

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 21, 1983

EVENING SESSION

CONDOLENCES

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly I would like to move a motion of condolence with consent of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a motion:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former member of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan:

Joseph Lee Phelps, who died March 16, 1983, was a member for this legislature for the constituency of Saltcoats from 1938 to 1948.

He was born in Ontario in 1899 and educated at Wilkie, Saskatchewan, where he farmed. In 1916, at the age of 17, he was elected a district director of Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association. He also served as a member of the provincial executive of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and a member of the Wilkie Board of Trade.

From 1944 to 1948 he served as Minister of Natural Resources and Industrial Development. In his later years he was instrumental in establishment of the Western Development Museum and was vice-president of Saskatchewan Senior Citizens' Action Now Association.

Recording in deepest sorrow a sense of loss and bereavement this Assembly expresses its sincere sympathy with the members of the bereaved family.

Prior to moving that motion, to be seconded by the Leader of the Opposition . . . Well, I can claim to have known Mr. Phelps in the Assembly, as he sat here some time ago. I did have the occasion, I suppose as all members did in the previous legislature, of seeing Mr. Phelps in his lobbying capacity with the Senior Citizens' Action Now Association. Even at that time he obviously had known the rules and the procedures of the House and the processes of effectively trying to lobby and get his points across. From that point of view I did have the occasion to meet with Mr. Phelps, and from that point of view I was reasonably impressed with the man at that point in later years — being able to carry on very effectively serving the citizens of the province of Saskatchewan.

I suppose it's imperative and important that as members of the Assembly we recognize all those who have sat in this Assembly. It's an honour to have sat in this Assembly and been a member of this Assembly, and it's with that I would move the motion as I read, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member for Elphinstone, the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to those addressed to the House by the member for Kindersley, the Minister of Finance.

I did not know Joe Phelps as a member of this House, since he ceased being a member in 1948, and nobody who is now in the House has service which goes back to that time.

I did know Joe Phelps in a number of other capacities during the 1950s and 1960s, and '70s and into the '80s.

I don't know how one would appropriately describe Joe Phelps, but I will try by describing him when I knew him over this considerable period of time as a person of boundless energy and firm commitment and great organizing ability. Joe Phelps was not satisfied with the status quo, with I venture to think any status quo. He believed in the need for change and the possibility of change. He viewed the world as something which needed to be changed. There were certain impediments and obstacles in the way and these were there obviously to be overcome, and he attacked his environment and his world in that way.

He, as was indicated, was a member of this House from 1938 until 1948. I heard many stories of his career as a cabinet minister, stories which indicated that he had a great number of surprises, surprises for his constituents and surprises for his cabinet colleagues indicating a restlessness in achieving his objectives which did not always fit lightly into the system of cabinet solidarity.

He, as a minister, and I heard many stories from those who worked with him, was absolutely tireless. He worked Sundays and holidays, and expected that naturally the public servants would work Sundays and holidays. They were able to accommodate to that reasonably easily. He also was unwilling at times to recognize some limitations of weather when flying in the North, and people who perhaps were more experienced in the North than Joe had to be exceedingly firm with him in saying that sometimes you did not fly in the North. This was a matter of vigorous controversy and I have heard some lively stories about the flow of controversy on those occasions.

As you will gather, I am painting a picture of a man who was, at least in his younger years up to 60 or 65, a person who lived life at the full gallop. When he got older, into 75 and 80, it was perhaps at a fast canter. But he certainly threw his whole spirit into everything he undertook. He was a person of driving organizational ability and his monuments are all around him. He did not sometimes fully analyze all the problems which he confronted, and perhaps that's why he in his own way accomplished so much. He transformed the North, bringing the fish board and fish marketing service and the fur marketing service and other agencies into the North which during this period immediately following World War II, brought about the first transformation of the North. The brick plant in Estevan is something which he in effect started by acquiring a closed down brick plant, getting it going again, and eventually it was replaced by the modern plant which we now know.

After his defeat in 1948 he turned his mind to some other organizational activities. In the period of a little over a year, he organized the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, which was, by the then standards of the day, a relatively militant farmers' organization, the lineal descendant of which is the National Farmers' Union we know today.

He turned his mind to organizing the Western Development Museum, went across this province gathering up the examples of older machinery which he said would soon be gone. There was much controversy, as frequently surrounded Joe, as to just how all this should be organized, but it was all done. He gathered in the exhibits; most of the exhibits which are currently in the Western Development Museum were gathered in by Joe Phelps.

Following that, he was instrumental in working towards Pion-era. I not quite sure just

how all of those arrangements took place, and again, there were frequently controversies, but that particularly interesting exhibit of Saskatchewan culture, the Threshermen's Reunion, and the like, have taken place not all because of Joe's energy, but certainly partly because of that.

In later years, he turned his attention to senior citizens' organizations. He was acting in presenting material to the Wartman commission on senior citizens, and, as has already been mentioned, was very active in an organization called Senior Citizens Action Now. Most of us have been the object of a good deal of lobbying at one time or another by Joe Phelps on behalf of a number of causes, latterly Senior Citizens' Action Now, and I think none of us who have seen Joe in action can have anything but admiration for his drive, his initiative, his commitment to others. These activities were never for the financial benefit of Joe Phelps or Joe Phelps's family. They all were in the furtherance of the vision of what society ought to be.

So we have seen the passing of a person who is of a kind very, very unusual in our society: one who is unprepared to accept the status quo and who is most prepared to devote all his attentions to reshaping the world in a manner in which he thinks it ought to be reshaped.

So I join with the member of Kindersley in extending our condolences to the Phelps family, a number of whom I have known, and I join with all other members of the House in expressing our sympathy to all of the bereaved family.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say a brief word about Mr. Phelps.

Like everyone else here, I did not know Mr. Phelps when he was a member. I did have occasion to work closely with an individual who knew him well when I ran in the Moosomin constituency in 1971. I worked very closely with a man by the name of Alex Cunningham who lived in Kipling, and I believe still does.

Mr. Cunningham had been what in these days would have been called an executive assistant to Joe Phelps. They were not called that then. The role had not been so formalized, but he served in a capacity which was roughly similar.

He spoke in an admiring way of Mr. Phelps. What was said to my colleague from Elphinstone is very true. He had boundless energy and he had a faith in his society and his fellow men which led him to believe that virtually anything could be done if one simply took the time to explain the merits of what you were doing. He worked day in and day out as minister of natural resources, which was his portfolio. It is quite possible that had he been a little less diligent as minister, and seen more often in his riding, he might have been returned in 1948. That was not to be the case. That was not Joe Phelps. It was not in his nature to put himself first. He put his society first, and as was the case with many others in '48, he was not returned.

In some ways Mr. Phelps' most striking achievements may well have been achieved after 1948. His role with respect to the Western Development Museum deserves a special note. The Western Development Museum now has what is undoubtedly the world's finest collection of agricultural machinery. The nature of the collection is so extensive that it has taxed the resources of governments ever since to try and house the collection. One should not take away from Mr. Phelps' very real achievement in getting that collection together, and only a person of Mr. Phelps' energy, and boundless

optimism and faith would have attempted it.

One must remember that in the early '50s, I think there was not the sense of our heritage that there is now, and no sense of its importance. He had to work with a society which largely did not understand the importance of what he was trying to do. The machinery was littered across the province in granaries, in barns, behind barns, off on the far quarter section, and he had energy that only he seemed to exhibit. He got it all together and organized what is, as I say, the world's finest collection of agricultural machinery, and that may be his most enduring achievement.

I knew him when he was involved with Action Now, and I had to admire his energy, and his fairly simple, straightforward approach. His position with respect to Action Now was that the minimum wage was, we said, the least a person ought to live on, and senior citizens ought to get the minimum wage. That's what he campaigned so tirelessly for. He didn't achieve it during his lifetime. I have the impression that may only be because he didn't have enough time, but given more time, he might have pulled this very considerable feat together, too.

He was an individual who, as my colleague from Elphinstone said, wanted nothing really for himself. He wanted only a better society. He worked very energetically for that and made contributions toward that end which very few of his generation could match. I join, Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues on both sides of the House in paying tribute to one of the giants of Saskatchewan in yester-year.

MR. JOHNSON: — Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise as the member for the Saltcoats constituency and add my condolences and condolences on behalf of a lot of Joe Phelps' friends that have called me since his passing. I'm sure he served his constituency as well, or much better by what I understand from some of the other colleagues in the House that have spoken prior to me. He served his constituency very well in the 10 years that he did serve as member of this legislature. I live close enough to Yorkton to understand the Western Development Museum and it is something to see for all the people that have not had the occasion. And I understand he's had somewhat a lot to do with that, Mr. Speaker. So I'd just like to indicate on behalf of his friends, and I'm sure he had many in the Saltcoats constituency, that our thoughts are with the bereaved family and I, too, would like to join at this time with the rest of the colleagues of this House in wishing our best to their family. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker. I would now like to move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition:

That the resolution just passed, together with the transcripts of oral tributes to the memory of the deceased, be communicated to the bereaved family on behalf of the Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address in Reply

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

MR. SCHMIDT: — Well, Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned for supper (which I didn't get time to eat but it was nice to have the time off), I was saying that it was with great pleasure that I listened to the throne speech several days ago. You might wonder why I listened to it with such great pleasure. Well, prior to the last election, I had commented to my wife that it was only a matter of time until we would have to take our family and leave this province. My family has been in this province for 85 years and it would be disappointing to see it have to leave. There is a reason why we contemplated leaving this province.

Under the former government we were fast approaching the sorry situation where the tax receivers would soon outnumber the taxpayers. If that day would have ever come to this province, myself, my wife, and my children would have voted with our feet and moved to Alberta.

The opposition tells us here that we are to create jobs. It's a noble intention. I had thought their speeches would be shorter. My wife has always told me about short speeches. She said, "When you don't know what you're talking about, don't speak." I had hoped that their speeches would be shorter.

They're telling us to create jobs and that's a noble intention, but I want to advise the members of the opposition that governments do not create wealth, only people create wealth. Governments take wealth from the people and spread it around. Now, this also is a noble intention, providing the people have any wealth to spread around.

The way the former socialist government of this province operated during a period in time when Canada, the world as a whole, and Saskatchewan prospered, not from their work but by the fallout from the general economic times of the world ... The way they operated this province was nothing more than to squander the people's wealth. The socialist government during that period of time had more revenue at its disposal than any government in the history of this province. Times were so easy from 1973 to 1982 that this province could have been governed by drunken sailors. It is my opinion that it would have been better governed by drunken sailors. The socialists created government jobs on the people's wealth when they should have left the money with the people, for the people to create more wealth. We hear the opposition tell us 'Tory times are tough times.' Well, Tory times are not tough times. They just appear that way. And I'll tell you why. It's because when times get tough, that's when the people turn to the Tories for leadership. It always takes a while to clean up the mess. Even fools could govern during good times, but it takes leadership to govern during difficult times.

