

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 4, 1981

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. GROSS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to members of this Assembly 23 grade 8 students from Wymark, Saskatchewan. They are seated in the west gallery with their teachers, Mr. Knelson and Mrs. Stella Kant. They are also accompanied by parents, Mr. and Mrs. Karandyck. I am sure members of this Assembly would like to wish them a pleasant and educational stay at the House today.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. WHITE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the hon. member for Lakeview, I would like to introduce two groups of students to you and to the legislature. First, there are 50 grade 12 students from Sheldon-Williams Collegiate. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Robinson and a chaperone Mrs. Keith. I will be meeting them for a short time after, at 11:15, to discuss matters which they have witnessed in the legislature. I am sure we all hope they have an interesting and enjoyable time here.

There is a second group from a school in the Lakeview constituency. There are 22 grade 8 students from St. Pius X School. They take all of their instruction in French. I would like to introduce their teacher, a friend of mine for some years, Miss Kathy Leibel. If you are aware of her background, you will be aware of the quality of instruction they get. Miss Leibel spent four years in Quebec studying French during the summer and three years in France at Grenoble, Paris, and so forth. I will be meeting them for pictures and drinks at 10:45 and hope to visit their school after the New Year. Most of these students, although they go to school in Lakeview, come from my own constituency, Regina Wascana. I would ask all members to welcome them to this House. We do hope they have a very enjoyable and interesting time here.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to extend a welcome to the students from St. Pius X School. It is one of the classes in the province which I know particularly well. I have a daughter, Raguel, who is with the group. It is good to see them here. I hope they have an enjoyable stay. They are coming to visit my office for a little while after they meet with Mr. White. I am looking forward to their visit.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — De la part du gouvernement de la Saskatchewan, et de tout le monde ici, je voudrais dire aux élèves de St. Pius X que nous sommes très heureux de vous voir ici. Je voudrais dire aussi que nous sommes très heureux qu'en apprenant le français vous allez contribuer à l'unité de notre pays. Et aussi vous allez avoir la satisfaction qui vient en apprenant une autre langue. Bonne chance dans votre avenir.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Monsiur le President, c'est aussi un plaisir pour moi de souhaiter une chaleureuse bienvenue aux etudiants de l'ecole St. Pius X. J'espere que vous allez jouir de votre sejour aujourd'hui.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Closure of Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. Mine

MR. TAYLOR: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, yesterday in your absence this legislature, the people of Saskatchewan and, more importantly, the people of Uranium City were shocked with the sudden news of the withdrawal of Eldorado, the lifeblood of their town. In questioning your government, we were given very little in the way of answers. We were told something about a pie in the sky task force that may be structured. Seeing you are here today, Mr. Premier, I would like to ask you, on behalf of the people of Uranium City and the people of Saskatchewan, what plans your government and you as the Premier have to help these people at a time of serious turmoil in their lives — a disruption of their way of life. And what plans do you have to save the town of Uranium City?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, our government was advised of the decision of Eldorado Nuclear at about 5 p.m. on the day before yesterday, some 15 hours before the public announcement was made. We have, through my colleague, the member for Athabasca, and through other officials of the government, been in touch with the officials of Eldorado Nuclear, and with officials of the community of the municipal corporation of Uranium City. Any plans we make will be made in conjunction with Eldorado Nuclear and with the people of Uranium City. I have every confidence that these three groups, together with the trade union, the United Steelworkers of America, will be sitting down to devise appropriate measures such as are possible in the circumstances. Clearly, we have no plans that we intend to impose upon the people of Uranium City and we will develop plans in conjunction with them and their elected officials.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I and the other members of this legislature have sat in here and heard you, Mr. Premier, and the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan expound on the great future of the North. You spoke about Uranium City, the jewel of the North, and about the opportunities for natives that will come out of the North. Obviously, it appears that this is blowing up in your face at this time, Mr. Premier. My concern is for the children, the senior citizens and the families. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had a call from a man in Uranium City who has 12 children in his family . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. The member is giving information. It sounds strangely like a debate, and I want the member to ask a question. He's asking a supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: — My reason for giving information is to seek an answer to the information I'm giving, Mr. Speaker. Be that as it may, the man has 12 children and has worked three and one-half years without missing a shift. My concern is for the people of Uranium City. They are residents of Saskatchewan. Are you going to take action that will

safeguard the future of these people, or are you going to let the town die and the people fend for themselves? What are your actions going to be?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, our government is going to take such action as seems reasonable, in consultation with the people of Uranium City and in consultation with the union and in consultation with Eldorado Nuclear. We have no plans to announce in advance of hearing the wishes of the people of Uranium City, their concerns for their community and their proposals for its future.

Members opposite may well have a prescription that they can tell the people of Uranium City they ought to accept. For our part, we do not have a prescription which we intend to impose upon the people of Uranium City. We intend to sit down with them and attempt to work out an appropriate future for that community.

MR. THATCHER: — Since the Premier and the Minister of Mineral Resources appear to be taking turns ducking question period, my question is to the Premier.

Mr. Premier, in the Assembly yesterday the Minister of Mineral Resources was questioned about the decision of Esso Minerals to put a hold on its planned mine in northern Saskatchewan, which was targeted for 1985. I'm sure the Premier is aware that Esso Minerals based that decision on declining markets and on the fact it simply could not get sufficient orders to justify that timetable. I'm sure the Premier is also aware that one reason Eldorado Nuclear is closing down in Uranium City is soft markets; it could not see justification for spending \$450 million.

Mr. Premier, yesterday the Minister of Mineral Resources defended your actions on uranium. The Minister of Mineral Resources said that the uranium industry looks wonderful. My question is simply this: in light of the market reports, in light of the reports by Esso Minerals, in light of the actions of Eldorado Nuclear, do you stand by the contention of your minister that everything is just wonderful in the uranium industry today, and for the projections of the 1980s?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I suspect the question of the member for Thunder Creek contains its usual accuracies or inaccuracies. I doubt very much that the member for Biggar, my colleague the Minister of Mineral Resources, indicated everything was "just wonderful." I will check the record to see whether those were the words or whether it is a paraphrase with a slight distortion, which we have come to expect from the member for Thunder Creek.

Let me say this. Unless I misunderstand the material put forward yesterday by Eldorado Nuclear, Eldorado Nuclear was postulating an increase in uranium prices and was pointing out that even with an increase in uranium prices, that particular mine had difficulty. It is the view of the Government of Saskatchewan that with uranium prices at their present level, and very possibly with a future increase (but even without a future increase), mines like the Cluff Lake mine, the Rabbit Lake mine and the Key Lake mine will be economic.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, yesterday the Minister of Mineral Resources hung his hat on the fact that the Eldorado Nuclear mine was a deep shaft mine. He did much the same thing that you are doing today — saying that the open-pit mines are going to be economical. Esso Resources is building an open-pit mine, precisely as you've just described, with the high quality ore unlike what we had

at Uranium City. Would the Premier tell this Assembly why Esso Resources would differ so markedly from what you and the Minister of Mineral Resources are saying?

In addition, Mr. Premier, as the second part of this supplementary, the Minister of Mineral Resources indicated that SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) had reports which indicated that uranium markets are going to be just marvellous. I may be paraphrasing when I say "marvellous in 1980." I think the term that he used was "buoyant." I would ask the Premier if he would instruct the Minister of Mineral Resources to table these SMDC reports in the Assembly, or if they are (as we suspect on this side) merely a group of press clippings from you, the Attorney General, the Minister of Mineral Resources, and the head of SMDC.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I suspect the hon. member for Thunder Creek has been reading some old song scores, because he said something that was "wonderful" and something that was "marvellous." I think the song goes, "They say that falling in love is wonderful," and then it goes on from there.

Dealing with some more practical subjects, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of Esso Minerals or Esso Resources having announced any date for commencing a mine. I am not aware that they had committed themselves to develop a mine. I am not aware of them advising the Government of Saskatchewan that they intended to develop a mine. I may be misinformed on that; I am not aware of it. Returning now to the question of whether or not a future mine, anywhere at any time, is economic clearly depends upon the size of the market. I suggest to all hon. members that the price which is now prevailing and is widely anticipated to increase modestly will be and is a price which allows the existing open pit mines in Saskatchewan to operate at a profit. We have no reason to believe that the price will decline to a point where those mines will not be economic and none of those economics apply to a 30-year-old deep shaft mine.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Premier, since you have just indicated that you are going to continue to spend hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money in the uranium industry on what is now a very questionable project, isn't it true that, as the uranium situation stands today, you have expended hundreds of millions of dollars in the past, and you're going to do it in the future, to make yourself the uranium kind of the world? Isn't it true that, as of today, your throne just fell apart?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of observations. The province of Saskatchewan never was in a position to become the major uranium producer in the world, did not ever anticipate that it would be in that position, and is unlikely to be in that position. There are many other places that produce uranium: Niger, Gabon and Australia. Many of them produce uranium in very large quantities. With respect to the uranium mines which are now under construction or producing in Saskatchewan, their success or lack of success is no better or worse today than it was a week ago. The fact that one particular mine with very peculiar economics, compared with the rest of the industry, is declared by its owners to be uneconomic in no way affects the economics of the other mines. A simple reading of the statement by the president of Eldorado Nuclear will indicate that the basic reason for its decision, as I read from its statement, was that the ore had run out. Such is not the case for any of the mines in Saskatchewan. Accordingly, the basic economic decision is very different for those mines than it is for Eldorado Nuclear.

MR. SPEAKER: — What does the member for Nipawin ask?

MR. COLLVER: — I'm standing on my feet to ask a question.

MR. LANE: — The Premier has just indicated that Esso has never indicated a date for its mine, never given any firm dates and at a conference in Calgary, reported in the *Leader-Post* on November 1, 1979, the president of Esso Minerals stated:

Assuming the necessary government approvals are received we propose to start the mine mill construction phase sometime in 1981 with production to begin in the mid-1980s.

In fact, there was a firm date committed by Esso which your department and your government knew full well. Mr. Premier, how can you stand up and say that there wasn't a severe blow to your proposals in your uranium development projects when something as firm as that was cancelled yesterday?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, if I understand the hon. member right, he is saying that something as firm as the statement at the conference in Calgary in 1979 was "cancelled yesterday." I need say nothing about that except that the information that Esso Resources has changed its position yesterday is pure fancy. There is not a shred of evidence to suggest that Esso Minerals changed its position yesterday. Mr. Speaker, I want to establish very clearly what hon. members opposite are saying. They are saying that Esso Minerals cancelled their decision to proceed yesterday . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Sorry, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members say that Esso Minerals postponed or delayed their proposal to have a mineral operation in northern Saskatchewan yesterday. I do not believe that to be the case.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary. Your Minister of the Environment said that the election results of 1978 were a clear mandate for your government to proceed with uranium development. In 1980 the president of SMDC was quoted as saying the following on the oversupply and surplus of production:

"We believe it is a bit of an interim thing," says Lloyd of the large inventories held by some North American utility companies.

In fact, time after time, your government has made it clear that the future of Saskatchewan, that the cornerstone of resource development, is the uranium industry. Now we're finding out that information being given is not accurate. Would the Premier be prepared today to agree to an all-party inquiry, to sit interessionally and commence in January, of members of this Assembly to determine uranium markets and whether or not the uranium future of Saskatchewan is in serious jeopardy, as all indications are that it is in serious jeopardy?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of things clear, which are very obviously not clear to the member for Qu'Appelle. We believe that the cornerstone of economic activity in this province is agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Secondly, with respect to resources, it has never been the contention of this government that uranium was the cornerstone of resource activity. In fact, it has always been the contention of this government that both potash and heavy oil were very much more activities which were going to attract capital investment and economic activity than uranium. Nobody ever suggested that uranium was going to

attract investments of \$2.5 billion. The proposals for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan alone propose an investment of that order of magnitude during the 1980s. But leaving that aside, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite is contending that the uranium future of Saskatchewan . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — I said that for Key Lake alone.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is suggesting that anyone suggested that \$5 billion was going to be invested in a mine at Key Lake, I say the man can't read . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, my point was perfectly clear. I said there would not be an investment of \$5 billion; that member said there would be an investment of \$5 billion, and that member can't read. We ought to get the member for Kindersley to read something to the member for Qu'Appelle, because he obviously can't read.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The new Deputy Leader.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The new Deputy Leader!

