the town. Such a by-law was not enacted by the council of Kamsack.

Judge McClelland states that the town solicitors should be available to explain the meaning of these two very important sections of The Urban Municipality Act.

Judge McClelland's final comment in his recommendations is:

It is too easy to take government for granted and call on others, including senior governments, to do what we should do for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I should point out to this House that the cost of this inquiry

was approximately \$65,000, although the final bill is not yet in. No decision has yet been made by the government as to who should bear the costs for this, although the position of my own department is that this is the responsibility of the community which requested the inquiry. Judge McClelland makes no findings of impropriety on anyone's part. He makes no recommendations with respect to any possible legislative changes for either the Attorney General's department or the Department of Urban Affairs. He makes no recommendations that any charges be laid under either The Urban Municipality Act or any other legislation. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — It's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that when the Attorney General briefed the press today they didn't have a copy of the report, because some other things were also stated in the report, which reflect most damagingly on the Attorney General of Saskatchewan. I refer, for example, to page 136, I think the Attorney General knows the import of this statement:

On the evidence (referring to one of the councillors), former councillor Boyd could have been convicted of a violation of Section 41(h) of the Act, but the time within which a prosecution must be commenced has expired.

That's the first example. We all know now why the delay went on in this House: to take us beyond the limitation period.

Secondly, with regard to Councillors Koturbash and Zabinsky, I refer to page 150 of the report not referred to in the Attorney General's self-serving summary, which refers to their activities regarding Arrow Petroleum Service Station.

This seemed like a routine matter, but had action been brought within the limitation period, Koturbash and Zabinsky might have been disqualified.

Who stalled beyond the limitation period? Little Walter over there.

It's surprising and shocking that we saw a deliberate attempt by cabinet ministers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I want to comment. This is a very serious matter. I listened very carefully to what the Attorney General said today in a ministerial statement. The rules are quite clear on ministerial statements. The Attorney General had a point-by-point reading of the charges. To each charge was given the judge's opinion. The Attorney General advanced little or no argument or debate in that presentation. The members of the Assembly who comment on the Attorney General's ministerial statement at this time must be brief and factual and without debate. They must adhere to the same rules as apply to the person who makes the statement. If the member wishes to debate the issue, there will be an opportunity to put the matter on the order paper in the form of a resolution and everyone will have a chance to debate it. I want to caution any members who intend to speak on this that they must be brief and factual and not debate.

MR. COLLVER: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. COLLVER: — I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, under what rule or what section of Beauchesne's or any other authority the opposition is required to repeat its statement in response to a ministerial statement in the same tone and order as the minister gives his statement. Under what section are you making that ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: — In the event there is any confusion about ministerial statement, I will bring in a full Speaker's statement dealing with the matter of ministerial statements and responses and the historic pattern that has been followed. I assure the member there is sufficient procedural information to support the position I have stated in the House, and I will bring the necessary statement before the members at the earliest opportunity.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, did you say you would commit yourself to bring before this Assembly a set of rules and regulations that include a statement saying we must present our statements exactly the same way the minister presents his?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I thought I stated quite clearly with regard to ministerial statements that I will bring forward the rules that apply to ministerial statements and I will bring forward any past practices that have been adhered to in this Chamber with regard to ministerial statements and responses thereto.

MR. COLLVER: — Which will include the one you made today. Is that right, Mr. Speaker?

MR. LANE: — Also not addressed, which became very clear on a reading of the report and certainly downgraded by the Attorney General, is the very basis of the conflict of interest legislation introduced by the government opposite. It has been proven ineffective, useless and not workable as a result of this report. I quote from page 135 referring to the parcel J allegation:

There was good reason why Koturbash should have explained that he had an interest in the property as a shareholder of Arrow Petroleum and refrain from voting on motions dealing with the property.

Referring to Councillors Koturbash and Zabinsky at page 155:

They were prone to voting on motions without disclosing their interest in the subject of the resolutions, and have been, to that extent, responsible for the criticism that has been heaped upon them.

I want everyone to remember that it was the Attorney General opposite who came to this House and said this conflict of interest legislation was vitally necessary, that it was necessary for good local government. And here, the first time conflict of interest has been accepted by the judge, no action is taken. No action is taken on two vital cases because of stalling — deliberate stalling — by the two cabinet ministers opposite. At one time it was a very serious offence, Mr. Speaker, to delay prosecution or hide evidence. Mr. Speaker, I refer, as well, to page 150 about reference to Broda's involvement and how that should have been brought before the council. Unfortunately, those were left out of the report. The Attorney General and lawyers know the full extent of responsibility of any individual who hides or delays evidence so that prosecution deadlines are passed. You stand accused of that.