It was in 1975 or 1976 that this province took its first turn in the right direction. Those Liberals with wisdom joined the PCs to fight socialism. I got to know the ministers of the socialist government. It's probably a fatal error on their part. One day I returned home from a meeting in Regina, and said to my wife, 'If these are the quality of men who are running this province, I will work to remove them.'

Yes, it was a sorry mess that we inherited on April 26, 1982, but in these tough times our new government has made these Tory improvements and the opposition will say, 'Here comes the gas tax, the mortgage interest, and the whole song and dance.' Well, yes, here it does. We reduced taxation on gasoline; we gave mortgage interest rebates

where they were necessary; we introduced housing programs and the farm purchase program. The opposition says it's not enough. Well, say it is not enough, but here are the results: Saskatchewan has the lowest unemployment rate and it has maintained in that level since; it's been the lowest in Canada. We're the only province with an increase in jobs in the last year — the only province. We're the only province with increased housing. Housing in Saskatchewan is up 14 per cent, when housing in all of Canada is down 29 per cent.

We're the province with the smallest per capita deficit in our budget, and for that reason — well, you may have heard the election promises and heard them implemented and are tired of hearing of the election promises under implementation — I ask you to consider the results. The results are what counts, and because we produced results, we won the by-election in Prince Albert-Duck Lake because people are interested in results, and that is the main reason they support our government.

Now, for too long, I have sat in this House and listened to the opposition, with their suggestions, and they have two simple suggestions: increase spending and reduce the deficit. And those two are not possible; they don't go together with each other. Sometimes I would like the opposition to tell us which they prefer — to cut spending or to reduce the deficit. And just in case they don't know, although they practised this very much, the third alternative is to raise taxes. Or these three alternatives, they will not tell us which they prefer. So therefore, in these difficult economic times we have no choice but to have a small deficit and to have a small cut in spending, but we have not raised taxes. We are leaving the wealth with the people so that they can put it to work for their benefit.

With respect to the throne speech, we've heard that the state of the Canadian economy is in a difficult situation. And I'll tell you why it's in a difficult situation. It's because under the socialist government in Ottawa, under Pierre Trudeau, and in Saskatchewan under the former government, we have turned Canada into a third world country. Think about it. The only difference between Canada and the poor third world countries is that we have a small population. That means we have fewer mouths to feed, and fewer people to share the wealth with. But in reality, we are a third world country with a small population.

Since 1968, our industry has been decimated; our economy has been ruined; and we have continued to be producers of raw materials. Now during the 1970s, when we had to bear with the former government, we could do nicely on raw materials because it was in a period when they were in short supply. Now, in the 1980s, we hear Tory times are tough times. They are tough times because when the wealth was plentiful, nothing was saved. It was sunk in holes in the ground to buy potash mines, when we already owned the potash, and we already taxed the companies.

We have slumped to having the 24th-best economy in the world. Where we used to be second or third, or even a tolerable fourth, we are now 24th. Why is this? It is because we concentrate on taking the wealth from the people and squandering it. In any event, the people of Saskatchewan have said, 'Enough of that,' and have now put us in charge.

I can say that times may not be plentiful, but they will not be tough times; that while Saskatchewan may be short of cash, we will not suffer like the balance of Canada; we will not suffer like the United States; or we will not suffer like Europe. We will certainly not be in the position of France, who joyfully elected a socialist government, and now are sorry. It's plain to see why they're the biggest wine drinkers in the world. Their

government is driving them to drink.

Saskatchewan has valuable assets, but they're not in demand today. It is not the fault of the Tories that they are not in demand. We are not in power in Ottawa; we do not rule the world. As a matter of fact, the majority of the world's people are ruled by socialists.

We know that oil, potash, beef, grain, lumber, pulp and farm machinery are not in great demand now. Even with the basic elements of our economy in difficult sales positions, we are still number one in Canada with respect to jobs; with respect to unemployment; with respect to housing. Now if that is tough times, then I would say Tory times are good times.

If the NDP have a solution to solving our problems in Saskatchewan . . . We're in a position where many of our citizens are short of cash. This is nothing new. I come from a family that was used to being short of cash. The solution to this entire problem is to raise wages, to create jobs and raise wages. When our products are not selling in the world, the opposition does not know better than to suggest that we increase the price of our product.

It would be nice to raise wages. I would like to raise the minimum wage, but I want the people of this province, Mr. Speaker to keep in mind that the government of Saskatchewan does not pay minimum wages, that the government pays very reasonable wages. When you're talking about minimum wages you're asking us, as legislators in this Assembly, to dictate to other citizens how much they can afford to pay their employees. Now this is a noble thing to do when there is wealth, but there is a shortage of wealth, and as the Minister of Labour has so ably stated, jobs are more important now than high wages.

I don't mean to say that 4.25 an hour is a high wage. It is definitely difficult to live on that wage. Fortunately, a lot of people do not have to live on that wage alone. Unfortunately, some people do, and our government will consider ways of helping those people.

I want to point out to the members opposite and to the members in my government, Mr. Speaker, an example of what happens with wages.

I own parts of various businesses and enterprises, and in total employ nine people, and I can say that not one of those nine people is on minimum wage. I can also say that in one of those businesses, for two years now, I have made no profit. All I have done, in conjunction with my wife, is to create employment for four people, and have drawn not one cent, not once cent of return on my investment from that business.

I am saying that, as a businessman, if I am required to continue this employment and dig deeper into my pocket to maintain and create these jobs, I might be inclined to say I will close that business and put my money in the bank. If I do that, there will be four more people unemployed. So you have to balance legislating minimum wages with realities of the world, that not every employer is greedy; not every employer is wealthy. As a matter of fact, in the city of Melville in my constituency, I know as a fact, that the average businessman earns less per annum than the average unionized employee on the CNR.

I'm not saying that the people who work on the CN in Melville are overpaid, but I'm saying that it is difficult to be in business and that these businessmen who are not getting

wealthy are not in a position to help those people who do not have large wages.

The NDP accuses us of being the party of big business. Well, as far as I am concerned, I'm small business, and we are the party of the people, not the party of business, of labour, of farmers, of any particular element, but a party of the people of Saskatchewan trying to do the best for the common good.

The NDP is a union party. Yes, a union party. I want to explain that to you. They are not a labour party, not a party that looks after the workers, but a union party — a party that is bought and paid for by the union leadership. The NDP receives funds from the union. Union leaders control the NDP and the NDP follows the union line.

We are concerned with the welfare of the workers, not the bosses of the union who are well paid. None of them are on minimum wage and none of them suffer. The leadership of these unions has lost touch with its workers and therefore on many occasions the leadership advocates wages that are out of range, and instead of helping their workers, they contribute to unemployment.

I want to give a lesson. I heard that Nadine Hunt was here. I can't see the gallery from here, but I hope she is here. If she isn't, I'm sure that the members of the opposition will tell her what I've just said. I want them to repeat or show her *Hansard* because I want to tell the heads of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and the heads of the unions in this province that unions are a necessary part of our private ownership system. While unions sometimes believe that socialism is their salvation for the worker, the worker is part of what is commonly known as the free enterprise system.

I can say that socialism is the enemy of workers. Consider that in Russia unions are illegal. Consider that in Poland unions are oppressed. Now why would a country that is socialist such as Russia or Poland suppress unions? Because Karl Marx had a theory, and the theory was that in capitalism one capitalist would swallow up the other capitalist until the end there would be only one capitalist left on earth, one man who owned the entire earth. Workers would rise up against one man and take over.

Well, theoretically in practice it doesn't work that way. In Russia the workers rose up and revolted against the Tsar, but the socialist hierarchy, the Bolsheviks, took over the revolution and workers remain oppressed. There's a reason they don't allow unions in Russia, because unions are too democratic and unions speak for freedom in a socialist state. Under socialism, when the people own everything, theoretically, the people will look after themselves, but they don't. In a socialist system it simply doesn't work.

I caution all union people to beware — beware of their freedom — because they're being taken advantage of by the NDP for the NDP's purposes of power and socialism, because if you ever had complete socialism, unions would be abolished as they are in Poland and in Russia.

Now, our government is concerned with the workers and the welfare of the workers. I believe that at heart the unions believe that as well and follow that purpose. I caution the leadership of the unions in this country and in all of the free world that when they go to bed with socialists, they are sleeping with a bear — a great big red bear. And that great big red bear will devour them at the first opportunity.

Unions are necessary. They go hand in hand with a free, privately-owned system. When there are some people with capital and expertise they create employment, and

therefore, when there's employment there is a benefit to the workers and a much improved system for the people. Unions are necessary, but they are not to be used for political purposes as they are in this province. Unions are to represent the workers and not be the government. I can tell you this, that our government will be considering legislation to grant to workers democracy in their unions — the same type of freedom that we all have as citizens. We will see if the NDP will oppose democracy; it will be an interesting situation.

Now, there's another topic that comes to my mind when I heard the Leader of the Opposition discuss the situation with respect to the testing of cruise missiles. Mr. Speaker, we have to be realistic. I dislike war; I fear war; I don't wish to see my children burned; I don't wish to see anyone harmed in any way.

As a matter of fact, I don't even kill mice, and my grandfather used to chastise me for that. I remember in 1971, when I tried to make a living as a farmer, and learned very quickly that it was difficult. We had more wheat than we knew what to do with on the farm and every time a mouse run out of a bin, my grandfather would say, 'Kill that mouse, kill that mouse.' My brother and I would sit there and say, 'Let the mouse live.' He would say, 'You have to kill those mice; they eat wheat.' And we'd say, 'Grandfather, we have more wheat than we can sell; let the mice eat it.'

So I am, by nature, a pacifist person. I suppose . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Someone suggested that I am by nature a socialist; I suppose that's true. But I am a realist. I am a realist to know that socialism doesn't work. As a Christian, I believe in charity, and I suppose that says that by nature I am a socialist. But I am a realist and I can tell you that with respect to the question of the testing of cruise missiles, we must also be realists.

There is a group protesting continuously, and I call them the HITSS, the head-in-the-sand-society. They don't realize that if we throw away our missiles, the Russians can't be trusted to do the same. While no wants war, they don't want us to test our defences. Why I say they are the head-in-the-sand society is because they are not realistic. They don't protest chemical warfare in Afghanistan; they don't protest Cuban troops in Africa. They protest nuclear weapons, which we are going to use as a deterrent or a defence, and we shouldn't test them in Canada, they say.

So if they're not tested in Canada, they will be tested somewhere else. I say to these people with their heads in the sand that the Russians will conduct their first test in Canada because if they ever throw missiles at the United States, they're going to be tested over Canada to see whether or not they can be shot down. So it doesn't really matter whether we test missiles. The important thing is that we support the United States who had always given us a free ride on defending ourselves. I submit it's cheaper to let them defend us than it is to figure out ways of defending ourselves.

I will be branded as a hawk and I don't mind being branded as a hawk. As a matter of fact sometimes I call myself an eagle. But eagles survive, and that's the name of the game on the question testing of nuclear weapons. If we could develop some sort of a system where the Russians would agree to reciprocate, then I would be prepared to destroy all of our weapons.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tell them about the cruise.