AN HON. MEMBER: — This week's Deputy Leader.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — He's a man in whom the leader has put his confidence wisely, because at least he can read and the member for Qu'Appelle can't.

Mr. Speaker, I will go over that once again. There is no basis for believing that the economic viability of the mines in northern Saskatchewan is any different today than it was a week ago. A week ago we believed it was sound; today we believe it is sound. Members opposite, I understand, don't believe the uranium industry can prosper. It was four years ago, when they were led by the member for Nipawin, that they told us that the potash industry couldn't prosper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think we're going a little astray.

MR. ANDREW: — A question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, the question is this: your government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars of the Saskatchewan taxpayers' money on the uranium industry. The people of Saskatchewan have a right to know what the markets are and what the potential return on that investment is going to be. Can the Premier advise this Assembly if you are prepared to table your market studies, table your committed sales and allow an all-party committee of the legislature to investigate just what is happening in the uranium industry in the world and in Saskatchewan today and in the next 10 years?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, this House has a committee which can do exactly that: the crown corporations committee . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I have been in this legislature for 21 years and in no single session have I not been a member of the crown corporations committee. For 21 years I have been a member of the crown corporations committee. I have answered questions as a minister in charge of corporations. I have been on the government side in crown corporations; I have been on the opposition side in crown corporations. I have asked a good number of questions in crown corporations and I have had a good number of answers when I was an opposition member in crown corporations.

The members opposite had a full opportunity to review, as recently as last May, the markets for uranium. They will have another opportunity very soon in this House . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I am sure that they will, between now and the time of the crown corporations committee, get their material in order so that they can advance their questions in some ordinary and rational way. I know that when they do, answers will be forthcoming.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I notice the Premier has a bandage on his finger. I wonder if that's a sign that he got his finger burned yesterday. I posed a supplementary question yesterday to the member for Biggar and he had no satisfactory answer. As a grandfather of the family of crown corporations, Eldorado Nuclear has certain responsibilities to its employees. Since it is a grandfather of that wonderful family of crown corporations and since the Premier today did not give any indication that Eldorado Nuclear had any better answers for its employees than did any other corporation that has closed down plants and refineries in Saskatchewan, will the Premier now request his government to stop that nonsensical advertising of the family of crown corporations as being different from any other corporation in its relationship to its employees?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member evidently is confusing Eldorado Nuclear with a provincial government crown corporation. I am not here in this House to defend VIA Rail. I am not here in this House to defend the Canadian National Railways and its advertising. I am not here in this House to defend the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and its advertising.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I watched the Premier listen to your question very intently and very quietly. I wonder if you could afford the same courtesy to him when he is answering it?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I am simply not here to defend the federal government. I have never been a Liberal, unlike some members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — A member of my party has never been the minister in charge of Eldorado Nuclear, unlike members opposite, and I'm not quite sure where the members of the Unionist Party stand on that. So we have no position on whether Eldorado Nuclear should be defended, whether it should advertise, or how it should advertise. We undertake to answer for the activities of the Government of Saskatchewan; we do not undertake to answer for the activities of the Government of Canada. There are opportunities elsewhere to ask those questions. I would not presume to attempt to defend their record.

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATE

Address in Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Chapman and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Berntson.

MR. TAYLOR: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to enter into the throne speech debate in this legislature. I think it is a very important time to be discussing the future of this province and the direction we are taking, especially in view of the recent problems which seem to be besetting our uranium industry.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the throne speech that was delivered in this House some days ago, I must say there was very little content that I could see. I failed to see anything in there about economic reform or economic growth. There didn't seem to be an solid suggestion for economic stimulation, nothing about industrial strategy, nothing about new opportunities for people.

Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, there was some mention of something for home-owners. Some mystical, will-o-the-wisp, elusive piece of legislation that has yet to surface in this legislature. Perhaps it will surface, and I hope it will in a much improved form from the three lines that described it in the throne speech. Mr. Speaker, if this is so I'm sure that much of the credit can be taken by the members on this side of the House, who have continually questioned the Premier and the government opposite about this needed legislation for the home-owners of this province who are in dire situations. We have continually called for help for home-owners, and have offered real suggestions that would help alleviate the serious situations in which many of them find themselves today.

This may be expecting a lot from a tired, old government, but I would hope that at least it has held discussions by now with the credit unions. I understand the Attorney General finally got around to doing that yesterday, to find out how this elusive Bill would affect them. I'm inclined to agree, Mr. Speaker, with the *Leader-Post* reporter who felt that the newly erected handrails on the legislative steps are a symbol of a tired government, a government void of new ideas, with no vision for the future of this great province and its fine people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to comment further on this weak and ineffective throne speech (which is simply an attempt at reverse psychology) would be wasting your time and the time of this House.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks to the dismal record of this government which can certainly be discussed at length. That is what I intend to discuss in the brief time allotted to me, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps for the clarification of the members opposite, who I am sure will not have any idea of what reverse psychology means, I would like to explain.

Mr. Speaker, reverse psychology is actually an attempt to lower expectations and build fears into people's minds with tax increases (as the Premier of this province did in his speech at the recent NDP convention) and then to come forward with a bag of goodies in the spring followed by a close election on the heels of the budget. Mr. Premier, you may be a crafty politician and a sly little fox, but I warn you that the people in this province are beginning to see through your political trickery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — As you know, Mr. Speaker, this little maneuver may have backfired on our pussyfooting Premier because it appears that the vast millions of dollars (and I

repeat, vast millions of collars) of our money, the money of the taxpayers of this province that has been invested in uranium, may have blown up in the face of this government. Or, to quote the lines of William Shakespeare, "They may have been hoist with their own petard."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — It may well be that because of the government's foolish investments and extravagant wastage on lavish government buildings (as an example) he may well have to raise taxes to pay for necessary services, the services which count in this province — the hospitals, the schools, the nursing homes, the pensions and the other important services that affect the lives of people. So the Premier's threat of raising taxes may actually be what will have to happen because of foolish, unwise, extravagant investments by the government opposite with the people's money.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem with the government. It has changed. The government opposite has changed from the days when it espoused the slogan People Before Politics to Politics Before People. I would like to repeat that, Mr. Speaker: Politics Before People. In other words, Mr. Speaker, its guideline is to use the people's money to maintain political power at all cost — have the people become dependent on the government. That's the by-line — make the people dependent on the government instead of the government dependent on the people.

Mr. Speaker, as the throne speech had little serious content I would like to my remarks to the speech of our Premier, who many call "Buy-back Blakeney." The Premier spent much of his time trying to justify his fence-sitting approach to the constitution. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to concentrate on the constitution other than to mention what I feel are two significant points. I am sure that we have all heard enough about the constitution, but I do not believe that the people of this province realize the difficulties that our party faced in trying to improve this constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I remember very clearly in this legislature in Saskatchewan discussing with the Attorney General of this province the need for the acknowledgment of God in the constitution. I remember, Mr. Speaker, that he said this could cause some rather difficult legal interpretations. Well, I don't know what interpretations he was referring to, but I firmly believe that if the acknowledgment of the existence of God is a problem for the country's lawyers then we had better take a serious look at where we are headed in this country of Canada.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan realize that the clause put into the bill of rights by the late John Diefenbaker, which gave the citizens of Canada the right to enjoy property, has been deleted from the new charter. I should repeat this because I don't believe the people of this province realize that the clause put in by John Diefenbaker, the right to enjoy property, has been deleted from the new charter.

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Saskatchewan would be interested to know that it was at the insistence of the NDP that this was dropped from the charter. Who are the leaders of the NDP? Who are the men who pressured the government to drop this? They are Mr. Broadbent (maybe better known as Badlybent) and our Premier, "Buy-back Blakeney." When I speak of property, Mr. Speaker, let me make this perfectly clear. I'm not just referring to land. I mean all property: your car, your home, your resort home, all your possessions. Why should any party feel so strongly about this? What is there to fear?

What is wrong with allowing people the right to enjoy property? I may be of the old school but I believe that John Diefenbaker knew more about Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan people than Allan Blakeney and the NDP will every know. In other words, if the right to enjoy property was important to John Diefenbaker, it's important to me and, I'm sure, to many of the other residents of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier went on to discuss the great achievements of his government in the field of agriculture. If things are as rosy as he tries to make out, why are farm bankruptcies increasing in this province? Why are the cattle producers resisting the stabilization plan if it is so good? By the way, I think I know why they are resisting it. It is because neither I nor anyone else in this legislature knows what the guidelines and regulations of the stabilization program are. They seem to change week by week. Why is the number of farmers continually declining? Why are many producers selling out their complete herds of cattle and going out of hogs? Why is it necessary to go to England to try to get dairy farmers to come to Saskatchewan? These are the real questions that should be addressed in the agricultural sector of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier points with pride to the land bank. I would just like to mention that if this is the main answer to the farm problems of Saskatchewan, eventually most of the land (and indeed taken to its logical conclusion, all of the land) could become the property of the state. That would certainly be a sorry day for this country, this province and the hungry of the world.

Look at Poland. It was once a proud, productive agricultural nation. Now it is unable to feed itself. Look at Russia. It has the best land in the world but has continual crop failures. Is that what we want our system to develop into? I say, on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan, most definitely no.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier talks about the splendid medical services in this province. If this is so, why do we rank eighth in Canada on per capita expenditure? Why are people having to wait 14 months to two years for elective surgery? I would like to give an example. A very good friend of mine was having serious trouble with his legs. He had very little circulation in them. He wanted to have tests to see if there was a blockage in the main arteries. He was told that he would have to wait six months to one year just for the tests. Luckily, he met a man from B.C. this summer who had had the operation. My friend left Saskatchewan on November 10 and went to B.C. where he obtained an appointment. He had the tests; he has had the surgery and is coming home Monday. He's walking around and feeling fine. Now that's what I call medical care. That's where you're helping people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — A little retarded boy in my area wants his tonsils out. He applied to get his tonsils out in July. The poor little fellow has enough health problems and he is still waiting today to get in to have his tonsils out. When I was 12 years of age I had my tonsils out in two weeks, in the same province of Saskatchewan, in the hospital at Wolseley, and I'm feeling fit and fine. That's what I call medical service to the people, Mr. Speaker.

Where is our great medical service? All we have in Saskatchewan is a buzz work, a buzz word used at election time about medicare. I want to see medical services that treat people who are sick in this province. That's what we need, and that's what a Progressive

Conservative government would be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn to education for a minute because we must realize that if there is one important aspect to making a new Saskatchewan, developing the resources, it certainly is the production of the human resource. All other resources, be they oil, potash, uranium (be what it may) are nothing without that human ingredient to put them into a marketable product that will benefit you and me, Mr. Speaker, in this province of Saskatchewan. Those are the things. Education is the way in which we can better the lives of the people in this province.

I see that my time is coming close to an end. I could go on all day in this legislature and tell the members opposite how they could bring in an effective education system that would educate the people of this province so they could take advantage of the opportunities that are here. For example, there is the adult basic education plan for the people who, unfortunately, could not finish their schooling, and who are in danger of their program being cut. Can you realize that? Education is the only help for these people to better their way of life. It is the only avenue by which they can get off the social security roll and unemployment, and this is in danger of being cut in this province.

In our universities, the avenues by which we train our intellectual elite, the people who will develop the new technologies for this province, the funding is being cut back drastically by the government opposite. The president of the University of Saskatchewan states that there are demands in the market place for skilled people such as engineers, graduates in commerce, data processors. All of these are being cut back when society and the job market is crying out for skilled people. Is that educational accountability? Is that serving the needs of the people of Saskatchewan? I say that's hogwash. They are certainly not coming to grips with the issues out there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on in education but I really feel that what we have in this province, in a supposedly have province is exactly a have-not system of education.

There are many other areas, such as social services, nursing homes, rural life, in which we hear a lot of lip service. We would actually like to see some definite proposals for an industrial strategy that would strengthen and revitalize rural Saskatchewan.

I want to put in one quote from the Minister of Agriculture which shows the hypocrisy of the government opposite. The Minister of Agriculture, in criticizing the federal government (and I don't blame him for doing that) on the transportation system, states the following:

We do not want to see money showing up in a new hotel, in a new mine, in a record free-standing building, or a television ad.