AN. HON. MEMBER: — Why didn't McClelland recommend something?

MR. LANE: — I am surprised. That wasn't in his terms of reference, very surprisingly. I

am very glad the Attorney General asked why it wasn't, because an investigation by the Attorney General into the actions of cabinet was deliberately excluded from the terms of reference given to Judge McClelland by the government opposite. Today, Mr. Speaker, conflict of interest legislation has been ruled ineffective, irrelevant, and it can be defeated, first of all, by the dragging of feet by government and, secondly, it can be defeated by councils saying that it doesn't matter.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General obviously came in here figuring that the Conservatives should apologize. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that on the evidence within the report the press was conned on and which wasn't brought to their attention, in fact it should be those two members before a judicial inquiry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Secondly, Mr. Speaker, any time any councillors or any people concerned about local government can't get satisfaction, they have the privilege of coming before the Conservative Party and having their concerns brought before this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — It is most unfortunate that the government opposite didn't listen to those concerns and move promptly so that the full force and effect of the law, as drawn up by the government opposite could have been brought into place.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! It is customary for the minister to make a statement and the Leader of the Opposition or a person so designated by the Leader of the Opposition to respond. If the members of the House wish to hear another member on the subject, I would be prepared to allow it. The member for Nipawin.

MR. COLLVER: — On a point of order then, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, not at the behest of the House, on a point of order. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that you have been going against the tradition of this House since a third party was in this legislature. If you are not recognizing the Unionest Party as the third party . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I gave the member for Nipawin the floor to respond to the ministerial statement, not to rise on some point of order.

MR. COLLVER: — Then I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — All right, the member is quite within his rights to rise on a point of order, but he did not gain the floor on that basis.

MR. COLLVER: — Now I rise on a point of order. Do I get the floor now? Am I recognized now, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order? On a point of order in the *Votes and Proceedings*, the members for Swift Current and Nipawin are recognized as the Unionest Party of Saskatchewan. If we are a recognized third party in this House for that purpose, then we have the right to respond to a ministerial statement, not at the behest of the House. That is my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the point of order of the member for Nipawin is not well taken. This matter was dealt with some time ago, and if the member wants me to resurrect the position that the Chair has taken on that matter, I can easily do it. If the member for

Nipawin wishes to know it, I do not recognize the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current as a political party in this House. I don't care who else recognizes them as a political party. Order, order! Now they may call themselves a political party; that's no concern to me, but for the operation of this House I do not recognize the Unionest Party as a political party.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, now I will rise at the behest of this House, obviously. Do I have the floor, Mr. Speaker? Thank you very much, thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Well, it's the first time that's ever been said.

Mr. Speaker, I have very few comments to make about the Attorney General's statement. The member for Qu'Appelle has very, very ably explained the position of any good opposition in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — I would, however, like to make one comment that was not made. The Attorney General came into this House and very "syruply" presented to the people of Saskatchewan that this inquiry — a judicial inquiry — cost \$65,000 of the people's money to investigate supposed wrongdoings on behalf of elected officials in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the day that this House ceases to recognize the necessity for publicly elected officials to act in accordance with the law and take whatever action is necessary at whatever cost to the Government of Saskatchewan is the day that freedom ceases to exist in Saskatchewan.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 1 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act

HON. MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to move first reading of a Bill to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 2 — An Act respecting Prairie and Forest Fires

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting prairie and forest fires.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources Act

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Department of Finance Act

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Department of Finance Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member I move that a Bill to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend The Credit Reporting Agencies Act

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member I move that a Bill to amend The Credit Reporting Agencies Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 7 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation Act

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Legal Profession Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Jury Act, 1981

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Jury Act, 1981, be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Police Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Police Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Recording of Evidence by Sound Recording Machine Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Recording of Evidence by Sound Recording Machine Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 14 — An Act to amend The Regulations Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Regulations Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 15 — An Act to amend The Small Claims Enforcement Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Small Claims Enforcement Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Provincial Court Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The provincial Court Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Arts Board Act

HON. MR. WHITE: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Arts Board Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend The Marriage Act

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Marriage Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Prescription Drugs Act

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Prescription Drugs Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:31 p.m.