MR. SCHMIDT: — Tell them about the cruise? It's a beautiful little machine.

With respect to what our government is going to do in the next session and the details of the throne speech, we will continue to work in housing. There is no doubt that we have got a very good start and whenever I go about my constituency, people are very pleased to see the number of housing starts. We will create a climate for economic development.

During the days of the NDP government, myself and several of my partners were looking for places to invest money. We couldn't find anywhere in Saskatchewan where we felt safe in building an apartment under the rules and regulations set up by the NDP. The closest place we considered was North Dakota. Fortunately the climate has changed in this province and are now considering investment here. While I may be loyal to Canada, I'm not foolish as to give charity to my own country when I am treated well in another country.

With respect to labour, I have touched on some points. We will protect workers. We will protect their democratic rights. We will require labour leaders to be responsible and we will insist that no one is above the law, that everyone must follow the law of this country. That includes workers, employers and members of government.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to make improvements and co-operate with co-operatives. My grandfather was an original founding member of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. My father was a wheat pool agent for 19 years. I have a background in co-operatives and I under them. Co-operatives in this province, whether they are large or small, are simply Saskatchewan-owned corporations and we're very pleased to have them here. We will treat them equally with other Saskatchewan-owned corporations and we're very pleased to have them here. We will treat them equally with other Saskatchewan-owned corporations.

With respect to small business, I note that in the Speech from the Throne, we will reconsider the situation with respect to bonding of small business. I can say that this has been a problem in my constituency. Small businesses are not able to get a bond to get them started, and large out-of-province corporations outbid them, simply due to the reason that they can't get a bond. I am pleased that our government will correct this situation.

With respect to agriculture, we understand that the price of grain is to go down. This further verifies our version that farmers cannot afford to pay more for freight rates. Our government and our Premier have suggested that if rates are to change, they're to change with the price of grain. I have proposed this solution for many years, and I am pleased that it is being considered. Hopefully, the federal government, with the decrease in price, will understand the wisdom of this suggestion.

I cannot leave the topic of agriculture without the delightful thought that the opposition has lost the last election, and I will not be forced to buy some of the CPR. I see in the *Leader-Post* that John Twigg, who formerly worked for the NDP in British Columbia, still wants us to buy the CPR. He still hasn't learned that there is no benefit to the people of Saskatchewan in buying a railroad. I don't know what it will solve to buy the CPR when the CN charges the same freight rates and is already owned by the people of Canada. I don't see the advantage of it at all.

With respect to energy and natural resources, I am pleased to see that we have changed our royalties to make it easier for exploration of our oil and gas. As usual, the federal government in Ottawa will not let us sell our gas. While we, as government, have tried to co-operate, they hinder us at every move. Fortunately, we will not have to tolerate this

situation in Ottawa for a long time, but it's going to take years and years to erase the scars of Pierre Trudeau and his economic folly.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech is truly an improvement. It's the first step in sensible government in this province. I note that there are things in the throne speech that do not cost a lot of money. There are things also in the throne speech that are not there, but that I would like to see there; but I am patient. We cannot change everything at once. It took years to get us into this problem.

I encourage my government to adopt the Alberta system of work-fare rather than welfare. I suggested that it is a very good experiment in Alberta, and I cannot see why anyone would object to having people working rather than simply drawing their cheques. I commend the Conservative Government of Alberta for such an innovative experiment.

I note that our government intends to deal with the water problems of this province. The water problems are not just problems in the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon. I drink the Regina water but I don't drink the Melville water. I'm pleased to come in for a drink of water. Water is a problem through this province. I am pleased that our government is going to deal with the problem on a fair basis throughout Saskatchewan. I hope that the cities of Regina and Saskatoon . . . Excuse me. I hope that the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw . . . I know Saskatoon has a different problem. I understand it's sewage, not water. Maybe some people think Regina's water is the same. I hope that Moose Jaw and Regina can soon come to some form of an agreement as to what they wish to do with the water, because we have indicated we are prepared to co-operate.

With respect to justice, I am pleased that the Attorney General is making improvements. I have further suggestions. If I ever get my way I would like to see local jails. If I ever got my way I would remove the colour television sets from provincial jails, and there are various other ideas that I would like to implement.

I can say that this government has gone a long way to make improvements. The NDP, the socialists, they're always in a hurry. They're not thinking about the consequences of their acts. They want to change everything. We as Conservatives see that there are lots of good things in this province. We don't want to change everything. We want to improve everything, and this throne speech is the start of the great improvement.

I will vote against the amendment, in favour of the main motion on the throne speech. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. EMBURY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to rise tonight and speak a little more briefly, I think, than the former member on the throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest, which I rarely do, to the Leader of the Opposition, but I did listen with some interest on Friday, because on occasion — and I stress the word 'occasionally' — the Leader of the Opposition does come up with an interesting speech, and Friday was one of those rare exceptions. It's not because the political or economic content of the speech was worthy of any notice, but I did note his theme. It caught my interest, and it caught the interest, I now of the member for Moosomin and the member for Melville, who also commented on the theme of the Leader of the Opposition. Basically, there was nothing else to look at in the speech, so let's take a look

at the theme of that speech of the Leader of the Opposition, which was on Friday: movies and movie titles. The Leader of the Opposition went to some length to try and find a movie title that he thought would capture the essence of the throne speech.

I was interested, because I didn't know how many movies the Leader of the Opposition knew, and so I found out two things from that speech: I knew how many movies he had seen in the last year and I found out what kind of movies he likes. Now it's not surprising to anyone in this House that since the last election he's been able to see a lot of movies but I didn't know the types of movies he was looking at. He obviously has a great liking for disaster movies and horror stories, which is rather enlightening because that probably would explain a number of things. It would probably explain the performance of the last government and why the election resulted as it did, but more interestingly, I think it will be explain the present posture and the present failure of the opposition to address any of the issues before us today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's only fair that if the Leader of the Opposition has gone to all the trouble of trying to capture for us the essence of our throne speech, that we try and return the favour for him and try and find out how we can capture what the opposition has been doing for the last 11 months. It's a difficult task, Mr. Speaker, because they have not made their position clear. We're not sure just what positions they're talking in any of the issues that are before us today.

There is an additional problem that we have when we try and find the movie title that would depict the opposition, and that is that the press has already got into the game ahead of us. Now we know, for instance, that Dale Eisler of the *Leader-Post* has 'Allan and the Seven Dwarfs' all wrapped up so we can't use that. He used that right after the by-election so that's out, Mr. Speaker. So what kind of movie should we look at to try and depict the opposition?

Now look at what's happened to them. They've gone from 45 or 46 members — whatever they had in the last House — down to eight. The grand plans for the crown corporations are gone. The land bank is gone. So with that, perhaps 'Gone with the Wind' might capture some of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. EMBURY: — I don't think so though, Mr. Speaker, because when I thought about it a little more, I realized that that would be a slap in the face for the makers of that movie. After all, it was movie about a war with principles involved, and that wouldn't do at all to describe the opposition.

We keep going and one of the major problems I think we face as a government, Mr. Speaker, when we deal with the opposition is that we really don't know what alternative solutions they are putting forward to us. We don't know exactly, Mr. Speaker, what they want the government to do. We know that they don't want us to go this or we don't want that but we don't know what their alternatives are, so I think the theme that we're going to pick out for the opposition, and I think we can follow it through this speech, is 'Allan in Wonderland.' 'Allan in Wonderland' is probably a fairly decent way to describe the opposition. It's got a history, Mr. Speaker. Just what does the opposition want us to do? What alternatives are they giving to the province of Saskatchewan?

Let's go back to last April's election. We promised a number of major changes in Saskatchewan. We said that we had to protect the homeowner. The opposition said,

‘No, that won’t work. The interest deduction plan will not work — bad thing.’ We said we’d take the gas tax off — they said we couldn’t afford it. We said that we would introduce a public review commission — that was a bad idea.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that’s fine. The opposition said that that wasn’t available alternative but lo and behold, when we introduced those bills into the House, they voted for them. Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the search for the alternative goes on. That obviously is not what the NDP are offering the people of Saskatchewan as an alternative because they agree with us.

Let’s look at the economy. My colleague, the Minister of Finance, last November brought down a budget. There are a number of quotes that I’d like to read from *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, to give you an example of what the opposition is saying to the people of Saskatchewan and is saying to the government.

On November 26, 1982, the Leader of the Opposition was speaking on the budget, and he said, and I quote:

Now, Mr. Speaker, why are budget deficits for provincial governments bad? Well, they are bad for the same reason that they are bad for you and me in our personal lives.

Mr. Speaker, one could assume then that the Leader of the Opposition was suggesting to the people of Saskatchewan and to the government to cut expenses and balance the budget. But, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition went on to say, not the next day . . . Same speech, same day, he went on to say:

Why in heaven’s name could we not proceed with needed projects at a time when we have hundreds of people out of work . . .?

Well, that was only three pages later, Mr. Speaker, in the same speech. What are the alternatives that the opposition are giving to the people of Saskatchewan? On the one hand they say don’t raise the deficit; on the other hand, spend more money.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on. Let’s talk about jobs. We had a good example today. I have the Leader-Post from Saturday. The announcement was that the minimum wage is to be frozen at \$4.25 an hour during 1983, Mr. Speaker, the opposition has been in this House week after week telling us to create jobs. It’s our duty to create jobs. It’s the number one issue — to create jobs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, now the opposition rejects the government’s argument that increasing the minimum wage would reduce jobs. Mr. Speaker, obviously they haven’t understood what the recession is all about. The recession, Mr. Speaker, has caused unemployment to increase, and the reason unemployment has increased is because businesses can’t afford to keep the people employed any longer. What’s the NDP’s answer? Well let’s increase the cost to the employer. We won’t have any jobs at all.

Mr. Speaker, here’s another alternative given to us by the opposition What do they want us to do? What are they offering to the people of Saskatchewan? We don’t know. It’s Allan in Wonderland, Mr. Speaker. No one knows what we’re supposed to do.

Mr. Speaker, obviously we can’t find the answer in *Hansard*; we can’t find the answer in the most recent utterances of the opposition.

Just what are the priorities, just what are the alternatives that they give the people? I listened closely today. I thought perhaps the Leader of the Opposition would finally give us the alternatives, give us what his priorities are. I was surprised. I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, to find that the number one priority of the Leader of the Opposition, the lead off in his statement today, was foreign aid. Foreign aid. Now I can agree, Mr. Speaker, that there is some importance to the SCIC and the government will continue to fund that, but I'm not sure that the people of Saskatchewan think that that's the number one priority.