Mr. Speaker, that sounds very familiar. That sounds exactly like the track record of the government to which he belongs, and I say that for the minister of the crown to criticize another government when they are doing the same thing is nothing but hypocrisy, and the government opposite is full of it.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time has run out. I would like to go through all the avenues of wastage, but my colleague will have ample opportunity to do that. It would take a day to describe the vast wastage of the province of Saskatchewan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very obvious that I will be supporting the amendment put forth by my colleague, the member for Souris-Cannington, but in no way will I support the motion from the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, it has been said that a speech is a mirror of the soul. We have just been looking through a glass that is dark and have had a dim vision. If that is true, the measures contained in this government's throne speech are indeed a clear image of the concern of the Blakeney government for people.

But, Mr. Speaker, before I get into my main remarks, I would like to share with members and the people of Saskatchewan an appalling discovery. I am referring to the Opposition leader's speech several days ago. Several times during his remarks he referred to this government as being old and tired. As I listened to the Conservative member, his words had a familiar ring to them. Guess what I found? It is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, but it is true. The words, ideas, and thoughts contained in the member for Souris-Cannington's speech were all taken word for word from old speeches by his leader, Mr. Devine.

Tired and worn out are we? The Minister of Labour, the mover and the seconder, and all my colleagues who have spoken to the speech came prepared to take part in the current debate. I say the Conservative opposition is tired. The Conservative opposition is worn out and, Mr. Speaker, is bone lazy if they have to hear the recycled speeches from their leader who hasn't been able to get elected.

I urge members to check the record. Take out *Hansard* for Tuesday, December 1. I have underlined in this *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, in red, various aspects where the member quoted from his leader.

Look at the red ink, Mr. Speaker. It looks so red it looks like it has the measles. Devine and Berntson — they are two peas in a pod. Mr. Speaker, two old, withered, shrivelled up, spent peas in a pod, old peas hanging on De-vine. Let me demonstrate with just two of the many examples, Mr. Speaker. The member for Souris-Cannington, on page 88, in the middle of the page, said:

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.

It sounded like an original idea. He travelled and listened. Now, let's turn to a speech given by Grant Devine. I happen to have a copy of it: "Inflation and the Cost of Living," a statement by Grant Devine, Progressive Conservative leader. If you look at this speech, Mr. Speaker, on page 2, the leader, Mr. Devine, said:

In my travels throughout this province I have talked with an ever-increasing number of people who are really afraid of this cancer we call inflation.

Does that sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? It is similar; we just heard him the other day. Mr. Speaker, the member for Souris-Cannington plays a very good Charlie McCarthy to his leader's Edgar Bergen. Here is another little gem on page 92.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, not another one.

MR. ENGEL: — Well, the whole thing is full of the same, but I will just tell you a couple.

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 etc., etc.

Where did he get those lines from? If you turn to an energy statement by Grant Devine, Progressive Conservative leader (I have his speech here), on page 1 it says:

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.

Having found out the Conservatives, I want to know just whose perceptions the member for Souris-Cannington was asking us to share. These are two mouldy, worn-out peas in a pod, Mr. Speaker. Nobody picks them; nobody wants them. Barren of ideas, the opposition leader parrots the sterile rhetoric of his leader. It's absolutely astounding. You can pick out almost any paragraph from the Leader of the Opposition's speech and read it word for word from the opposition leader's speech. And if you search through Mr. Devine's various speeches in Saskatchewan, you can find where the member for Souris-Cannington's nimble mind was at work, cutting and pasting.

I've prepared copies of both of Mr. Devine's speeches and underlined copies of the proceedings of this Assembly where the opposition leader's remarks are found. I hope members of the press will study them. In fact, the only portion of the opposition leader's remarks that didn't appear to come from his leader were his remarks about northern Saskatchewan. But I'm sure they actually did. Finding out would be an interesting job. If ever there was a bunch that was old, tired out and bone lazy, it is the bunch across the way. The member's speech might not have been so bad if the original copy wasn't so bad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will return to my comments in regard to the throne speech. This past year has been a year of achievements for the people of Saskatchewan. Under the leadership of Premier Blakeney, Saskatchewan has taken the lead in resolving issues related to an accord on the constitution. This government has reached an energy agreement with Ottawa that will, without doubt, do much to stimulate the energy industry in Saskatchewan, bringing us closer to energy self-sufficiency. Continued vigilance by this government has ensured for our people here a stable and secure future. The people of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg appreciate the responsible attitude and the attention to detail displayed by the Blakeney government when it comes to dealing with local communities. Whether it's a \$10,000 grant toward the cost of a new fire hall in Lafleche or the more than \$13,000 paid to the community of Rockglen for resurfacing streets, this government listens.

Mr. Speaker, we have introduced many new programs to help develop areas outside the large urban centres. One of the most significant is revenue sharing. Revenue sharing has assisted communities like Assiniboia to develop the services which help them to compete with larger centres. In Assiniboia alone, revenue sharing has risen from \$2,900 under a Liberal government in 1971 to over \$138,000 with an NDP

government in 1980-81 — a 50-fold increase. And that doesn't include such provincial assistance as funds for municipal water assistance, the community capital fund, the road ambulance program and a host of other ways in which this government has not only listened to local communities, but acted.

Mr. Speaker, that's just one example of this government's concern for all people. But there's another characteristic of the Blakeney government my constituents are pleased with. They like a government that lives within its means, and at the same time makes it possible for individual taxpayers to live within its means, and at the same time makes it possible for individual taxpayers to live within their means. It does this by cutting the personal income tax rate, cutting the corporate income tax rate for small businesses and taking prompt action to cushion the impact of the federal Liberal government's disastrous economic policies on Saskatchewan farmers.

Across the province, contrary to the observations that the member who just took a seat made, beef producers are responding to the Blakeney government's introduction of a beef stabilization plan.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — As of yesterday, there were close to 900 applications received by the board's office, representing some 60,000 head of cattle for sales of over \$50 million a year. The board chairman, Henry J. Elden, tells me "Good applications are coming in. Cattlemen and ranchers like the plan." I just tore this out of the *Western Producer* this morning: "Schmidt urged the federal government to quickly adopt a national stabilization plan." It doesn't sound like a Tory, but that's the Minister of Agriculture for Alberta.

While the federal Liberal government still waffles on a national stabilization plan and a marketing plan for hogs, Saskatchewan continues to operate SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program). Seven and one-half million dollars have been paid out of producers over the past two years.

Through our crown corporations, Saskatchewan people now own a significant piece of Saskatchewan's energy future in potash, in uranium and in petroleum products. Through the heritage fund we have the cash to pay for needed projects today, and the investments to make sure of tomorrow. In all, Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of this government are a reflection of its deep concern for people.

Mr. Speaker, the success of the Blakeney government rests on a very understandable premise, a premise rooted in a prairie society and its people. In its past, and in its present form, it's one idea that old-line parties have either failed to appreciate, or ignored for their own purposes. It's the idea that we are interdependent. This government realized the fact that if each part of our population has the opportunity to develop its potential, then all will prosper. The needs of the communities of Limerick or Wood Mountain or Gravelbourg or Palmer are linked with the lives and the hopes of the people in our cities like Regina, Saskatoon, Yorkton or Prince Albert. This government recognizes that fact, Mr. Speaker, and having recognized that fact has acted in the best interests of all its citizens, not just in the interests of a privileged few corporations or individuals, as is the case in every province where a Tory government rules.

The interdependence this government knows about and acts upon in Saskatchewan clearly shows up in this throne speech and it is a vital, creative force shaping the development of new and existing possibilities for our people. Others see the policies

and programs of the Blakeney government as beneficial examples, not only for Saskatchewan people, but for other provinces and other countries — good examples for people everywhere of how government should respond to people.

Mr. Speaker, the style and substance of this throne speech offer much to the chaotic economic and social conditions facing us nationally and internationally.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, I was recently appointed to the position of Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, with particular responsibilities for international development. The creation of this position is further indication of this government's attention to the idea of interdependence. Additionally it shows our deep concern with and for the plight of those underdeveloped countries.

Here in Saskatchewan we are a privileged part of the world community. We have a moral responsibility to assist the underdeveloped parts of our interdependent world, to help them achieve social and economic justice. But given the opposition in this House by the Conservative members to security and by their leader's saying it's a joke on Saskatchewan home-owners, it is unlikely Conservatives would accept the merits of Saskatchewan being involved in international activities.

Saskatchewan is a part of a global society, just as much as it is a part of a national, North American or western society. It is a part of a global environmental system, a global economic system and a global social structure of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, it is an undisputed fact that Saskatchewan's economic well-being is dependent on international markets. Agriculture, the largest single industry in our province, is almost totally dependent upon export markets. It is a market where the buyer is purchasing the most basic commodity for human existence. Potash, the second largest export, is also dependent upon a market where the commodity is required to provide for the basic necessities of life.

In 1980, Saskatchewan's exports totalled \$2,450 billion for grains and \$958 million in potash sales. If you add other exports from Saskatchewan, it makes a grand total of \$4.72 billion in gross export sales.

Social and economic justice in a global society is as important to Saskatchewan as is social and economic justice within our provincial and national societies, for social and economic justice ultimately mean peace, and peace ensures survival. The understanding of interdependence enhances development. This is the reality of why Saskatchewan is involved. The challenge is simply recognized on a world scale.

Mr. Speaker, do we have an appreciation of the interdependence of Saskatchewan with the rest of the world? Do we have a clear understanding of the challenge of the world's society? In fact, how many Saskatchewan people are aware of their government's current activities in the world? Saskatchewan relies on world markets for its economic health. The same markets are dependent upon general economic conditions at the global level. The developing nations are at the mercy of the economic institutions and the decisions of the developed and OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) nations. Restricted trade barriers, wild currency fluctuations and price fixing are just a few of the constraints imposed by developed nations on the economic structures in the developing world.

The developed nations have established a world system that recognizes only the

interdependence of the developed world, and the economically weak are denied their right to economic justice and, as a result, social justice. But if the poor remain poor, and the weak only get weaker, what benefit is there to society? Of what benefit is that to the Saskatchewan farmer who can't sell his grain, because those who need it can't afford it? Of what benefit is that to the potash miner who loses his job, because those who need it can't afford it?

The meaning of interdependence is not just a factual understanding that our morning coffee may be a product of a plant grown in Colombia. The real meaning is that our society is a global society, and economic justice for all. It is a moral irresponsibility to ignore the same disparities in Saskatchewan society or Canadian society. We, as members of that society, would not tolerate it. Why should we tolerate it in the international society?

While it is morally irresponsible to ignore social and economic disparity, it is also economically foolish. That is the challenge of our global society — the challenge to achieve development. It is a challenge to realize the interdependence of people and nations, and to co-operate in a concept of mutual interest. That, too, is a challenge to be addressed by the people and the Government of Saskatchewan. It is a challenge which your New Democratic government willingly accepts and will pursue with the co-operation of other sectors within our provincial society.

Mr. Speaker, the broad range of concerns this throne speech encompassed for the people of Saskatchewan shows this NDP government is a government of conscience and compassion. I heartily endorse the promise it contains for Saskatchewan's future. It is obvious that I will be supporting the motion, and will not support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, most of the comments of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, the deposed PC house leader, don't need any answer, most of them are nonsense. but there are a couple of things I would like to comment on.

Several times the PCs opposite have mentioned handrails at the front steps. It's odd, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Saskatchewan, the government of the people, which is interested in people, cannot even do things for the senior citizens of this province without the PCs opposite sneering. And now, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley has stood up in this House and like people in the past has attempted to take credit for medicare. Even though they fought it tooth and nail, they attempted to take credit for it. Now they are trying to take credit for the constitution. The only thing they could say in that whole constitutional debate was, "No, don't talk about anything on negotiations." Now they try to take credit for the achievement of the constitution. Mr. Speaker, they remind me of a bunch of flies that ride around on Engel's tractor all day long, and come the end of the day, they say, "Look at all the acres we have cultivated today." That is about all their comments bear comment on.

I would like to talk about Yorkton for a few moments to indicate some of the projects the Government of Saskatchewan has been involved in, projects which have contributed to the economic activity and the economic growth of Yorkton and the surrounding area. They are: Sask Tel's fibre optic network link going to Yorkton; a new plywood overlay plant being built in Yorkton; a new potash mine proposed near Bredenbury; the development of the largest wetland area in the province, southwest of Yorkton. Sask Tel has expanded one building and has built a service centre. The Department of Highways

has constructed a major service centre. A new addition has been announced for the hospital. A liquor board store has been built. Besides, Mr. Speaker, like all other municipalities in Saskatchewan, Yorkton received substantial grants which are a direct dividend from the resource revenues that come from Saskatchewan's NDP resource policy.

Revenue-sharing grants to Yorkton in 1981-82 will amount to \$823,068. I would like you to compare that with any city of comparable size in Alberta. An estimated \$50,534 will go to Yorkton under the municipal road grant. Under the second community capital fund, the city of Yorkton will receive an estimated \$1,125,000. Such resource revenues are greatly welcomed by the people of the Yorkton constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — They are welcomed, Mr. Speaker, by people all over Saskatchewan, because they know that no other government in Canada does so much to keep the local property taxes down.

It is interesting to note that while I was in Roblin, Manitoba, recently, I found out some very interesting things indeed. It is a town with approximately 1,200 people. But strange, off the main streets there are no sidewalks. I happened to talk to a man who had a house of about 950 square feet with a garage. His property taxes were \$1,100, with no tax rebate. The man said to me, "All we get for our taxes in this town is \$1 million in debt."

Our house in Yorkton is 1,040 square feet with no garage. But our taxes are \$731, with a rebate of \$230. The actual tax then is \$501, less than half that of a similar sized home in the town of Roblin, Manitoba.

In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, people go to small towns to live so they can get lower taxes. In Roblin, they are double those in Yorkton. I guess people want to live in a province where the resource dividends are used to the benefit of all the people of the province, not just the foreign-based resource companies. That's why they turfed out the Tories in Manitoba. The people of Manitoba will be a long, long time working their way out of the devastation of a PC government.

Under the Schreyer government, they had just begun to get things rolling in their province. Now, they have to start all over again, because a Progressive Conservative government was elected in 1977 and things immediately turned for the worse.

With the Progressive Conservatives the economy in Manitoba got progressively worse until 1981, when they had a \$256 million deficit. I guess that's what they mean by Progressive Conservatives. Can you imagine how the PCs would howl here in Saskatchewan if the Blakeney government had such a deficit?

By comparison, the Blakeney government had had a balanced budget every year since its election in 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — And the PCs opposite have the gall to talk about mismanagement in Saskatchewan! It doesn't matter what the Saskatchewan government does, the PCs say it's wrong. Premier Blakeney and his government are praised all across Canada —

everyone but the Saskatchewan PCs recognize the quality and the leadership of Premier Blakeney and his government. Only these PCs opposite see Canada's foremost statesman as a sly fox. Strange, Mr. Speaker, strange. Everyone in Canada is out of step but them.

The people in my constituency tell me that the PCs have no ideas of their own; they just carp and complain. My constituents tell me that if Premier Blakeney were St. Peter in heaven the PCs opposite would find something wrong. Undoubtedly, they would be looking for the thermostat to turn the temperature up because even they know where they belong.

Let's look at a few of the differences between the PCs and the NDP. We freely admit that we charge the highest royalties and resource taxes in all Canada, and we're proud of it. Ours is the only province in Canada to make attempts to tax everyone fairly. Taxation can't always be fair, but you can't write off \$70 million in taxes to a company like Inco (International Nickel Company of Canada Ltd.), as was done by the PCs in Ontario and the Liberals in Ottawa, and still consider yourself to be taxing fairly. You can't allow major oil companies to pay no corporate income tax, as did both Liberals and Conservatives in Ottawa, and consider yourself to be taxing fairly.

But the PCs here say that Saskatchewan's tax structure cramps the style of the industrialist — crushing tax loads on business. What nonsense; Saskatchewan still has more hardrock mineral exploration than anywhere else in Canada. StatsCanada says that Saskatchewan is the fastest growing province in All Canada. None of that means anything to the small minds of the PCs opposite. "We should be taxing resource corporations like Alberta does," said the former Tory leader, Collver. Between 1974 and 1977, Collver's idea would have cost the people of Saskatchewan \$442 million. It has been said before, but it bears repeating.

We should be taxing resource companies like Alberta does, says Collver's little sir-echo, Grant Devine — the would-be leader of the PCs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Paul Rousseau said the same thing, too. Devine's suggestions would have cost the people of Saskatchewan \$1.152 billion from 1974 to 1981. The people of Saskatchewan can use that money for themselves, thank you.

"We should increase services to the people," say the Tories. And we heard the member for Indian Head-Wolseley coming out with that line just now. It doesn't matter what services one is talking about — the Tories say that they would improve them. If you could possibly believe them, the Tories would spend more money, more money, more money everywhere. They say, "Do as President Reagan did." Yet, in Reagan's U.S.A. one of the first things to be cut was medicaid. Yet here in opposition the PCs claim to support medicare. Reagan, the hero of the PCs, made cuts all right. He cut programs to middle and low income people but he increased programs for the wealthy and for the corporations. He cut taxes for his corporate friends only. If that's what you want, people of Saskatchewan, vote for the Tories — they'll give it to you.

"Where are our hospital beds and bigger hospitals?" ask the Tories. It doesn't matter that the Progressive Conservative Government of Ontario is cutting hospital beds to 3.5 beds per 1,000 people as compared to Saskatchewan's 7.4 beds per 1,000. It

doesn't matter that the Progressive Conservative Government of Ontario charges \$552 a year medicare fees, and they're talking about a \$5 per day hospital deterrent fee and a \$5 per day deterrent fee for visits to the doctor. Just what are those Tories saying? "Cut programs but increase services. Slash taxes but spend more and more and more money. Govern like President Reagan who cuts medicare, but do more for medicare." They want more hospital beds but all Tory governments across Canada are cutting out hospital beds.

I find it odd that the member for Indian Head-Wolseley should be concerned about the elective surgery that has been put off in a few places in Saskatchewan. You can find those all across Canada. But he makes a federal case of it here. Certainly we are concerned about those people. But what do you suppose happens in Progressive Conservative Ontario, with half the hospital beds per population as Saskatchewan? What confusion! What contradictions! What nonsense! But if confusion reigns supreme in the Conservative ranks, we in the NDP have had a constant message over the years that has proven its worth in the actions of the Blakeney government.

The Conference Board of Canada made a survey of Saskatchewan and said that Saskatchewan was one of the best places in Canada to live. From Woodsworth to Blakeney and Broadbent, the CCF and the NDP have called for a planned economy, an industrial strategy. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley says there is none. If he hadn't taken off for the boondocks the minute he finished his speech, I would have invited him to listen to what an industrial strategy is in Saskatchewan, at least part of it. If the Canadian government had followed the advice of the CCF and the NDP over the years, we would not have had the crushing interest rates of today and we would not have had the disastrous inflation that we have today.

But Saskatchewan is not an island. We cannot control the federal follies that come to us from Ottawa. Revenues from the potash corporation and Saskoil and other resource companies are used to provide dividends to the people, dividends that help to reduce the ravages of inflation, by the programs that we present to them. It takes the intelligence of the Blakeneyes, the Romanows, the Cowleys, and many of the others in this government to provide the leadership to assist and to guide the people in this province to work together, to do things for themselves. That is what government is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to give another lesson in government to the Tories. They are tough to get through to, but I would like to try, I would like to ask them a question. To whom do the officials of IMCC (International Minerals and Chemical Corporation) owe their first loyalty? To whom do the officials of Gulf or Imperial Oil or the CPR owe their first loyalty? To the people of Saskatchewan? To the people of Canada? No. The officials in those giant corporations owe their first loyalty to the shareholders, whether those shareholders are in New York, Dallas or Switzerland. That loyalty means huge profits for the corporations at almost any cost. And if those corporations don't have huge profits, there are no jobs for those officials.

If the activities of those corporations are harmful to Saskatchewan, too bad. If they can influence their hirelings to work for corporate tax breaks and tax loopholes that most Canadians can't have, excellent for them. It's fantastic for those corporations if they can get the people of the host country to work and vote for governments that provide the tax loopholes and tax breaks and tax write-offs. To whom is the first loyalty of the officials and the workers of the Saskatchewan crown corporations that the PCs like to malign? Their first loyalty is to the people of Saskatchewan. Most of the officials and workers in

the Saskatchewan crown corporations were born in and live in Saskatchewan. This is their home. They are proud of it and they want to do their very best for their home, their province, their country. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that we are proud of the officials and the workers in our crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we have confidence in those Saskatchewan people who can manage just as well as anyone, anywhere in this world. Do you need to stimulate the economy? Instruct the crown corporations to work that in. Do we need to control the supply of potash, for example? Instruct the crown corporations to do so. Do we need to have large utility companies to provide excellent service and keep the rates the lowest in the world, you use the crown corporations to do it.

Naturally, crown corporations are not a panacea but they can be used, along with many other means, to make this planned economy of Saskatchewan work for the benefit of Saskatchewan people. In 1971, the last year of the so-called free enterprise government, the people of Saskatchewan received a mere \$32.5 million. Last year, they received \$584.5 million. Those dividends go to the people of Saskatchewan through the programs provided by this government. The Tories say that that's no good at all. They tell the people of Saskatchewan that they'd do better. "Vote for the PCs," they say, "like they did in Manitoba." They'd give you a \$256 million budget deficit instead of a balanced budget like we have.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal more that I would like to have said but I see my time is running out. I will be supporting the main motion and I will certainly be opposing the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a great pleasure for me to take part in this throne speech debate in this my 15th year in the legislature. With time running close to an election, and with my decision to not seek re-election, this may be my last speech in a throne speech debate. In the course of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to review some of the achievements of the New Democratic government for the people of Saskatchewan. Before I do that, I would like to express my sincere gratefulness to my constituents for giving me the privilege and the honour of representing them in the legislature. I'm very proud of the confidence that the people of the Canora constituency have shown in me over the years. I'm proud, too, of the support they have given to the policies of this NDP government. I'm optimistic that they will continue to give their support to the NDP and to my successor to this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder for their excellent presentations in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The constituents of Estevan could well be proud of their member, Jack Chapman, and the constituents of The Battlefords made a good choice in their member, Dave Miner.

This year is the 10th anniversary of our government. During the 10 years we have worked together with the people of Saskatchewan to accomplish a great deal. We have achievements we can be proud of: the development of our resource industry by the people of Saskatchewan, the expansion of our health care system, help for local government, support for rural communities, programs for small businesses and an agricultural policy that has brought young farmers onto the farms and is keeping them there.

Mr. Speaker, the achievements of the Blakeney government and Saskatchewan farmers in maintaining a strong rural society are unmatched in Canada. Today, Saskatchewan has a greater percentage of farmers under age 25 than either Manitoba or Alberta, and a greater total of farmers under age 25 than both provinces put together. These figures are a direct result of two New Democratic Party government programs: land bank and FarmStart. There are now 2,700 land bank leases and 4,700 farmers participating in FarmStart. In my own constituency of Canora, 93 farmers have received FarmStart loans and 205 farmers have chosen to sell their land to the land bank to put young farmers on the land.

These programs, Mr. Speaker, have helped to keep our family farms. Slightly more than half of Saskatchewan's nearly 70,000 farms are under five quarters and almost 90 per cent are 10 quarters or less. These small farms are viable. Contrary to what the Conservatives say, there is a place for small farms in modern agriculture. On the basis of 69,000 Saskatchewan farms, the 1981 realized net income is estimated by Statistics Canada at \$17,500 per far, on average. This compares favourably with Tory Alberta's 58,000 farms with net income estimated at \$14,600, or the 29,000 Manitoba farms with net income estimated at \$6,000.

These figures, Mr. Speaker, prove Tory leader Grant Devine wrong when he says that 80 per cent of our farm population is non-productive. One of the reasons these small farms are viable is the effort made by successive NDP governments to improve the stability of the industry. From the beginning, support of the wheat pools, the Canadian Wheat Board and the crowrate has been the cornerstone of NDP agricultural policy. This NDP government has supported the wheat board with \$55 million for the purchase of 1,000 hopper cars through the Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation to take Saskatchewan grain to the market. We have fought long and hard in support of the crowrate. We stood alone among the prairie provinces against Conservative Sterling Lyon, Conservative Peter Lougheed, Liberal Pierre Trudeau and the CPR.