What's the number two priority? Well, the Leader of the Opposition's number two priority today was the cruise missile testing. Mr. Speaker, again that's an issue that has to be faced and discussed and a decision made, but I'm not sure that the thousands of unemployed and the farmers and anyone else out there who is in economic trouble really think that foreign aid and the cruise missile testing are the top two priorities in this province. But according to the Leader of the Opposition today, those are the first two things that he wanted to talk about. Foreign aid and the cruise missile testing: there they are number one and two. Important issues perhaps Mr. Speaker, but I question the priority when one looks at the other issues facing this province.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina Elphinstone accused this government in the throne speech of mentioning many things but not addressing them. I thought that was an interesting comment. I went back to the last Speech from the Throne from the NDP and that was on November 26, 1981. Mr. Speaker, needless to say that speech not only didn't address problems, but didn't mention many either.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, let's just try and compare some parts of that throne speech with the present throne speech. And let's start off with the economy. Mr. Speaker, the economy in 1981 was beginning to show signs of stress and that was indicated in the speech. Mr. Speaker, the then government put forward one single program to help the economy in 1981-82, and that was the home-owner's security act. There, Mr. Speaker, was a classic piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, untold jobs would come from home – owner's security act, untold jobs. Not one job. What a fiasco! Mr. Speaker, it was a great success, it was a great success. I think at last count, Mr. Speaker, there were two people in Saskatchewan that benefited. Not one, but two.

Mr. Speaker, the mortgage interest reduction plan introduced by our government helped 35,000 people, not two, created jobs and did something for this province that this pitiful piece of legislation could never do. Mr. Speaker, it's the type of answer that the NDP have been giving this province for years. It's the type of answer that the people finally got tired of, and threw them out.

I go on in that speech of November 26, 1981. We come down to agriculture. There wasn't a heck of a lot new going on in agriculture. They promised to continue a five-year farmland program already in existence, so they decided to mention it again. They decided to continue the SHARP program, which had already been started in 1976, for hog producers. They were going to continue the beef stabilization plan.

Mr. Speaker, all those things were all going on. There wasn't a new proposal for agriculture in the whole speech. This is from a government in which the now Leader of the Opposition says that our speech didn't address problems. I think, Mr. Speaker, as we go through this November 26, 1981 throne speech of the NDP we will find out who is addressing the problems and who isn't.

The November 26, 1981 speech, when it came to the area of municipalities, promised nothing new, but promised to look at a new urban elections act. Mr. Speaker, of course they did not deliver the new elections act, we did, but that was it. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is our Minister of Urban Affairs going to do? He's going to introduce a new planning and development act, a new urban municipalities act. Now, Mr. Speaker, we've been here 11 months and got that far. These fellows were here for 11 years and didn't produce. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the facts as they come in will point out to the people of this province exactly who is addressing the problems in this province and who is not.

Let's go on to industry and commerce. Industry and commerce, well this was a heavy one for them. They had a well servicing assistance program that year, and a temporary oilfield support program. Mr. Speaker, the total amount of money spent ... (inaudible interjection) ... This was to get the oil business out of the doldrums. They spent the whacking sum of \$2 million, and resulted, of course, in shut-ins all over the province. Addressing the problems, Mr. Speaker. I think without having to go through what our government has done to get the oil business going, which has been successful beyond words, let the people judge who is addressing the problems and who isn't.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at our throne speech, keeping in mind this great November 1981 speech that is supposedly to have answered all the problems. Right off the bat, we discussed tax policy — what our philosophy is, what the people of Saskatchewan should expect of us, and what we think should happen in regards to taxes. The NDP never mentioned tax policy in the budget speech, never came close to it and I think that says something right there.

In the economic development, as I've mentioned, there was no plan, no strategy, in the NDP speech. Mr. Speaker, I think that our record speaks for itself. I think if we step back and look where we came from, and where we're going, it is very clear. I think that when we got into power last year we knew we had to do two things. We had to protect the consumer, and secondly we had to try and stimulate the economy. We said we'd protect the consumer by protecting his home, which we did, and there are thousands upon thousands of people who benefited from that program. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that many of them live in Regina Lakeview, in my constituency, which is basically a residential seat. They will remember that, Mr. Speaker. They will remember it this year, and they will remember it at the next election.

Secondly, we said that we had to try and stimulate the economy. We had to put money back into the hands of the consumer, and we did that, \$150 million worth on the gas tax. Mr. Speaker, we went on from there and built other programs. The Build-a-Home Saskatchewan, to allow people to buy their homes, to allow workers to gain jobs — all a success, Mr. Speaker. The Build-a-Home Saskatchewan is a success story on its own. I think that the figures read in the month of January alone this year — for January and February — the increase in housing starts is 140 per cent in Regina over the last year. I think that it is no doubt that our approach to getting the economy going is working. I think that the people will show in four years that we were right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we have to re-read this throne speech to the opposition. But there are certain parts that I think they should listen to because, Mr. Speaker, they don't seem to understand what this throne speech is about. Because they never had a plan, because they never had a strategy, they don't understand one when they see one. I think that they must remember that the Premier of this province has said

time and time again that we will build this province on four corner-stones: labour, education, business and government. It's in this speech, Mr. Speaker, what the strategy is, what we plan to do over the next number of years, and this year in particular.

Economic development, Mr. Speaker, is on page 3, and I quote:

Infrastructure enhancement, particularly in education and research capacity, is urgently needed.

My government will soon be announcing details of a major high technology development strategy. This strategy would provide the impetus to (1) permit the private sector to benefit from the implementation of high technology in existing and new industries in Saskatchewan, and (2) allow the public sector to lead the development and application of technology.

Mr. Speaker, a strategy, an industrial strategy, where we want to go, what kind of business we want to foster over the next five, 10 and on, years. Mr. Speaker, labour relations. You can't just legislate labour relations, as the opposition would like people to believe. It is a matter of not only legislation which is in place and the improvement of that legislation, but it is also a matter of attitude, a matter of communication and that I think will be borne out over the next number of years.

Mr. Speaker, education is another corner-stone of our strategy, and I would like to just quote again from the throne speech. Another corner-stone my government considers, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

My government considers post-secondary and adult education to be a corner-stone in the economic and social development of Saskatchewan . . .

To this end, my government will significantly increase capacity in the next three years through a number of measures, including: the addition of new training programs at the province's three technical institutes, the completion of the expanded version of the Prince Albert technical institute, improved planning for future training and manpower needs by forging a closer link with labour, industry and the public, improvement and expansion of our ability to train highly skilled manpower for complex fields, notably through addition of new high technology programs to the curricula of the technical institutes, and (finally) the development of contemporary educational and training programs targeted for single parents in need.

And the speech goes on.

Mr. Speaker, education, another corner-stone. And government, the last corner-stone. Mr. Speaker, government. It was interesting to note on page 7 of our throne speech that there's a heading called 'Government Effectiveness.' You would have to look long and hard through any number of NDP throne speeches to find government effectiveness. It's in here, Mr. Speaker. It is one of our objectives that will be met and it will improve what we think the people of Saskatchewan deserve from their government. The objective of the reorganization, which will be coming, will be to achieve a more effective and efficient government structure, better able to respond to the needs of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be up tonight to speak in favour of the main motion. I will

certainly not vote for the amendment, and I would urge all members of this House to follow my vote.

MR. MYERS: — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join in this debate on the throne speech. At this time I would like to extend my congratulations to all my fellow colleagues, the member for Moosomin, the member for Melville, and the member for Regina Lakeview who have spoken so eloquently and to those who will speak later, including those from the opposition who wish to join in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, as it has been alluded to in the throne speech, I too look forward with confidence to the opportunities that lie ahead for the constituency of Saskatoon South, and the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that Saskatchewan is suffering an economic downturn in regards to agricultural and natural resource sales. This is true. Saskatchewan is not unlike the rest of Canada, or in fact, the rest of the world. This has happened because of an uncaring and irresponsible federal government — a federal government that has brought the energy industry to its knees in this country; a federal government which is now threatening the farmers of Saskatchewan with higher transportation costs, Mr. Speaker; a federal government supported by its allies in socialism, the little red rump, the NDP Party.

Mr. Speaker, the letters NDP, like the New Democratic Party, stand for: negative development planning, negative development policies, and negative development production incentives. When the Leader of the Opposition talks about plans, it would seem the only plan he has delivered so far is the Pepin plan — and we all know the disasters of it — a plan so disastrous in scope and breadth that it would leave Saskatchewan and western Canada reeling for many years.

Mr. Speaker, what the throne speech alludes to is that we as a government realize that we are part of a national economy, and we want to partake in that national economy. Unlike the former government, we have implemented programs to stimulate this province — programs for housing, to assist the construction trades; programs in resources, to assist the oil and gas industry and its employees; programs which have given Saskatchewan a net gain in jobs, while the rest of the country has declined. Mr. Speaker, this is a figure which has been consistently supported by StatsCanada; a figure and a position which we will maintain by future programs this government will be implementing.

The people of this province saw in this party, which is now a government, a trust — a trust to bring about innovative and progressive programs; policies for the future; policies for progress. Mr. Speaker, we made a commitment to lower taxes in those policies for progress — a commitment which we as a government have re-affirmed in the throne speech. We also realize that co-operation is required by our government with the federal government in Ottawa, co-operation to solve common problems, and to work as equal partners in pursuit of the solution of those problems. We will not, however, become subservient to the federal government, but rather an equal participant for the betterment of this nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, and I'm sure my fellow colleagues believe, that this government is striving for economic development that is permanent and competitive with world trade; economic development that is designed for the future; economic development such as high technology and computers and communication systems; economic development which will be assisted by research centres and by this government.

Mr. Speaker, when establishing industries, we are also aware that we must protect the land. In particular, the threat of acid rain looms before us, a threat which we cannot ignore. Agriculture has built this province. Agriculture is also the base of most of our economic trade. Agriculture has been, still is, and will continue to be for a long time into the future, the key to this province's success and wealth.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must always bear in mind the importance of maintaining a rich and fertile land, a land capable of producing the food for this nation and the nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk about keeping Saskatchewan farmland productive, I must also mention that we as a government must keep our industries productive. Our labour relations must be fair to both employee and employer to enable us, as a province, to be competitive in the world market. The Premier said it before, and I'll say it again. The people of Saskatchewan are compassionate, but they must be competitive, be able to provide the economic base for supporting our social amenities. We cannot have one without the other, and therefore a competitive spirit must emerge to provide us with the productivity that is required to make this province number one.

Mr. Speaker, the crown corporations must be more productive to enable them to provide efficient services at the lowest possible costs. We stated prior to, and during, the last election that we would take steps to make the crown corporations an efficient and a more integral part of the Saskatchewan economy. The throne speech realizes this, and I support the feelings of the throne speech.

Co-operatives, like the crowns, are an important sector of this provinces' economy. They touch every citizen of this province and provide many vital services. We recognize that they must survive, and we as a government must give them the necessary support when the co-operatives require it.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses also, like co-operatives, require assistance from time to time. A continuing communication link must be maintained with small businesses. Realising this, we are reviewing the complicated procedures for performance bonds on government projects.

In the area of energy, a review took place last year providing us with the background required to put incentives into the oil patch, incentives which have paid a dividend to our economy, a revitalization of an industry which was being brought to its knees by the former government, and which was alluded to by the former speaker.