AN HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — We believe in helping farmers when they need help. When the federal government backed out of the drought relief program, the Saskatchewan NDP government came through. Mr. Speaker, in the Canora constituency, which was partly affected by the drought, there were 92 applications for fodder assistance which received a total of \$23,400 or an average of \$255 per farmer. Under the emergency fencing assistance program, 221 Canora farmers received \$54,478 or an average of \$221 per farmer. Drought assistance to my constituency totalled over \$78,000. What about crop risk protection? This government has long provided relief through crop insurance for grain farmers. The Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Fund has grown from almost nothing in 1971 to coverage of 43,000 farms and almost one billion dollars in 1981. In 1980, in my constituency alone, farmers received some \$3.5 million in indemnities. Weather conditions are unpredictable. No one can tell when a drought will strike.

The situation is quite different, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to marketing agricultural products, although the Conservatives would have us believe otherwise. Orderly marketing has been supported and expanded by the NDP government over the years. Supply management has given stability to poultry, dairy and egg producers, and more recently under this government, the Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program (SHARP), established in 1976, guaranteed hog producers a return on their investment.

In the past 18 months alone, SHARP has paid out \$5.7 million to Saskatchewan hog producers.

As part of the march toward a stable market for Saskatchewan farmers, your NDP government has introduced a voluntary beef stabilization plan.

Now all Saskatchewan farmers can be assured of at least recovering their investments and receiving a return for their labour. Saskatchewan farmers can look with confidence toward the future. In 1981, the Department of Agriculture received a 30 per cent increase in its budget. Research to increase productivity will receive \$25 million over the next five years under the FarmLab program. I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that some of that research will take place in my constituency. My constituent, Michael Yaholnitsky of Canora, a young farmer, is participating in the FarmLab research program as are other farmers throughout the province. The participation of farmers in this program indicates the kind of co-operation and partnership that is developing between the farming community and this government. It is one more step toward a future for Saskatchewan agriculture, where agricultural research ensures productivity and orderly marketing guarantees a fair return to the producer.

Along with the successful effort of stabilizing a strong agricultural industry, we can also say and show, Mr. Speaker, that we have developed our resource industries in a manner that not only complements agriculture but stabilizes our whole provincial economy. In 10 years of NDP government, Saskatchewan's resource revenues have gone up from \$32 million to \$800 million per year. That is a record in itself.

Five years ago we established a heritage fund to better manage these revenues. Since then, over \$1 billion of resource revenues have been provided from the heritage fund to finance important programs for people, programs like medicare, our prescription drug plan, senior citizens' programs, and property improvement grants to reduce local taxes.

Besides ongoing government programs, the heritage fund makes money available for needed capital projects with lasting value like the expansion of the veterinary college in Saskatoon and the Ipsco (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation) plant and many community projects.

Finally, the heritage fund ensures a sound economic future by investing in income-generating, job-creating assets, such as Saskoil and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Part of the strength of Saskatchewan's economy, Mr. Speaker, is its small business and commercial sector. Now this is no accident. Over the last 10 years the NDP in Saskatchewan has built a network of programs and support services which is designed to enable local businesses to flourish. The wide variety of programs and support offered includes a very visible one, the Main Street development program. Since the program started in 1978, 90 Saskatchewan towns and villages have received almost \$7 million for revitalizing business districts by upgrading business premises.

In the Canora constituency, Mr. Speaker, seven communities — Canora, Theodore, Ebenezer, Springside, Buchanan, Endeavour and Rama — have received thousands of

dollars to help upgrade their business sections. Mr. Speaker, it is a program that builds moral and civic pride, while helping small businesses meet changing conditions.

A new project to help Saskatchewan towns mount an organized business development program has been started in Preeceville as part of a province-side pilot project. The goal of the project is to determine whether small communities that must rely on local people to stimulate new commercial and industrial development have enough people with sufficient skills and dedication to do the job. I am confident that Preeceville will develop the enthusiasm, the drive and the commitments to make this project a success.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, small businesses in the Canora constituency have received over \$634,000 in loans from Sedco. That is why small businessmen in rural Saskatchewan tell a different story than the members opposite. Businessmen in Canora constituency know that the programs for small businesses, and the help available from Sedco, are further reasons that we have thriving rural communities.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has received international recognition for its well-planned, diversified economy and good management practices. At the same time, under the NDP, Saskatchewan has a reputation for leading in social programs.

I am pleased to be able to tell the members of the Assembly how much senior citizens in Canora constituency benefit from the home care program. In 1980-81, home care districts in my constituency received over \$171,000 to help senior citizens stay in their own homes.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we in Canora are very happy to have a new 18-bed, level 3 care addition to Gateway Lodge nearly completed. The substantial construction grants of \$200,000 in 1980-81 and \$160,000 this year are more of the statistics that the Leader of the Opposition finds so meaningless. That is what he said, Mr. Speaker, while giving some of Grant Devine's old speeches in reply to the throne speech. It's no wonder that he doesn't want to use statistics — he can't find any to support his case. But the people of Canora do not find these statistics meaningless.

Senior citizen activity centres in Springside or Willowbrook do not find grants to senior citizen activity centres meaningless. The Golden Agers Club in Ebenezer doesn't find its grant from the community services division of social services a meaningless statistic, as the Leader of the Opposition does. Under this government our senior citizens are, for the first time in Saskatchewan's history, getting meaningful support to help them enjoy a richly deserved retirement, after contributing to the well-being of our province for so many years.

It's not just senior citizens who are benefiting, Mr. Speaker. Our young people now have access to better schools, regional libraries and outstanding recreational facilities. And just another meaningless statistic, in the terms of the opposition leader, this government has spent over half-a-million dollars on developing Good Spirit Provincial Park over the past five years.

I have not even begun to mention the contributions made by our government for things we take for granted. I think of the recent construction of Highways 9 and 49, costing over \$2 million and the planned reconstruction of Highway 47 or the huge increases in revenue sharing and the community capital fund available to local governments.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of the improvements made in my constituency over the past

10 years, I am proud indeed. The achievements are there in all parts of my constituency for all segments of society. These achievements are convincing proof that the spirit of co-operation, which is uniquely Saskatchewan, can do far more than the self-serving philosophy advocated by the Conservative Party.

The co-operative spirit has built Saskatchewan. It tells us, like the Christian church, we are our brothers' keepers. I am happy to see that this year's throne speech reaffirms that commitment to continue the tradition of working together, improving preventive health care, protecting home-owners and encouraging energy conservation.

Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing the amendment and supporting the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great pleasure today to have the opportunity to rise in this debate to support the motion by the hon. member for Estevan and seconded by the member for The Battlefords. I want, at this time, to congratulate both of them on the fine jobs they did setting out the record of Saskatchewan. It's quite clear why these two members are in the House and the members who opposed them are not.

Mr. Speaker, I read with interest a series of news articles over the recent months concerning the "Devine Right" or the comings and goings of the Progressive Conservative Party. As the press has speculated that this session will be a build-up to the election, I will not disappoint them.

I think I will put a few facts on the record, but first I want to mention my constituency. Mr. Speaker, the fine people of Kinistino do not appreciate being called passive, as they were called the other day by the Leader of the Opposition. They do not feel that their local governments are puppets on a string, as was mentioned by the Tory member for Souris-Cannington the other day in his address. Mr. Speaker, I think the address that he made shows the callous disregard the Conservatives have for rural people and rural government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, the people of my constituency are diverse, both in culture and occupation. They are hard working and honest and I feel very privileged to represent them in this House and in this government.

Today I want to talk on several areas: crown corporations, the economy and leadership. I am very proud of my involvement with the family of crown corporations, especially those with which I am directly involved. I want to briefly illustrate what the Conservative policy on crown corporations is and what it would mean to the people of this province.

Just recall their own convention, several weeks or a month ago, when their leader, Mr. Devine, said he wanted nothing to do with this kind of a family. What he said was that he wants nothing to do with crown corporations in the province of Saskatchewan. What happened? He basically got a standing ovation for this kind of rhetoric. Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin, the self-professed leader of the Tory party today (who was the leader and I think still is) says, "Hear, hear!" That's what he will do to crown corporations; that's what his party will do to crown corporations.

First, Mr. Speaker, they have said that crown corporations should operate on a break-even basis. It's a nice easy statement to make, but, then, Mr. Speaker, they go on to attack STC for increasing its rates in order to break even. They go even further and condemn us for trying to remove a short service which had a loss last year of \$100,000. What does this mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that the Tories would do what we have been saying, in this House and throughout the province, they would do — they would sell STC. They would have Greyhound Bus Lines in here the day after they were elected. They would have Grey Goose in here the day after they were elected. There would be no STC.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at another crown corporation, that I am responsible for — Sask Tel. They call this crown corporation a gouger, a monopoly giant that rips off innocent people. They say this corporation made from \$60 million to \$100 million profit last year. If the members opposite deny having said this, perhaps they should read the press report of the professor's speech in Swift Current.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that they don't want to listen, that they don't care about listening. The annual report was tabled in this House. It is a public document; it's on public record. Either they are deliberately misleading the people of this province, or they are calling the provincial auditor, who verified the financial statements, dishonest. Well, they can't have it both ways. They can have it whichever way they want to. I don't think the provincial auditor is dishonest, and we certainly didn't make \$60 million to \$100 million last year.

Mr. Speaker, the story goes on. They, depending on the time and location, change their story on what Sask Tel's rate increases were last year. In fact, I'm sure that the opposition members haven't told one of their constituents, who are mostly rural people, that there wasn't even a rate increase on multiparty line service last year. I'll bet they were never told that — another misleading statement by the opposition. I think it's very bad to see them mislead the public in that way. I don't intend to nor do I have to defend Sask Tel or its employees who, I think, are some of the hardest working, most honest employees, and who have more integrity than many of the people in this province. They pay taxes as anyone else does, but nothing less do they get than criticism from the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on this subject, the newspaper reports of the speech of the PC leader in Swift Current went on to say that a PC government would open the books of crown corporations. What does this mean? Is he suggesting that this Assembly, or the employees of Sask Tel or any of the other crown corporations are hiding something from the public? Is he suggesting that the auditors, either in the private sector or the provincial auditor's department, are not doing their jobs, are not telling the truth, are dishonest in their statements?

Mr. Speaker, Sask Tel generates its revenue by providing a service, and the more it is used, the greater the revenue flow. Budgets are set to control expenses and project revenues. But there is no way, unless one is a magician, to accurately state what the revenue will be. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, instead of attacking the Sask Tel employees as gougers, we should be commending them for providing such a high level and high quality of service.

Mr. Speaker, a second Tory policy, as stated by almost all of the members opposite, is that they would set up a new bureaucracy called the public utilities rate review board to

regulate the crown corporations. This is interesting because, at the same time, they say that the government is too big. They have said on many occasions that our government is too big, but they want to set up another bureaucracy which would make many regulations.

Notwithstanding this, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the Tory proposal. Since they have not been in government since the days of the old Depression, the Dirty Thirties, I will have to select the governments of Alberta and Ontario. I might as well speak about Alberta and Ontario because those are the ones that the opposition likes to speak about.

In Alberta, they have 50 more people in their regulatory department than they have in their rate review board. This costs the people of Alberta over \$2 million each year. They have a board which has never once refused a rate increase. Now compare that to our system. Have rate increases been refused? Yes, they have. Does our system cost this province \$2 million? No, it doesn't. Then what is so good about a rate review board? Mr. Speaker, the only benefit is that instead of the politicians having to bear the responsibility and, therefore, the public reaction to rate increases, they can duck behind a bureaucratic wall and say, "Don't blame me."

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The member for Kinistino has the floor.

HON. MR. CODY: — Now let us turn to Ontario, Mr. Speaker. There they duck behind not only the provincial bureaucracy, but the federal one as well. They stood idly by, in the province of Ontario, when Bell Canada went for a rate increase of 30 per cent. What did the Ontario government do? It did nothing. Have we ever had a 30 per cent increase? Not on your life! Never in the history of this province has Sask Tel had a 30 per cent rate increase. And why did they need a 30 per cent rate increase? Well, it's because of the fact that they lost their revenue through the forced interconnection with CNCP and were forced to sell equipment. These are just two examples, Mr. Speaker, of what Devine would do for you, and I wouldn't want to take a chance.

Now, before I leave this subject, I would like to touch on one more point. So far, to date, they have talked only about regulating public utilities. I don't want anybody in Saskatchewan to believe that. They would soon regulate all companies, and I want the companies of private enterprise to be wary of what would happen with a public utilities rate review board put in by the Tories. Do you know what would happen? What about the city of Saskatoon with its electric utility, or the 60-and-more rural telephone companies, or co-op insurance? Would they soon be under their thumb? You bet they would. What would the taxpayers of Saskatoon say? Would they appreciate the increase in their rates of property taxes, which will surely follow if the city has to hire expertise to fight for a rate increase? Will the farmers appreciate, for the first time ever, having to be regulated? Mr. Speaker, I don't think they would.

Let me now move on to another subject and the third policy for crown corporations. The Tories say they would make them efficient, businesslike and competitive. Well, what does that mean? Does it mean that when the economy slows down, they would lay off employees. Does it mean that, like CP Rail, they would stop providing service? Does it mean that we would have boards of directors, which are now made up mainly of Saskatchewan people, replaced by millionaires and bankers from eastern Canada? Does it mean that they would have the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation become a land speculator? I think it does. I don't think there's any question that that's what they mean. Does it mean they would allow new electrical plants, privately owned, to compete with SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation)? Does it mean that SGI

(Saskatchewan Government Insurance) would have to wait an extra year to incur even greater losses before it had an increase in rates? Does it mean that STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company) would reduce its senior citizens' discount, which is now at 50 per cent, to 10 per cent, or to zero, like other bus companies in Canada do? Does it mean that Sask Tel would drop its 50 per cent discount to those unfortunate people with speech impediments? Does it mean that the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation would charge the going interest rate on loans for residential rehabilitation, instead of the 8.58 per cent it now charges? Does it mean that FarmStart would charge the going interest rate, instead of the 12 per cent rate? Of course it does; they believe in high interest rates, and they believe in high interest rates for farmers. There's no question about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, does it mean that Sask Minerals would have to shut down one of its plants in south-central Saskatchewan? Does it mean that the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation would have to shut down its Hudson Bay plant? I think the member for Kelsey-Tisdale wouldn't mind that a bit. He wouldn't be fighting for it; you can be sure of that. Does it mean that the Saskatchewan Municipal Financing Corporation would cease to purchase municipal bonds, so you wouldn't have any schools and hospitals, and so on? Is that what it means?

Mr. Speaker, the list is endless. I could go on and on about the number of items that the opposition would cut, scrap and reduce, because of the fact that they would want to make them more efficient, more competitive.

Mr. Speaker, before leaving the crown corporation sector, I want to turn once more to STC. This small corporation has been under attack lately on a number of issues, which I want to briefly deal with. First, I'll discuss the new prairie shuttle service. Mr. Speaker, the other day the member for Moosomin referred to a million-dollar service for government executives. Well, I assume he is referring to the prairie shuttle. STC purchased six new buses for this service at approximately \$30,000 per bus above the normal price, in recognition that the price for this service is more than twice what it costs for the normal service. Mr. Speaker, we are trying to enter a new market with this service and that is to the people who are in the business group, men and women. At the same time, no one is getting a free lunch. There is no subsidy involved.

It is designed to provide income to allow us to maintain and extend other services in the province of Saskatchewan. I know the members opposite would like to have STC be more efficient, to cut out runs to Pilger, Middle Lake, St. Benedict, Raymore, Southey, Ituna, Semans, and places like that. There is no question that is what they would do. Once they have reduced it to such a state that there would be no service, then they would sell it. That is exactly what they have in mind.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I have heard the members opposite talk about STC and how it should be providing greater service. Now, what do they want? When we add a service, they complain and criticize. When we reduce a service, they complain and criticize. They can't have it both ways. It is time the Tories enunciated their policy with regard to transportation in this province.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, this past spring we brought about a major change in the Southwest. More recently, I announced a number of improvements in the Northwest. I would also like to indicate that a number of other changes will be forthcoming shortly.

Thirdly, I want to announce, at this time, a major policy move regarding accessibility for the handicapped. STC personnel have been, in the last year, dealing with groups like the Voice of the Handicapped and the Saskatchewan Council for Crippled Children and Adults. I am pleased to announce that effective January 1, at all company-owned facilities, STC will be providing boarding and off-boarding assistance to those requiring it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CODY: — At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to allow a person to accompany a passenger, free of charge, if it is so desired. We have ordered special wheel chairs (they are being purchased at the present time) which are narrower and will be able to fit into any bus which we have in the province of Saskatchewan. I am also pleased to announce that we have been successful in developing an automatic step. We will be introducing this feature, over time, in our buses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, I think it goes without saying that STC is showing leadership in this field. We are pleased to work with the public, the handicapped and whoever else wants to help us in getting a better deal for the less fortunate than ourselves. We continue to update our equipment and facilities to provide these types of services as required.

Mr. Speaker, I turn again, for a moment to Sask Tel. As was announced in the throne speech, we will be reducing the charge for rural multiparty line service from a \$400 charge to a flat \$100 charge. This change is a direct result of an extensive study done by a committee of the board of directors of Sask Tel, who last year conducted several hearings throughout this province. I was particularly interested in their work, as they found that Sask Tel has a tremendous reputation in rural Saskatchewan for its service and for the people who work in Sask Tel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, I say it's shameful that, on every opportunity, the member for Wilkie, the member for Moosomin, and members for almost anywhere on the other side of the House, ridicule and talk about the Sask Tel employees and Sask Tel as a corporation and how it gouges the public. Mr. Speaker, we have also introduced a new program to reduce long-distance rates by 50 per cent for persons with speech and hearing impediments. Sask Tel has also unveiled a new service for northern Saskatchewan. This service means not only a complete upgrading of the communications system, but also reduction in some of the rates charged. It is interesting to note that Sask Tel provides a service second to none in Canada, and at rates which are among the lowest in the country.

Let me now turn to another subject, Mr. Speaker, and that's the economy. Somehow the Devine Tories feel that this government is responsible for the high interest rates and, therefore, can do something about them. Mr. Speaker, the high interest rate policy was established by a short-lived Tory government in Ottawa. Incidentally, it was led by a

western Tory, and supported by Conservatives in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the members across the way should hand their heads in shame for supporting high interest rates, something they have done over the years.

Can a person really be surprised? No, you can't. I say you can't be surprised. I say it's not surprising at all that they would support high interest rates. Who is benefiting from these high interest rates? Is it the small business community? No. Is it the farmer? No. Is it the blue-and-white-collar workers? No. Is it the average home-owner? No. Of course it's not. It's the Tories' friends, the banks. That's who is benefiting by this program. Now, just by coincidence, who contributes the most to the PC campaign funds? Is that a surprise? It's not a surprise to me. It is the banks. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's those friendly organizations which have reported 50 per cent profit increases while farmers lose their livelihood. I want to quote from a recent *Leader-Post* article, from December 2. It says:

Bank Profits up 50 Per Cent. The Royal Bank of Canada reported a profit Tuesday of \$492.5 million or \$5.92 a share for the year ending October 31. That was a 50 per cent increase from the last fiscal year . . .

Year end assets reached \$87.52 billion. This is up 39 per cent from \$62.83 billion, and annual revenue reached \$10.92 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely amazing. The high interest rate policies perpetrated on this country by the Tories in Ottawa when they were there (in as little time as they had) were supported by every Tory in this House. And then they say that the Saskatchewan government should be doing something about it. I say they should hang their heads in shame. There is another one in today's paper.

Profits of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce rose 61.5 per cent in the fiscal year ending October 31 to \$310.2 million from \$192.1 million earlier, the banks says. Assets rose to \$66.8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the story goes on without saying that the Tories in Ottawa and the Tories in Saskatchewan are the reason we have the mess we have in Canada today with regard to the high interest rates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CODY: — I suppose one could say that the Tories like this set-up, because it is politically attractive. But I don't think it is politically attractive, Mr. Speaker. What do the Tories say when they are faced by angry home-owners? What do they say when they are faced by angry farmers, businessmen, and unemployed people? They say that the province should give the banks welfare, that we should help pay banks their usury fees. Now, of course, as I said a moment ago, they like to say that this is perfectly attractive. But does it really solve or deal with the problem? I say let us not give the banks welfare. Let us force the federal government to rid itself of the Joe Clark financial mess. Let us get honesty back into our financial system.

Mr. Speaker, you noted here several weeks ago what the voters in Manitoba did. You know what they experienced under the Lyon Tories' economic theory. I'm sure that, come the next election, the same thing will happen to the Tories in this province that happened to the Tories in Manitoba.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, before closing today I want to talk about one more subject: leadership. At the recent gathering of the Tory faithful in Saskatoon, the Devine leader was quoted as saying that he could match Blakeney both in intelligence and in political integrity, or something to that effect. As all people know, a matching pair consists of two opposites. I guess you could therefore say that Devine is close to being a perfect match after all. Blakeney has been elected and has never been defeated. Devine has not been elected and never will be elected. Blakeney believes in the family farm and strives to maintain it. Devine says 80 per cent of the farmers are inefficient and strives to reduce their numbers — like his partner Lyon in Manitoba who drove 40 per cent of the hog producers out of business during the first three months of 1981.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CODY: — Blakeney believes Saskatchewan should control its resources. Devine says the multinationals should control them. Blakeney is a statesman. Devine looks to his predecessor in the states. Blakeney rejects the horse and sparrow approach of Reaganomics. Devine believes that Reaganomics is the only answer.

Mr. Speaker, I think it goes without saying that the people of Saskatchewan will give the Conservative party in this province its due reward come the next election. I think the reward that the Conservatives deserve they will get come the next election. There is no question in my mind that when you count the Tories on the opposition side next time you won't find 17. You won't find 15. You won't find 10. I'm doubtful that you'll find 5. I think the policies they have enunciated will come to haunt them and the people will tell them so. Mr. Speaker, it's pretty obvious what I'm going to do. I'm going to vote against the amendment and for the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to rise and speak to this throne speech. It's unfortunate that we don't have a law about truth in this Legislative Assembly. It's unfortunate, because some of the rhetoric we just heard from the minister responsible for Sask Tel and the fancy bus service is not true. That is a fact. He makes innuendoes and so forth about everybody but he doesn't have facts to prove them. On that note, let's start with a fact. I will quote from Tommy Douglas. You all know who that gentleman is. I'll tell you where I discovered this quote. I was in North Bay, Ontario, the day after Mr. Diefenbaker passed away and I picked up a newspaper. In that newspaper, a gentleman called Tommy Douglas had written a column. He was referring to Mr. Diefenbaker, the greatness of the man, and what he had accomplished. He said:

There are two of his accomplishments which I shall always remember with gratitude, for which Canada owed him a great deal. When he became prime minister, he amended the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Service Act to provide that Ottawa would pay approximately one-half of the cost of hospital care in the provinces willing to provide such service. And he set up a royal commission under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall on the comprehensive health insurance which was implemented in 1968 and constituted a major step toward the comprehensive health insurance for all

Canadians.

That's not me who is saying it; that's Tommy Douglas, so let's get the facts correct. He goes on in that column to indicate that if it hadn't been for John Diefenbaker, he would have shut medicare down because he couldn't afford it . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . That's what he indicated in his column. Get the North Bay newspaper. It is a syndicated column. That was the implication. Let's remember that. Those are facts. That's not my statement; it's his. Now, you guys just don't like the truth shoved down your throats but that's what is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You don't believe it? I may not believe Tommy Douglas, but you always do. He said it, so let's stay with it. He said that Diefenbaker saved medicare and that medicare was in dire straits financially, and that's the way it is.

The speech given by the member who just spoke prior to me was not nearly as colourful as the jacket he always seems to want to wear. He always has the flowering jacket but the flowering words don't represent the truth.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in question period and as we proceeded today we heard about the "public interest." Sask Tel, the crown corporations and the members on this side could have the facts. I have sat in public accounts and in crown corporations. In public accounts we don't often get the line, "It's not in the public interest." But, in crown corporations we are always told, "It's not in the public interest," or "no comment." "We're scared the competition will know what we're doing" is another excuse they use. I think they use those terms to hide under so they don't have to tell the facts.

Mr. Speaker, we've had some discussion about uranium. Because of a change in our caucus critic positions, I have been awarded the position of critic in that area. I will talk on that subject in a few moments.

I see the Minister of Social Services has entered the Chamber and I would like to give him a few comments about a major strike, or withdrawal of service, in my area. It was at a provincial correctional centre north of Saskatoon, known as a remand centre or however you want to refer to it.

Oh, the member for Qu'Appelle just brought in a document showing that the Premier, Mr. Blakeney, is a shareholder in the Bank of Nova Scotia. That's for your comment, Mr. Minister. Mr. Blakeney has signed a document saying that he is a shareholder in the Bank of Nova Scotia. It's right there in the document. You were commenting that we . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, I'll go back to the unions if you want to say that whoever pays the piper plays the tune.