We are watching the oil industry very carefully because of the unstable work markets. We do not want to lose the significant gains made during the past year. Just as we have stimulated the oil industry, we have also stimulated the natural gas exploration program. This change of suppliers will greatly reduce the cost of natural gas supplied within Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, just as we have launched a rural gasification program, we are also pursuing others forms of energy. The Nipawin hydro project is one of those forms, and it will assist the economy of this province to develop. Not only will we benefit from a renewable resource, but it will be providing jobs to the province's labour force during its construction period.

The potash industry, although it is not an energy producer, is, however, an energy stimulative. Both public and privately owned mines will continue to share a market which will be aggressively attacked. We also realize that unwarranted taxation in this area can detrimentally affect the Saskatchewan resource base.

Mr. Speaker, we are also aware of unwarranted regulations being placed on the public service, and will move to remove the red tap which has for so long under the past government made it become ineffective.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of education, we have also believed that the backbone of a healthy economy and strong competitive work-force is a good and complete education. That is why the recently announced extension to the Prince Albert technical institute will reaffirm our commitment in this field.

Just as we have shown our ability to deal with education, we will show similar endeavours towards social services and health care. Mr. Speaker, Saskatoon needs a new hospital to replace the aged City Hospital. This government has provide the funds for the preliminary plans to be drawn up, and I know this government will fulfil its promise to make Saskatchewan number one in the health care field.

Mr. Speaker, it would be unfair not to consider housing as an economic stimulant . The program announced last fall — the Build-A-Home Saskatchewan program — has proven to be very successful. It has provided incentives to an industry which has been hard hit by the previous government. In fact, Saskatchewan now leads all of Canada in terms of new housing starts. This government should be commended for its quick action taken in this industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend the government for its announcement in the throne speech that it will be modernizing The Urban Municipality Act, an act for which changes have long been sought from the previous government by the municipalities. This government intends to continue listening to and co-operating with those municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, this government is also planning to modernize The Highways Act and introduce a new Vehicles Act this has been long overdue and will only reaffirm our intentions in making the highways safe for the public.

This government also intends to install regulations over cable TV and to promote educational and cultural communications through this media. This move will benefit most of Saskatchewan's residents.

Mr. Speaker, legislation has also been needed to clarify the laws for the lay person of this province. It is comforting to know that the small claims court will be used to alleviate the backlog of cases in this area which ahs been built up over the past years. It is also comforting to see that that the streamlining of the Finance Department will take place.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition accuses this government of not caring for third world nations. Well, I for one do not support aid that is directly channelled toward guerrilla organizations to allow them to kill, attack and maim innocent people. I do support the aid given to further the third world nations.

The Leader of the Opposition has also mentioned the testing of cruise missiles. I do not

support nuclear weapons build-up, but the member is wrong. We are not testing nuclear weapons on Canadian soil; what is being tested is a delivery system, a system which will protect Canadians in the future. If we followed the Leader of the Opposition's advice and laid down our weapons, we would be following the same tragic actions taken by Neville Chamberlain, prior to the outbreak of the Second World War, 'Peace at any price.' This action might be okay for the member for Regina Elphinstone since he believe in the same socialist views as the leaders of the eastern European countries, but I do not.

The member has also mentioned that we should be as foolish as to support the coffers of the federal government through a gas tax rebate, when in fact, there is no provincial tax on gasoline. He would be reminded that all taxes on gasoline are federal taxes, and if any rebate program should be installed, it should be installed by the federal government — a program I would personally support and endorse.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Regina Elphinstone also suggests that we should spear inflation by increasing the minimum wage, which is already the highest in Canada. The action clearly demonstrates that this member is not in touch with the public, nor is he in touch with economic conditions of this country.

He also alludes to dismantling some of Saskatchewan's crown corporations, corporations which had no business in the lives of the citizens of Saskatchewan. He also seems upset that this government is seeking to become efficient in other basic and required crown corporations. They believe that they could run anything and take over anything, if they simply dumped enough of the taxpayer's money into them. Mr. Speaker, that is not a philosophy that I support nor is it a philosophy that this government supports.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I will be supporting, whole-heartedly, the Speech from the Throne which has been moved by my colleague for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, and seconded by my colleague for Morse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with great pleasure that I once again a rise to speak in this House. Having not spoken in this Assembly since last March, I firstly want to sincerely thank my faithful constituents of Arm River who honoured me with a resounding victory on April 26, 1982.

For many years it has been said that the people of Arm River are the barometer of politics in Saskatchewan. I can tell my friends in the opposition that the barometer is still high in the Conservative area; in Arm River it will go higher. Since 1977 I have given my full-time consideration to the needs of my constituents, and they have responded by supporting me in all my endeavours.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to go through the highlights of the throne speech and make a few comments. Firstly, on the economy. Under the leadership of Premier Devine, Saskatchewan's economy is a bright light during a time of national economic darkness. Consider these positive facts:

1. Employment in Saskatchewan is the lowest in all of Canada;
2. Inflation in this province is lower than the national average;

3. Saskatchewan drivers pay less for fuel than any other province;
4. Housing starts and construction are well ahead of the rest of the country;
5. This government has removed taxes while in provinces like NDP Manitoba they are still raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I've noticed on several occasions in this House, not several, but almost every day in question period as our Premier rises to speak in answer to the opposition's questions, that any time he remarks about the gas tax, and the mortgage plan, and the farm plan, they start to mock him over there. They are repeating and repeating. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to say that almost every time I stand to speak in this House for four years and then for another four years, because all I've heard from the opposition since 1944 is medicare.

I'm proud of our Premier, of those remarks that he says in question period and, Mr. Speaker, I hope he keeps on with those remarks continually, and bugs them as they bugged me with their medicare for four years, or for 40 years I should say — 40 years, Mr. Speaker, medicare. Medicare is the best thing that ever happened to the province of Saskatchewan, but John Diefenbaker brought it to Saskatchewan, not those people. They just implemented someone else's plan, Mr. Speaker.

Health care. During the last election the NDP tried one more time to use the medicare scare tactic, but I say it didn't work this last election, did it, Mr. Speaker? Just look at the caring ways which this government has for the people.

Agriculture. The family farm purchase program is the best piece of farm legislation ever produced anywhere. It is a step to true family farm ownership. Premier Devine has asked in the past if the pioneers would have come to Saskatchewan if the posters read, 'Land for Rent in Saskatchewan.' No, they wouldn't. The socialist land bank plan was a failure. The family farm purchase program will guarantee the future of farming in this province.

Jobs and economic development. This government will not rest as long as any person in this province is unemployed who wants to work. To that end, this government will bring about measures to create new employment. We will encourage the people of Saskatchewan to invest in this province. This government will be introducing details of a major high technology development strategy. Research and development will be important factors in keeping Saskatchewan in pace with the 1980s. Energy is vital both to Canada and Saskatchewan. This government is watching the world oil situation very closely, and we are prepared to act to protect our oil industry.

We are proud of our 10-year program to bring natural gas to rural Saskatchewan. It was a program the NDP opposed. Then they discovered how popular it was before the last election; then they had a deathbed repentance.

Gross farm income in Saskatchewan last year was almost 4 billion, and this government is firmly committed to keeping Saskatchewan a leader in agriculture. How will we do that? New initiatives in the area of agriculture research and market development. Producers and commodity groups will be invited to participate in these new endeavours. Measures will be placed before the Assembly to keep the Saskatchewan grain and livestock farmers competitive with the rest of Canada. The

future of farming will be secure with the Progressive Conservative government.

Speaking of natural gas, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go back to a promise that was made in my constituency in 1971. The NDP candidate for Arm River promised natural gas to the Elbow-Outlook line. Again in 1975 they made the same promise, Mr. Speaker; as a cabinet minister this promise was made. In 1978, it was made again; and in 1982, the same promise was made again by a defeated cabinet minister.

As I campaigned this line, many people said to me, 'Will this be the same kind of a promise that was made to us for the last 10 years by the past government? Will natural gas just be a promise and we'll never see it?' And I am proud to say that in seven or eight short months, natural gas has been implemented to that line. It's been promised to the Elbow, Strongfield, Hawarden and Loreburn areas; and also, over by Allan, I have the town of Bradwell. I'm very proud to say that in these short months, this promise has been kept.

Mr. Speaker, in this House today I witnessed the Leader of the Opposition crying his heart out for more radio time, in view of the fact he had such few members. Well, Mr. Minister, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that I am quite familiar with the old question of radio time, and I can assure him his ex-colleague in this Assembly, Mr. Mostoway, not only didn't give us more time, but he tried to steal some from us when we were in opposition. I am the one to know, because I was the whip and dealt with him for three years.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of the minimum wage, I feel confident that the general public agrees that we now have the highest minimum wage in Canada, and it is a reasonable wage. To increase the minimum wage at this time would only cause many businesses, both large and small, to determine whether or not they should keep the present number of employees or cut back. Our main thrust, Mr. Speaker, is to alleviate the unemployment at the present rates of pay, and I'm positive those persons who are presently unemployed would be happy to be called back to work at the rate of pay they were receiving prior to being laid off. Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to creating employment, and we will fulfil that commitment. I can assure you that when the economy once again becomes buoyant under a free enterprise government, we will continue to maintain a high minimum wage. The workers want jobs, not hand-outs. Do those working want more money just to cause more hardship for those that may not be hired because of the minimum wage that the employer cannot afford to pay?

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the Crow. For four or five years now, I've heard the past government condemning us, the opposition, for not taking a positive stand on the Crow. Now, Mr. Speaker, the opposition is condemning the government for not taking a strong stand on the Crow.

I'd like to just go back and review some comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. Very interesting today in the House, when he was speaking on the throne speech, the Leader of the Opposition was condemning us for not taking a stand and saying that we would — we, meaning themselves — not go for one more penny. The farmers can't afford one red cent. I agree with him, but he's a little hypocritical when we go back one year and hear what he has to say. I want to quote from the *Globe and Mail*, Monday, February 8, 1982. This is said by the then premier:

That we think that under certain circumstances and at some future time, the case might be made for increasing the level of Crow, provided that it was

given the same statutory protection.

Now I don't want to be quoted as saying I'm happy to see the Crow increase. That's not so. But I am realistic enough to know that time goes on and costs go on, and I think farmers are realistic enough to say that at some time they should look at increasing the Crow.

Now that isn't what he's saying today. It's absolutely the opposite statement he made here a year ago.

Then on February 16, 1982, not too long before the election was called, the NDP rejected the Hall report. Imagine, they rejected the Hall report which says:

The Crow rate should remain and the federal government should pay the railways the difference between Crow and a compensatory rate.

Allan Blakeney said that Saskatchewan should buy into the CPR — \$2 billion using Saskatchewan taxpayers' money. Jean-Luc Pepin says it would take \$8 billion.

January, 1982 *Business Life* magazine, Allan Blakeney says:

It is clear that the railway should get additional compensation for the grain they carry.

Mr. Speaker, I just want this on the record, because many of us heard these statements a year ago, but the new members today seem to have forgotten the turnaround that the Leader of the Opposition is so ably being able to do now.