The Minister of Labour is better known as the "baseball bat minister." If you don't follow him, he's going to take a baseball bat to you. That's the way he operates — with a heavy hand, a big fist and a big bat. He said that every union member has to pay two-bits a month to you guys. Two-bits a month is paid by every union member, in his union dues, to the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour.

Talking about the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, it had its 26th annual convention in Saskatoon. I walked into that meeting and went to register. The man at the door said to me, "Oh, you're an MLA? The government paid for you to be here." I said, "I beg your pardon?" He said, "There's no cost; the government paid." He went down his long list of names — MLA, MLA, MLA — and no Mr. Katzman. I gave him a couple of names and asked him to look and see if they were on his list. There were no Conservative names on that list, but he told me the government paid for all these MLAs to come to the

convention. They were all listed. I asked, "Well, where's my name?" It wasn't on the list so I paid my money, obtained my booklet number 371 so the members would know I paid my fee, and sat and listened throughout the convention. It's interesting to note that they aren't happy with you boys; a lot of them just aren't happy. They said, "I ain't happy with you boys." It was interesting to watch your board of directors' members from SMDC get up and have to defend the status quo of your government on the floor of a trade union meeting. I think he's on the board of SMDC and represents, I believe, the steelworkers, but he had to get up and give your propaganda speech about how great you guys were so they would support you. But there were a lot of them who weren't happy with you. I might not have been happy with the way they wanted to go, but they sure weren't happy with you. And if some of you haven't read the resolutions, you should read them.

I'd like to know, and I don't know if I'll ever find out, if the government treasury paid the membership fee for you fellows to go, or if the NDP paid it. I don't know. But I know I paid my own, and I wasn't on that long list of prepaid by the government, as the man at the registration desk said.

I'm going to get back to the jail. During the strike I had the opportunity to talk to a lot of the guards who were involved. The fact of that whole withdrawal of services is one thing. The government and the present minister did not have the backbone to stand up and protect the rights of employees. And when a guard finally got mad and said, "Into the washroom guys and let's settle this thing," they were going to move him out, kick him out because he wouldn't do their thing. Well, you tell me how you'd like to walk around with a guy going like this beside your head as you went down the hall, because that's what they were doing to that guard — reaching around and going like that. You think he wasn't being pushed around? He had enough. And his fellow employees knew all about it.

The minister wants to talk about other things. Let's talk about the drugs that are smuggled into that jail. Let's talk about the methods by which they are brought in. I can tell all to him because I had to get the explanation from the people involved. They told me how guards can't search and how the drugs are brought into that hospital. They told me how, after certain people came to visit, the next day you would find drugs around that hospital. The guards had to tell me all these stories. He may say, "Did you do anything about it?" Yes, I told his deputy minister exactly what was happening so that, hopefully, they would cure that problem. I haven't heard anything, but hopefully we will stop seeing drugs smuggled into the jails as they have been.

The minister is yapping from his seat, but let me make a comment here. You know, a year ago I sat in my spot and asked questions of the Attorney General's department . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, Mr. Mostoway, I will not shut up. I will say what I have to say, and you will stay in your seat until you get your chance. Now, the minister responsible for interprovincial affairs said I was totally wrong. My facts were wrong. I referred to a protocol car being at this building and the next day being in Saskatoon, and I asked who paid for it. He said, "We wouldn't do that." Well, I've been told since that they dug in their files and found I'm right. Once again, if you'll check the fact you will find I'm right.

I had an argument with a Mr. Messer who used to be in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He threatened to sue you.

MR. KATZMAN: — No, he didn't threaten to sue me. That's the one difference between him and the Attorney General. But anyway, he said that I was wrong when I said they were going to try to buy land and options for Eldorado. He said that they were not doing that. Three days later he had to own up that I was right.

The minister responsible for Sedco and I have had a little bit of a disagreement. He got me on an edge. I didn't say it exactly the way the paper was written, but in crown corporations I indicated how the paper was written. And I was right. They both gave me the business that I didn't have my facts right. I say to the minister responsible for social service, get your act cleaned up, and let's have, in those places, respect for the guards' right to do their jobs and not be threatened. You know, the facts are that that guard isn't there today, but the real reason will never be public and I'm not going to give it if you haven't the guts to do it yourself.

Mr. Speaker, the whole problem with the government on that side of the House is that they can't keep their fingers out of anybody's business. They are constantly meddling. We had a lake drained up in northern Saskatchewan. I don't know why, but after pressure from outside sources, they finally allowed the Minister of Environment to push SMDC to see why they drained those lakes. They are going to have a bit of an inquiry. The question is: how much of a whitewash will it be or will the documents really be made available to everyone?

You talk about whitewashes (and unfortunately the baseball bat minister isn't here today) . . . Before I even came to this House, I had a very real interest in occupational health. Today, one of my fellow members, who belongs to the same basic union I did, is being confirmed as dying of cancer in Saskatoon, from asbestos in the civic auditorium. How many years did that file drag? How long did it take? I remember the last time that we had to embarrass the government and the city of Saskatoon, which were bedmates, into protecting the working man, was when I was involved with that union. We had to go on TV to show them what they allowed people to work in. Now, the union members had to go to Saskatoon City Council Monday night to say, "We've had enough; we are not putting our lives in jeopardy. We will not jeopardize the building; we'll wear masks if we have to, to do whatever is necessary. We want it changed now, not six months down the road. We don't want to talk about it; we want you to do something now." They are finally doing something.

Once again, it took the employees to force the minister's hand, to force the city's hand. It didn't take the Act which is in place now to cause it. They have said there were problems. For two or three years we fluttered around and fooled around. Nothing got done; people got sicker. Fortunately and hopefully, this problem will be cured. Hopefully there will be no one else affected. The indication from the worker's compensation board is that one man will be going on compensation for the rest of his time because of this situation.

I want to talk about a couple of problems in my own constituency. This one I will refer to the Minister of Rural Affairs. Several weeks ago, the Friday of our convention, there was a special meeting here in Regina with people from Manitoba, Alberta, and, I believe, the reeve from our area, speaking about the taxation problems in the RMs. How you handle section 310 of The Rural Municipality Act was the one in question, which deals basically with the taxation system.

You will discover that the real problem with that is an RM get less money than a city if

you use the population formula. A hamlet gets so much more money, because it gets the population figure and it can get as much money as a complete RM That's unfair, and the minister knows what I am referring to. I hope that somewhere down the road there will be a solution to the problem. It may take a considerable amount of discussion of the equalization system. I think the minister took the first step at that meeting and is looking at alternatives. I will give him a compliment for that. It's a tough situation. You lose no matter what you do, Mr. Minister, but you are going to have to do something. There are several suggestions and I would be willing to give you one which has been recommended to me. I am not saying it is my policy or my recommendation. It suggests that you look at section 310(c), which is the clause that says you pay the greater of the two. That is the one which has been recommended to me by acreage holders and farmers. It will be cleaner. I suggest you do with that as you wish.

I have a major concern about another area in my constituency. I think you are all aware that my area is a dairy shed and is very heavy in the production of turkeys, chickens and so forth.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The turkeys are over there.

MR. KATZMAN: — The member for Indian Head-Wolseley says there are some turkeys over on that side. I don't want to name them, because I don't have that much time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I understand there is one more speaker between me and 1 o'clock, Mr. Member.

Let me make a comment here. They are concerned with the dairy quota right now. The fluid milk quota for Saskatchewan is just about totally full. We have a considerable number of young dairy farmers now shipping industrial milk and wanting to go onto fluid milk. I am hopeful the minister can make sure that we get a quota in the federal system that will allow more industrial shippers to move onto the better paying (of course it requires more cash investment and better barns and so forth) fluid system. I would hope that the minister will work to make sure that we get a larger national quota formula.

We all heard the federal budget the other day. It wasn't good news. I tell you. It was bad news for any retiring farmer. I don't mind seeing some of the loopholes closed to those who are abusing the system. But let me look at *Maclean's* magazine dated November 23, 1981 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Mostoway, at least I develop my own speeches. I don't have a speech writer in the backroom producing them, as your guys do . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The minister says I should get one. Mr. Minister, I don't know what you would do without your special assistant who writes all yours, because I am certain we would know exactly what you think.

But let's look down the column on page 36 that shows that the federal government will be lowering the taxes for those earning between \$11,000 and \$15,000. You know, I'll bet you birds go ahead and pick that up in your budget speech. You're going to take away that 1 per cent drop he got — the \$11,000 to \$15,000 employee. He got a tax deduction and you guys are going to take it away, just as last time when there was a 9 per cent cut and you took that one away. I don't mind seeing you pick up some of that \$133,000 man's windfall. Let's get some of that; I won't argue with you on that one. But let's look at some of these other ones very closely before you take away the breaks they did get under the federal budget.

Secondly, we had the member for Yorkton (the soon not-to-be member for Yorkton) on

the street the other day making quotations from a Lorne Somebody in Ottawa. Yes, I agree, he did show some concern. But I think this House has to show concern too, and should let the federal government know it, instead of doing as we did last Friday, making it into a political piece by adding the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture. We couldn't leave a simple motion showing the concern of all members alone and approve it in this House. No, we had to fool around with it and make it a political statement. It's about time we developed a little bit of statesmanship in this House and let some motions go through.

Later on in the day we'll see how much statesmanship we have in this House, and I'm certain we will have some (maybe my comments will help), because I'll be moving a Bill from my side of the House to non-controversial Bills. That's exactly what it means and we'll see if it's allowed to go through. The opposition never argues with the government in moving their non-controversial Bills, because we know they can always come back if there's something wrong with them. That's just an indication that that's what I'll be doing.

Mr. Speaker, let me make one last comment before I take my place, and it's on leadership. We have a government now with a tired and weary leader. He can't spend any more time in the House than question period. When it gets a little hot, he leaves. He goes to Saskatoon to talk to the board of trade . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . You know, Mr. Speaker, there's one good thing in talking about a comparison of leaders. Let's talk about it. Let's talk about a Premier who walks into the town of Wilkie and doesn't have the courtesy to shake hands with the ladies who cooked the meal he has just finished eating. Let's talk about which one of those two men has the time for the average person. Let's talk about which one of those people does most of his travelling in the province in a car on the ground instead of flying in executive airplanes paid for by the Government of Saskatchewan — not by his own political party — when he makes political speeches.

Let's talk about a government that sends out its members to deliver cheques, because we want to build this building, and we want to build that building. You don't send the cheques to the people who deserve them. No, you have to go out there and do a grand speech and a big, formal presentation, so that you get credit. Well, let's talk about that credit. While you guys are fooling around with that cheque, wanting to get press and get your picture taken . . .

MRS. DUNCAN: — Ask them what happened in Swift Current.

MR. KATZMAN: — What happened in Swift Current? You told them you wouldn't give them a cheque until you had the time. Well, the mayor, and a former candidate of your party, from what I understand, said, "Bogus on that," and he wrote something in the paper about it. He's not happy. And I tell you something — the more you babies do that type of stuff, the more it helps us, because people are fed up. It's their money; all you're doing is recycling it. That's all you're doing. It's their bucks; it's going back to them. And let's let it go back to them; let's stop playing games with it.

The Attorney General, or should I say the minister responsible for protocol, and I have had a constant argument about one part of the \$3,000 grant. We'll have it again this year because I think he is wrong and I am correct, and he believes I am wrong. We'll air our differences, as we usually do.

But to prove your contempt for the people of Saskatchewan, you say to officials in

towns, "Well, we've got this cheque for you; it's approved; you can maybe start." But I'm warning them that, if you're anything like the minister for Sedco, they shouldn't start until they have the cheque in their hands because he withdraws it after the board has approved it. So they should be careful; he's done that, and you other birds would do the same thing. They should wait till the cheque is in their hands, but not sit there and wait two or three months. You have a surprise coming, Mr. Minister. In about a week you and I will talk. Sedco again, and you'll be the loser.

Let's remember that's the peoples' money you're sending back; let's send it back to them. When you open a building, cut the ribbon if you want, but give them their money. Don't start playing games because you need your picture taken. Let the member from the local area give the cheque, if you want. I don't care what you do, but give the cheque. Oh, we'll love you. You know, I'm getting tired of your Paul Mostoways and your Dennis Bandas and your Miners coming down to my seat and giving out cheques. We love them. Keep them coming, boys; we like them, we like them. We like those cheques, because they're sure helping our communities, but remember that cheque and that money you have to spend came from the taxpayers of this province.