Also, another word about the Crow. On March 4, just about three weeks, I guess, Mr. Speaker, before the election, the PCs sent a letter to Blakeney asking him to support a joint resolution to be sent to Ottawa supporting the Crow rate. The NDP never allowed the joint resolution to come to a vote. If they support the Crow, how come they won't send a message to Trudeau? Now they are telling the public the PCs do not support the Crow. Mr. Speaker, on the first day this House opened, our government saw to it that we had a joint resolution and sent the message to Trudeau. Why did they, one year ago, refuse to do so?

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased when I was given the task of preparing a full report on the water supply to the cities of Moose Jaw, Regina, and intervening towns and industries. I was attacked, Mr. Speaker, for prolonging this report and I make no apologies for the period I took to prepare my report on the Regina-Moose Jaw water system. I can assure you that the last paragraph of my report did not recommend another series of studies costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. The NDP government seemed to believe that as long as they were spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on studies, the public would be satisfied.

The questions of Regina-Moose Jaw water supply have been studied and restudied for 75 years. What we need is action, not studies. The past government — what did they think of? Studies.

Two years ago in this House, Mr. Speaker, we were on estimates with the Hon. Mr. Bowerman and I refused to move off estimates until we had some answer, some promise that the government would perform a study on which is the best route to go, a

carbon filter or a pipeline or some such other method. And there was a promise that he would do so.

But I didn't know until March of 1982 that this study did go forth and phase 1 report was tabled. And the same thing, Mr. Speaker, they dealt with 14 different solutions to solve the Regina-Moose Jaw water problem. And all they did was deal 10 of them out of the package and said, 'Let's deal extensively with four more,' leading to phase 2 study which would take them to 1989 with a price tag of approximately \$800,000., implementing the answer by 1990.

Now I am proud to say, very proud to say, that the Premier called me into his office and said, 'I want this ongoing water problem settled once and for all.' He said, 'I'd like you to do a study and have it on my desk in a few months, or as soon as possible. And I want it as thorough as possible and as professional as possible.' Now I'm very proud to say at the end words of my report, I said no more studies. We're not going to spend \$700,000 of this government on another seven years of studies.

I'd just like with your permission, Mr. Speaker, just give a few minutes outline of what I was asked to do in connection with this water report. I'll take you back to 1981, when the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina were requested in writing for assistance to install a carbon filter at the filtration plant. In 1982, June I believe it was of 1982, our government had the same request. In September of that same year 1982, jointly Moose Jaw and Regina changed their request by asking for financial assistance for a pipeline from Diefenbaker Lake to the filtration plant.

I began my studies, Mr. Speaker, and it was very evident on the very few weeks that a pipeline was the only route to go, but it was the financial package that was so expensive. So I knew that I had to get really into the meat of this and find some other method because it was too much money. I contacted professionals right across the country from Vancouver right to the eastern waters, even from the United States of America. We had professionals come in to look at our situation, and after about two months of very extensive studies it became very evident that our problem, Mr. Speaker, was not the taste and odour that plagues our cities of Moose Jaw and Regina each summer; it was a health hazard.

And that's why I had to come out with the statement that I unequivocally recommend that a pipeline would be the answer, the only answer that would fill the terms of reference that the Premier gave me to solve this problem once and for all.

I just thought it would be good, Mr. Speaker, to put on the record some of the highlights of my report that is now sitting. I am proud to say that the cabinet, the government and our government supported my solution and have made an offer to the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina and is not sitting, and depending on them, that they accept our offer or not.

While we're talking the subject of water, it takes me back, Mr. Speaker, to the estimates of the Hon. Paul Schoenhals, when the Leader of the Opposition was questioning him was going on and really giving him a hard time on the stalling of our government of not getting that pipeline built immediately.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should just do a little reminiscing at some of the history of how the NDP handled this. I have a letter in my hand, Mr. Speaker. With your permission I want to read part of it. It was written on August 29, 1972.

I wish to inform the public just how long the past government played around with the people's lives in this province, especially with the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw. The opposition thinks they have friends when the odd leak comes out from our government, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I had friends when they were in power, too. That's how come that I have a letter in my hand signed by Prefontaine; copies to Snyder, Messer, Wood, Cowley, Saddlemeier, and Jack Kinzel. I'm just going to read a few highlights — just a few highlights, Mr. Speaker, so we'll know what this is all about:

To: Allan Blakeney, Premier

From: The Planning and Research Executive Council

The first and most obvious reason is, of course, that in view of overlapping concerns we should avoid duplicating our efforts. Also, the information and conclusions developed through the financial examination should be fully taken into account in the policy analysis — the overall political, social, bureaucratic fabric within which water policy is woven. It is this latter regard that the real challenge exists in terms of bringing about changes in water policy and its implementation.

It looks to me, Mr. Speaker, what they're mostly thinking about here it how to build water into a political crisis. Shame on them, Mr. Speaker.

The attached staff report outlines the great complexity, not to say confusion, concerning who is responsible for water policy implementation in Saskatchewan. This is further documented in the case of Vanscoy in Mr. Snyder's memo.

This situation is made very difficult by the intense political and social concern with water in Saskatchewan, a concern which is historically and culturally deep-rooted and which is quite unique to this province. Over the years this concern and the political and bureaucratic response to it have given rise to a multiplicity of overlapping programs. Some of these, like conservation and development branch of the Department of Agriculture have very strong political ties. Local conservation area authorities and their power of local tax assessment, which will make internal policy and even organizational changes extremely difficult to bring about given strong local relationships and vested interests.

Consequently, it appears to us, that in order to accomplish anything really meaningful in co-ordinating water policy implementation, we will require some kind of political exercise which reaches the local level. This political exercise will, of course, not command much attention as a mere academic presentation. It will have to be rooted in a real live issue which highlights the present lack of co-ordination in a politically meaningful way. It seems that the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board provides the best opportunity currently available to achieve this. There may, of course, be other and better ways of bringing about the same local interest.

In response to your specific question regarding how we propose to structure the study, therefore, I think this will have to depend very much on the political environment including the extent to which we can build upon the public

visibility of the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board investigation report, and the extent to which the report highlights the need for further policy development and co-ordination of programs. I believe that a strictly internal academic study of water policy will achieve very little and will be quickly put to rest by the system.

This is signed by Prefontaine, 'Chief of Planning Office.' Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more comment. It says: 'Refer to the investigation report.' I referred to the investigation report and it happened to be 10 books! I just brought one here tonight, with a few remarks in it that I'm going to make.

The investigation report, Mr. Speaker, says that it's not necessary to build a pipeline in 1982 because we don't need it to win the seats in Regina and Moose Jaw. But before we do so Mr. Speaker, before we do so, we must see that some votes are got in the north-west, like we must build a pipeline at Lloydminster. Because in this book here, Mr. Speaker, are the minutes from cabinet obtained in 1981-82, and there are some very, very interesting letters I'm sure that the public would like to read, of how the government handled and what they about the people in Regina and Moose Jaw.

This came from cabinet. Just one statement here from Mr. Smishek. I think members here will remember Mr. Smishek. He says:

The nature of the problem, unpalatable taste and odour, particularly during the summer months, makes this a popular issue and one that most people will identify with.

Options: Make no commitment to cost-sharing until current studies are complete. This would defer decisions on financial support for at least 12 months, and generate widespread public criticism during the summer of '81, particularly if participation is low.

So they were hoping for bad water to make things worse in here. If thing could get bad enough, and they couldn't drink at all, then they could go back to their letter of 1972 where they had it all put together so very nicely, Mr. Speaker, just so very nicely.

I have 12 letters here, but I'm not going to take time to read them tonight, Mr. Speaker.

Conclusions:

Given these factors, the province will be in a no-win situation unless an early commitment to the principle of financial support is made. This commitment should be open enough to permit a good assessment of the proposed solution and the financing options, but tight enough to indicate substantial provincial support.

We haven't got enough time for me to read all night, Mr. Speaker. I have so many of these books, Mr. Speaker, but the one letter I read tonight is only going to be volume 1, and in the budget speech I'm going to start on volume 2 and volume 3 and volume 4. But I wish to inform the members of the opposition that volume 4 is not on water. It happens to be how you people financed your budget over there — the fact sand the figures and the names, who you fired, and the whole bit.

I like to hold people in suspense, I've been holding this one letter now for five years. I'd like to hold it for just a few more weeks to keep everybody in suspense, Mr. Speaker, but I do have to read this one. This is signed by Mr. Smishek again.

A decision to build a pipeline for Regina-Moose Jaw could provide a strong negative reaction in the north west part of the province, since the government has so far been unwilling to commit financial assistance for a pipeline to serve Lloydminster.

Further in this book, which I'm not going to take time to read tonight, Mr. Speaker, are the facts and the figures why, which I'll be tabling in this House at some further date. We'll leave them in suspense.

We do not have to build a pipeline to win the election in April of 1980.

This was written in the minutes from their cabinet in March of 1982. So what they were saying was, 'We'll get the pipeline to Lloydminster and secure all the seats in the North.' I kind of look around and see some members from the North here, Mr. Speaker. It backfired. You cannot fool around and play with people's lives like you people did. It backfired.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I just have one more comment. I want to welcome the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake into this legislature, and I want to make a few comments about that by-election. I know the people of Saskatchewan will believe me, believe my statement that the Hon. Allan Blakeney's days in politics are over, completely over, because he finished himself in Prince Albert with the statements that he made. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, stated many times during that election bout that people made a mistake on April 26 and it will be proven at the Prince Albert by-election; this by-election will show the people of Saskatchewan that there's been a poor government in the summer of 1982. The Hon. Mr. Blakeney said it on several occasions. But, Mr. Speaker, who's sitting here representing Prince Albert-Duck Lake? I'm very proud to say it's represented by us.

We have some more speakers so, Mr. Speaker, we'll just hold this information till the budget speech. We'll hold you in suspense. We'll be tabling some documents at that time that will make . . . I would give some advice to my MLA. I see my MLA has come into the House — I live in the city of Regina — Mr. Shillington. I will give him some advice, Mr. Speaker, to be very, very careful with his accusations of government because he doesn't know what I hold in these books. Mr. Speaker, it will be a pleasure for me to support the throne speech. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SVEINSON: — Mr. Speaker, members on the government side of the House, members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, loyal and sometimes lonely — loyal and sometimes lonely and occasionally . . . (inaudible) . . . I don't think I should go on. Before I get into the throne speech presented Thursday last I'd like to take us back in history a few months to a few days before the election call to the election of April '82. This House at the time was meeting and you were putting together a package of legislation which was legislating workers in this province back to work. At the same time, many people in this province were faced with interest rates of 18, 19, 20, 21 up to 23.5 per cent, and the government of the day, now represented over in the far corner of the legislature, had not an answer to the people in this province who were suffering the ravages of high interest rates on their mortgages. They got together, with their pride and arrogance and decided, 'It's time to take our package to the electorate in the

province and get the stamp of approval.' Well, the loyal opposition is the only living evidence left and that red, rotten, little apple that was so ably represented, and so ably represented socialism in this province, was falling from the tree the day they called the election. I'll tell you they scrambled around trying to hold it off the ground for 30 days. I'll tell you it was worse than a hot potato. But that red, rotten, little apple could not recover. The evidence is 56 seats on the Conservative side of the House.

Now I realize that some people are wrong some of the time. The opposition, in the last eleven months, has told us in this House that most of the people are wrong all of the time. The last time I was on my feet in the legislature we were going into a by-election in Prince Albert-Duck Lake, and I'm not one to make predictions, but I did at that time suggest that the people in Prince Albert-Duck Lake would elect a Progressive Conservative to this House. I met during the campaign one of your former members who visited this House one day; fortunately he was behind the railing. That was the last time he was acknowledged politically, and may be the last time he'll ever be acknowledged in Saskatchewan. He owned up to me and said, 'Bill, you are going to win this thing by 328 votes.' I think the final count (again it demonstrated your inability as an opposition or as a government to read the people of this province) was we won by approximately 900 votes in a seat that I don't think we had in the '30s. I could be wrong, and I'm sure if I am wrong I'll hear about it tomorrow or possibly late tonight in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: — There was nothing up there but gophers in the '30s. There wasn't any seat.

MR. SVEINSON: — I hear a reverberation from the other side of the House ... (inaudible interjections) ... I might mention a member for the Regina caucus of the NDP just suggested there was nothing in the province but gophers in the '30s. Well, my grandfather was here, and my grandmother was here, and gophers go to work. They were hard workers and they put this province where it is today in spite of the legislation passed by your former government.

What have you done for Saskatchewan? I hear nothing. Well, I think that's probably a little less than fair, but not completely out of line.

We had as a platform during that April election, just going back again, we were going to remove a massive tax burden put on the people of Saskatchewan by the former government in the form of a gasoline tax. As recently, in fact, as last week, your illustrious leader (I'm sorry I can't get my tongue around that word) from Ottawa, Mr. Broadbent, suggested that a \$3 reduction in the Canadian price of oil would reflect at the pumps by about a reduction of 10 cents a gallon of gasoline. That, he said, would fuel the engines of recovery in this country. A 10 cent reduction in the price of gasoline. The reduction we gave the people of Saskatchewan minutes after we, in fact, became the government in this province is close to 40 cents a gallon.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who said that?

MR. SVEINSON: — It was Mr. Broadbent who claims that they will fuel the recovery of this whole country. We have fuelled the recovery of this provincial economy since April 26. We probably have the lowest rate of inflation in Canada, and I think the members on this side of the House should be very proud of that accomplishment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: —The lowest rate of inflation anywhere in the country. And I think the members opposite in opposition should be proud that the new government was able to lower the rate of inflation to that which is the lowest in this country, but I didn't see them move during the last round of applause.

We also have the lowest rate of unemployment — the lowest rate of unemployment in the country, the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada, the only province with a growing number of working people in the country. Now, we are not only an example in Saskatchewan, we have become a pattern for governments across this country, and in fact in every free world society in the world.

The Saskatchewan economy is growing and is healthy. I have never seen a more positive individual on gloom and doom than Allan Blakeney. Positive — he takes such a strong stand for gloom and doom that he believes it himself. I am sure, and he led a government for 11 years and I am sure that after the honeymoon, they began to believe it themselves. They began to believe it themselves — legislated gloom and doom in this province for 11 years.

The first time I was on my feet in this legislature, which wasn't very long ago, I transposed the benefits to my constituency that were in fact derived through the gasoline tax removal and the mortgage interest reduction plan. At that time, those benefits would have accrued to approximately \$5 million annually. I can promise you that in your 11 years, there wasn't a single time in that span that we were even probably given a fraction of what we received from our new government in the first year in power. Now that accrual has in fact dropped simply because rates have dropped. It's one of the few legislative programs that governments can actually participate in which will in fact, Mr. Speaker, with time and low interest rates, no longer be necessary to protect the people of Saskatchewan from the ravages of high interest rates.

Now another program that the people of Saskatchewan were extremely dubious of was the land bank program. Let's collectivize our farming operations in Saskatchewan. Well, we do believe in the individual rights of the citizens in this province, and since becoming government, we have repealed The Land Bank Act, and have given back to the young farmers in this province who want to become involved in ownership, the ability to purchase farmland, to purchase it at a rate that is affordable regarding the return from the commodities they produce.

For the record, I would like to read from the *Globe and Mail*, Friday, March 18, 1982, page 2:

Property Rights Charge Not Dead: McGuigan — The federal government was ready to give property rights constitutional protection in 1981, but dropped the idea because of opposition from the New Democratic Party caucus in parliament and the NDP government, then in power in Saskatchewan.

Our grandfathers (and this was mentioned by the Premier during our election campaign) and our great-grandfathers possibly would have reconsidered Saskatchewan or Canada if in fact, the ads in Europe would have said: 'Land for rent in Saskatchewan, available to anyone who wants to lease.' How many of us would be here today? Not very many. Possibly we'd have an opposition of three and a government of 26 or less.

The right to the ownership of property, of land, of capital, is respected by every Canadian, is respected by every citizen in the province, and I do believe, is respected by every government in this province with the exception of possibly the Trudeau Liberals and the Blakeney NDP.

Individual rights have got to be protected through legislation. If those rights are usurped by governments, it's up to governments to give those rights back to the people. We will work to that end to protect the right of ownership of land, of capital, of property in this province, from the state and state ownership of the same.

Back in 1975, in the election campaign of that year, there wasn't a breath — not a breath — by your government of a potash take-over in Saskatchewan. There wasn't a breath during the campaign that that was even going to be looked at. Within a month, you had financed, you had mortgaged me as a guarantor on your note, and you had proceeded to purchase approximately 50 per cent of an industry that you had nothing to do with building. You didn't add one job to the provincial economy.

We have a proud industry in the potash industry. As a government we are in a position where we're going to protect that industry, and see that the working people in that industry are given the benefit of state ownership as long as we're in that position.

Water is another issue that Mr. Blakeney mentioned in his answer to the throne speech. As a member for Regina North West, water is a very important commodity, and I'll risk a drink right now. In 11 years in government, Allan Blakeney and his cabinet and his caucus did nothing to improve the water supply in Regina. In 11 months, we have initiated a program, through the former speaker (the speaker that was on the floor just prior to me) that will entitle this city and Moose Jaw, if the decision is made, to a pipeline from Lake Diefenbaker to Regina. I support that 110 percent, and I support the plight of the industry at Ipsco, and the plight of the workers in that industry 110 per cent. Believe me, I think that the next time I rise in the House, the solution for this water may be well in hand. And that could possibly be 12 to 15 months after we took power, not 11 years. Nothing was done. There are times of the year when consuming Regina water is a very testy proposition.

My constituents are very concerned. My constituents (if the phone calls that I receive regarding water and the pipeline are an indication) they would like a solution as quickly as possible. Most of them have desired that solution for the last 11 years, and attest to the fact that very little or nothing was done in that area. In fact, it didn't get off the ground to the point where anything was ever concretely laid out that would allow a solution to come forth. During our tenure, during our first sitting, during the first legislature in this province represented by a Progressive Conservative government we will, in fact, initiate a solution to the water problem in Regina. That's a promise to the constituents in northwest Regina, to the residents in Regina, the Moose Jaw area and the corridor that could, in fact, benefit from the better water supply in this area. It concludes approximately one-third of the population of Saskatchewan, and, in fact, is a threat to the health of that one-third, and the sooner we have a solution, the better for the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw and all of the population in this province.

The throne speech went into education in a fairly broad manner. Competitiveness for modern economies and security for individuals is increasingly tied to the efficiency of the educational system. We are going to, as a government, in the next months broaden the availability of education to the people in this province through our universities and also through our trade schools in various areas in Regina. We have announced

expansions of the program into Prince Albert, and I'm sure that the programs involved with training and retraining people in this province to better serve themselves in earning a living are going to be entertained, and will be entertained as long as we are the Government of Saskatchewan.

Housing. I mentioned earlier the mortgage interest reduction plan. It renewed the confidence that the people of Saskatchewan had in the ownership of their own homes. We have since expanded a program that was initially offered by the federal government. We have added an additional \$3,000 to Build-a-Home Saskatchewan program, and from all reports the success of the two programs is beyond the wildest expectations of our government or the federal government. We have, in fact, indications that housing starts to date were probably where they were last year in July and August, indications that that housing sector in 1983 will be extremely healthy. The multiplier effect of the housing industry is approximately 2 to 1 — two jobs are created for every house built. It's one of the most labour-intensive industries in the province, and we are committed as a government to ensuring that that industry is healthy in 1983. That was reiterated in the Speech from the Throne.

I would just like to spend a few moments discussing another area that's extremely important to the people in this province, and that is taxation, mentioned within the budget speech as an area that we have in fact are committed to reduce the tax base in this province. The initial activity, and I am extremely proud of our government, one of the few in history in Canada that has been successful in reducing the tax base of the tax burden by the people in their jurisdiction . . . Through the reduction of the gasoline tax, that was the single largest tax break ever given the people in this province.

We are in fact committed, through administration, through better practice of administering our government, to improving the efficiency of the province, and reducing the tax burden suffered by each and every one of us who are citizens and taxpayers in this province. There are very, very few examples . . . I can't think of a single taxpayer in the 11 years your administration was in power, Mr. Speaker, that there was an actual reduction in the tax burden to the Saskatchewan taxpayer. I'm sure there wasn't.

They hit them a little harder every day, every week, every month until on the 26th of April the final hammer came down. When the ballots were counted the people, 'We do not want a government that is going to further burden us with tax that we cannot afford to pay under the current circumstances.' We did offer that to the people in Saskatchewan, and they accepted it extremely favourably.

Friday last we announced that we were going to freeze the minimum wage in Saskatchewan. The people of this province I'm sure are aware, but if in fact they aren't, I would like, through this Assembly, to let them know that we do, in this province, have the highest minimum wage in Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Higher than Manitoba?

MR. SVEINSON: — It's even higher than Manitoba. So, while we have froze the minimum wage, the people in that wage bracket are probably in a situation where they can better cope with a tougher economy than the people in Manitoba or B.C. or Quebec, where they're taking far less home as the minimum wage than they are in Saskatchewan. There has to be a balance between business on one hand and employees on the other hand where they can work together to be more productive and allow each to be in business and each to be working together. That balance has to come

through the reward for the innovator and the reward for the worker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — It was reported to me at supper time today than on an open-line program in Regina this morning, the feedback supporting the maintenance of the minimum wage at \$4.25 was extremely favourable by callers from all over Saskatchewan. It's working. When the time comes that the economy recovers to the point that the people who are earning a minimum wage can be paid more money, I'm not sure whether we'll have to raise the minimum wage. We will in that case, but the employee will be in a position where he can afford to pay more for the productivity in his officer or his business. That time may have passed for many workers in Saskatchewan already. That time may have passed, but it will come when they will earn more for their productive effort within the business community.

Today they are at least competitive with all other provinces or they surpass all other provinces in that category. We are proud of that, of Saskatchewan. As a government and as residents of this province, we are proud of the fact that we have kept these people in a position where they are competitive with everyone across this country. We do have the competitive edge. We are open for business. We're first class and world class.