That's what you have to remember; that's who we are responsible to, and that's who is going to end up on the next ballot, be it June of '82 or June of '83 or October of '82. The final count will be in the ballot box, and I suggest to you members that unless you make changes, we're changing sides of the House, fellows. You're coming over to this side; we're going over to that side, with a leader who is responsible and listens, not one whose nose is out of joint and who wants back at the people who put on the community affair because there wasn't a big picture of him, because nobody took a picture as he shook hands. He has lost the common touch, boys. He's got his nose up in the air. Next we might see him in a limousine or something. Who knows? Time will tell.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be voting in favour of the amendment, for obviously, as I've just indicated, I could not follow a misled government such as we have.

MR. JOHNSON: — Mr. Speaker, before I get into the remarks I have prepared, I would like to comment a little bit on some of the remarks that the member for Rosthern has just put forward. One of the areas which he has been commenting on for the last five minutes or so is the grants from the province to the local governments. I suggest that he is commenting, in that case, for the school divisions or the RMs, as well as the urban municipalities. What he forgets when he says that this is taxpayers' money is that one of the things about the money coming from the province to these local governments is that is the sharing of the wealth of the total province and spreading it over where the population lives. This is one of the things that I think is very good about the system which we have for assisting municipalities: we provide funds where there is need and collect where there is revenue to be collected. I think the member opposite should realize that is a very effective way to run a province.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I take part in this year's throne speech debate. The throne speech indicated quite correctly the present Government of Saskatchewan has made great strides in recent years. It also indicates the very positive direction in which we are moving for the future. I agree with the direction which we have taken.

I welcome the promise of this government to continue to fight for the preservation of the crowrate. The statutory rate for hauling grain is one of the reasons why the farmers in the Turtleford constituency can continue to be grain farmers. Without that, I am sure

it would be very difficult, at best, too impossible to farm in the Turtleford constituency.

I am proud of the initiatives this government has taken to assist farmers: initiatives like the beef and hog stabilization programs; the purchase of 1,000 hopper cars which are now moving grain to market, research initiatives by the FarmLab (I believe this is one of the better approaches because the province of Saskatchewan varies considerably from north to south in the agriculture area and the labs to be spread out over the entire agricultural belt is a very good approach to take), initiatives like land bank and FarmStart and the drought assistance program.

I note with pride, Mr. Speaker, the assistance this government has extended to urban and rural municipalities, school divisions, the variety of programs we have put into place for small businesses, and the steps we have taken to strengthen the environmental and the protective legislation. Our record in health, education, social services and labour is second to none in Canada. Mr. Speaker, we have in Saskatchewan a government which responds to the needs of people. We have a government which strives to provide services to people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss in more detail two items. One of them is education; the other one is in the area of transportation. It is with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I tell you that in the past seven years, since I was first elected as MLA, every major community in the Turtleford constituency has received, or is in the process of receiving, a new educational facility. Be it classroom, gymnasium, library, extension to office space, or whatever, it has been built. Mr. Speaker, one's appreciation of a new building or a series of improvements of this nature is sometimes hidden or lost in the other activities which are carrying on, until one takes time to look back and compare the present situation with the past. Today, in the province of Saskatchewan we have the capability of providing good education. This was not always the case.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to take the time of the Assembly, and your time, to provide some information that I've gleaned from reading the minutes of the Belbutte School District from the first meeting held (it was a special meeting) on August 3, 1916 through until July 16, 1943. The book, Mr. Speaker, is a bit tattered as you can see, but it does contain in it the information that I'm going to use.

The first meeting, the special meeting, did three things: it appointed a committee of three, named the school and selected a site. It named the school the Belbutte School and proposed a site some two miles from the present site of Belbutte. At the first meeting of the trustees of the Belbutte School District No. 3848 on February 26, 1917, a motion was moved to borrow \$1,900. I'll read the motion as it was put forward:

For the purpose of building school and barn and furnishing and equipping school.

In 1916, the major source of funds for a school district for construction or operation, Mr. Speaker, was the local school tax base. To borrow every cent for the construction of a new school was not uncommon. Some schools in the area were constructed of logs because this material was cheaper. In the case of this school, a frame building was to be constructed with purchased material.

As long as the schools were funded by a local tax base, the operation of a school depended a great deal on the economy of the area or the times. In the case of the Belbutte School, it was very erratic. It was literally on a month-to-month basis.

At the April 11, 1919, meeting of the trustees, it was moved:

That we keep the school open for one month longer.

In this case, an amendment that "We go on until the end of June," carried instead.

During that same meeting, another motion was moved:

That we pay Mr. Knight (the teacher) \$190 as the last cheque for \$95 has been returned.

Teaching was not as secure a position as it is today, Mr. Speaker. Teachers sometimes had to wait for their pay.

In the minutes of the trustees' meeting held August 19, 1919, one finds a motion that reads as follows:

Moved that the secretary write the Department of Education, Regina, regarding the closing of the school indefinitely or until we are financially able to keep the school open.

Mr. Speaker, the school opened and closed according to the availability of money. Similar motions to reduce the school year were passed on February 14, 1920; February 27, 1925; February 23, 1926; February 5, 1927; February 16, 1928; and on it goes.

From the very beginning, in the Belbutte School District, it was recognized by the people of the area that provincial funding to equalize property tax was necessary to offset the varying economic conditions of the districts throughout the province. Changes of this nature have occurred in funding, Mr. Speaker. These changes have greatly assisted areas such as the Turtleford constituency. As I earlier indicated, it has allowed the division to provide good facilities for education throughout the area.

The province now provides operating grants to school divisions on a formula basis. The formula takes into account the need of the area. The greater the need of a division, the larger the grant. Costs such as busing, administration, construction of facilities and the number of students are taken into account, as well as the area, and then compared to the capability of the area to generate the necessary funds.

In the case of the northern lakes school division (the division which most of you will know as the Medstead School Division), it means a provincial grant in 1981 of \$3,396,000, as compared to local revenues of about \$900,000. Stating this on a pupil basis, a more startling picture appears. In 1981, the operating grant then becomes approximately \$2,300 per pupil or \$200 more per pupil than the Saskatoon School Division spends. The local revenue provides an additional \$620 bringing the total expenditure to something just less than \$3,000 per pupil. It is interesting to note that the operating grant to the Saskatoon School Division is approximately \$1,000, just slightly less than half that provided to the northern lakes school division. To state this in other terms, approximately 75 per cent of the operating funds for the northern lakes

school division comes directly from the province. Indirectly, through the property improvement grant and the, senior citizens school tax rebate (a program implemented by this government), I estimate another 15 per cent comes from the province. So approximately 10 cents on every dollar spent on education is raised locally in this area.

Mr. Speaker, so that the members for Saskatoon are not overly concerned about this, I would like to point out that it still leaves a higher mill rate for some of the units in the Turtleford constituency than what is presently being charged in Saskatoon.

I will now turn to a second item; this is an item which the member for Wilkie has placed on the motions in the blues. I find it very interesting to note that he has changed sides. He is now exactly opposite to what he was saying a year or two ago. I want you to take this into consideration when you are giving consideration to what the member for Wilkie has to say. Today, Mr. Speaker, in talking about transportation services (and they are important to Saskatchewan) I would like to speak about air service. Quite frankly, I have been shocked and surprised by the Conservative opposite to air service in the province. Our government is considering the purchase of Norcanair with an eye to expanding and improving the air service.

The fact that the present owners of Norcanair have said publicly that they do not wish to undertake large investments necessary to modernize the fleet is perhaps the logical consequence of the decision to privatize Norcanair made by the opposition in 1960. I can see the Conservatives protesting that it was the Liberals who decided to privatize the airline. When one looks across the way and sees the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Thunder Creek, it becomes exceedingly difficult to distinguish between the two parties. It is rather like trying to determine if a zebra has black stripes or white stripes.

Be that as it may, the facts remain that the private sector airline, Norcanair, is unable or unwilling to undertake the investment necessary to modernize its fleet. The fact also remains that for some time the opposition has been urging government action in the area of air service. On March 14, 1979, the member for Wilkie was on his feet in this Assembly. He was asking whether the Minister of Tourism had been in touch with the air carriers in the province about a Regina to Saskatoon weekend air service. He wanted to know, and I quote:

What action are you going to do or what are you planning to do about air service?

Mr. Speaker, if you look on page 5 of the blues, the same member has put forward a motion that this Assembly oppose any further action to purchase Norcanair. When he gets an answer, he doesn't want it. His colleague, the member for Qu'Appelle, told the government, and I quote:

The government has an obligation and a duty, Mr. Speaker, to provide regular air service.

How does this compare with this motion, which I assume went through their caucus, to oppose any further action to purchase Norcanair? On March 28, the member for Wilkie was again objecting to a Norcanair decision to discontinue some early morning flights. The member for Wilkie wanted the government to intervene so that cuts in service would not "affect the exploration or the opening up of the North."

Mr. Speaker, how does the member for Wilkie sleep at night when in less than two years he is first on one side and then on the other? By April 20, 1979, he was even more concerned about Norcanair cuts and demanded to know when he could “start having better air service in the province.” Of course, Mr. Speaker, that is what a Tory-Liberal coalition said would result when they privatized the company in the 1960s, but the opposition has never concerned itself with consistency, and on December 12, 1979, the member for Wilkie renewed his call for government intervention.

On that day he wanted to know when the government was “going to start accepting its responsibilities to provide air service in the province for tourists and businessmen.” Mr. Speaker, I then ask you to again refer to the member for Wilkie who put before this Assembly a motion that said we should take no further action to purchase Norcanair.

The Conservatives and their Liberal colleagues for Qu’Appelle and Thunder Creek have come full circle on the question of air service. In the 1960s they sold out Saskatchewan’s interest in air service, and as recently as last spring they were demanding that the government intervene, with such words as “obligation” and “duty” to provide air service. Now they are critical of any suggestion that the government directly assure quality air service to the North.

I suggest that the flying turkeys opposite don’t know what they want. They would replace a thriving public line with a private line, and now the private line is no longer willing or able to maintain a modern fleet so for several years the opposition has urged the return to public involvement. If you look at the blues, they are going in the opposite direction again. Today the opposition no longer wants the public sector to undertake the responsibility. It’s a good thing that the member for Wilkie isn’t a navigator or many Saskatchewan residents would find themselves arriving in Arizona, or Fargo, North Dakota, rather than in Saskatoon or Regina.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition has gone full circle twice and I don’t expect it will be very long before they will again be off on another tangent.

Leaving that aside, I would like to comment a little more on the direction in which this government is moving. We are working for good air service, we are responsive to the needs of the people, and I think the throne speech demonstrates that as a fact. In this session we will also see further initiatives in agriculture, building on the success of the land bank and FarmStart programs which have assisted 7,500 new farmers.

We now have a voluntary beef stabilization program, and our hog producers have benefited greatly from SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program). We have contributed 1,000 hopper cars to the grain transportation system, and we also have a \$25 million FarmLab program on the way for our strong agricultural industry.

This government has worked with municipalities, small business and industry. We have worked with farmers, labour, the young and the old. In Saskatchewan we have shown that there is a better way to build a province.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be supporting the motion that is before us, and I will not be supporting the amendment. I thank you for your kind attention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Mr. Speaker, I will have a few comments to make on the throne speech at

the next sitting; therefore I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 22 — An Act to provide for Certain Exceptions to the Lord's Day Act (Canada)

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to provide for certain exceptions to The Lord's Day Act be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: — When shall this Bill be read a second time?

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to refer the said Bill to the non-controversial bills committee.

Motion agreed to.

Bill No. 23 — An Act to establish an Environmental Magna Carta for Saskatchewan

MRS. DUNCAN: — I move that a Bill to establish an environmental Magna Carta for Saskatchewan be now read a first time.

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

Bill No. 24 — An Act respecting the Marking of Prices on Certain Consumer Products

MRS. DUNCAN: — I move that a Bill respecting the marking of prices on certain consumer products be now read a first time.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Substitution of Member on Private Members' Bills Committee

MR. BERNTSON: — With the leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by the member for Maple Creek:

That the name of Katzman be substituted for that of Garner on the list of members comprising the standing committee on private members' bills.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:54 p.m.