I'll tell you this: this is something that the members of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, are unable to understand, I'm certain. They cannot fathom the simple little term of attitude. It takes an attitude on everybody's behalf to create a circumstance or an environment where people are productive, where they get paid for their effort, where the innovator can go out and bring something new into the market-place and sell it. He doesn't do it with an attitude of gloom and doom that was demonstrated by this opposition since we became government, and while this is not the place to give the opposition the lecture on attitude . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — This is the place! This is the place!

MR. SVEINSON: — I seem to have a consensus on this side of the House that this is the place. I'll tell you, right after the election, the coffee shops in Regina were buzzing, the index level of attitude had done up about 400 points. If you want to relate that to something fiscal and solid, we'll relate it to the Dow Jones, just in case one of you know what it is. It rises like this; it falls like this.

During your administration, this province fell like that. Attitude was lost. The people in this province, my family . . . My father's the last to retire; he's leaving at the end of the month, but he'll come back, I'll tell you, if we're allowed to govern this province for long. My brothers and sisters were forced out of here 10 years ago. That's attitude.

You can't put attitude into a socialist package and take it out and sell it on the basis of state ownership, because people want to participate. They want to participate with their own ownership of land, capital material or whatever it is. I can promise you that we as a government will continue to make that commitment to the people in this province and elsewhere in Canada.

We have been around the world and across this country preaching Open for Business. That's an attitude. It's nothing more than an attitude. I am disappointed and sick and tired of hearing an opposition run it into the ground. It's about time we head something

positive other than doom and gloom from across the floor . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I can see that some of the members opposite have taken this very seriously. I know, Mr. Speaker, that I can expect in the next couple of days one of those of members across the House, possibly one of them who has aspirations as a leader and needs some attitude within his own organization, to rise with some conscience and say to the people in this House and this province that we want a government in the future led by the NDP with a positive attitude to the people of Saskatchewan. They may slip out of the eight people they've got, and they may graduate to 10 or 11, if they really go for it. Don't think that that is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, because the attitude cannot come from that side of the House. It's not a philosophy that contributes to positive attitudes. It's a selectively oppressive attitude if it contributes to state control of everything in our whole life. That's why the people of Saskatchewan presently are faced with the limited edition — the NDP opposition.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to review several of the points that we have covered in answering a document — a very positive document — tabled in this legislature Thursday last by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. I would like to just review a few of the points that we have covered. He mentioned that the ravages of inflation are common throughout the country, throughout the world. He mentioned, as well, they're less common in Saskatchewan than they are in any other province in this country. Inflation in this province is lower than any other province in Canada. I think we can be proud of that as a government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — He covers the Saskatchewan economy. Again, not only is inflation lower than it is anywhere else in the country, some of the leading indicators are ahead of the other provinces in Canada, and in fact, in North America. Housing, Mr. Speaker, is a leading indicator of productive growth in any economy. We have the most positive housing program presently available in Canada, right here in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — Tax policy — again, coming back to attitude. I know it's something you folks on the opposition side of the House understand very little. Mr. Speaker, I'll say tax policy does improve attitude. If I've got more dollars to spend, I've got a better attitude. It's simple as that. And we returned to the people of Saskatchewan in the first year in government \$129 million in taxation that was collected on gasoline.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — And that does contribute to a positive attitude. I can attest to that, Mr. Speaker.

Also on tax policy, as outlined in the throne speech, we are committed as a government to efficiency to lower taxes suffered by the people in this province. Taxes give the government power. We're going to usurp some of that power and give it back to the people in spendable income.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — Intergovernmental relations. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to let the opposition cover that themselves.

Economic development. We in this province, and as a government, have been espousing the open-for-business philosophy since we got elected. As I mentioned earlier, being open for business is nothing more than an attitude.

I see the members opposite knocking on their heads over that one, Mr. Speaker. But I'll tell you the attitude of the businessmen in Kuroki or a businessman in Torquay or Carrot River or Meadow Lake or even Edmonton or Vancouver or wherever else is deciding that his capital may rest best in Saskatchewan, putting people in this province to work and making him a little paltry profit that he can spend to expand his business and keep things going.

Now, I realize that's very difficult for an opposition to understand whose whole philosophy is state ownership and ownership by the crown corporations and ownership by themselves of our industries and our ability to produce in this province. I think we're sick and tired of that as a government and we're committed to our policy of being open for business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — Even though the Leader of the Opposition, or maybe it was the member for Regina Centre, stood up in question period one day, Mr. Speaker, requesting that we promise we will never have another Open for business conference. I think we may rename it: open for an improved attitude in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — And I noticed at the Open for Business conference that we had businessmen from all over this province, all over this country and we had some from foreign places, and I didn't notice one single member of opposition in attendance at that conference, not one.

Mr. Speaker, they have subsequently become experts, on open for what? I think we deserve an apology from the member for Regina Centre. If he would like to rise and apologize now, I'll forfeit my place on the floor . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I can see that they don't understand the situation, Mr. Speaker. So I'd better maybe go on to something else a little simpler, like crown corporations. They understand that. They spent 10 millions of dollars before the last election telling our families, who had the most . . . (inaudible) . . . of interest rates over their heads, that their crown corporations were the most comfortable place in the province. They probably were, and they probably still are.

As the chairman of the legislative committee on crown corporations, in my first session in this House, I must admit I've been somewhat appalled at some of the things that have come . . . Appalled or shocked — are they about the same, Mr. Speaker? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Some of the things that have come out in that committee . . . They are not things that came out as a result of management of the crown corporations. They are things that have come out as a result of direction from the former ministers who were in charge of

those crown corporations. They were told what to do; they had no control over their own management.

I think the people of Saskatchewan deserve something more than that. The people in our crown corporations are very able and a very concerned and hard-working group, and I think some of the decision making that was made on their behalf should be allowed to be made by themselves and their board. The decisions would be to make a more comfortable place through our crown corporations for us as citizens in the province, rather than a more comfortable place for the minister and his aides in the buildings involved, and some of them are very . . . We had a write-up recently in *The Leader-Post* of one such crown corporation's facilities for the minister and his friends.

I think as a government we are also committed to allowing these crown corporations a little freer rein on determining what they think as prudent, rather than what the politician demands as prudent of his crown corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — There's so much more I could say.

Small businesses were covered briefly in our throne speech. Personally I don't think we've gone far enough. Small businesses, farms, businesses and communities and cities across this country are the mainstay of our society, are the future of our graduate and our undergraduates, if they don't graduate. I believe that we have gone out on a limb as a government with extra moneys, with extra effort, for some people in our small-business community. I think we've got to have a more critical look at others so that the cash flow problems they are presently suffering can be more easily solved.

I can see, Mr. Speaker, that members of the opposition are a little confused and I can understand that, because there wasn't any solution during their era for small businesses. Their numbers diminished geometrically, not arithmetically. They went down geometrically in this province. We're going to see that these people can live and operate proudly in their businesses and support their families adequately in Saskatchewan through, if necessary . . . (inaudible) . . . placed in legislation by our government.

In the throne speech, it mentioned bonding practices on small projects. A new policy for simplifying these bonding practices will be implemented. Red tape is a problem that all businesses suffer, whether they be big or small. Large businesses can cover the costs much more easily. I read once where the figure was 10 to 1 — small business versus multinationals — to cover the cost of government red tape. Unfortunately, the small businesses suffered, but fortunately we are now the government and we're going to solve some of these problems for the small businessman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — Agriculture was another area that we've done a lot of work in and understandably so. Again, it was neglected by the former government to the point that it was an embarrassment to come into some of the situations that we have in fact encountered. We have, in agriculture, created a climate where the small farmer, or the farmer whose land is passing from generation to generation, now has a vehicle where financing is a realistic possibility. Before the election, at 18 or 19 per cent with the falling price of wheat or a steady price of the commodity they were growing, it wasn't

even realistic to consider the possibility of going out on the limb and borrowing money for a young farmer who couldn't afford to get into the business without borrowed capital. There were no solutions on the horizon.

The first volley fired during the election campaign was a few feathers off the Crow. And those feather landed softly. I don't know if you have ever watched a feather come to earth, but that's how quickly that volley came to earth in that campaign. It wasn't long after that they went from farmers to teeth, and that little apple we talked about earlier had already hit the ground. And, yes, one of the members mentioned hair care. There was even talk of that.

But agriculture . . . I think the future bodes well because of practices we have already legislated and practices which we are considering as necessary for the agricultural community.

On energy and natural resources, I think we all know the results of some of the changes that have happened, Mr. Speaker, since the election. We have in fact regenerated the activity in the oil fields in Saskatchewan through changes in the royalty structure on Saskatchewan crude.

We have also, very quietly it seems, restructured the legislation regarding mining activity in Saskatchewan. Suddenly the government is no longer just an equal partner in any project that is initiated in the mining industry in this province. Legislation of the former government put on the books to prevent the innovative entrepreneur from coming into Saskatchewan and producing the commodities that are produced in the mining industry without a full partner, the government — that was removed and I don't believe we spent enough time advertising that change. The mining industry in the last five or six months has been very active. The markets have been very strong, and I think if we go out and find the entrepreneurial types that are willing to explore and find the minerals in this province, and advertise the fact that we are no longer as a government demand that we be an equal partner, I think we'll see the flow into this province through exploration in minerals and development of the mining industry once again.

I can't blame the mining industry for being a little bit sceptical about coming into Saskatchewan. After the 1975 election, the former government proceeded without any announcement, without any indication during the campaign just finished, proceeded to take over half an industry. I can't blame the mining industry for saying, well, maybe Saskatchewan isn't the best place to look for gold, or copper, or lead, or zinc, or potash.

I'm just saying that the atmosphere now has improved to the point where in the next few years, I believe, we can expect activity in the industry to generate itself on the basis that these people can get a return, if, in fact, their dollars result in the discovery of minerals in Saskatchewan.

I'm going to just take another drink of the water you fellows left to us. You know, it's not bad when you're thirsty.

That particular industry, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, could be the backbone of the generation of future growth and development in Saskatchewan to a degree that we have never seen in this province. The mineralization to a degree that we have never seen in this province. The mineralization in the North . . . it's well known that there are mining opportunities in northern Saskatchewan second to none in this country. Recently in areas in Canada . . . (inaudible) . . . in Ontario where gold

mineralization was known about in the 1930s, they have created an industry that can employ thousands of people, thousands of people. The fact is that the technology and the innovators are a little wiser and a little more polished. They can seek out these mineralizations a lot easier. Saskatchewan, I can tell you, is the location in Canada that deserves a lot of further exploration in mineral development. This government is behind that mineral development 100 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — There was a mine in northern Saskatchewan where the innovator recently — 1971 is fairly recent — actually cemented the shafting just because he got the shaft from the former government.

I'll continue on. I think at this time it may be appropriate to close. I would like to say at this time that the member, Mr. Sid Dutchak, for Prince Albert-Duck Lake is a credit to this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SVEINSON: — He came up — I suppose David and Goliath come to mind, especially to the mind of the Leader of the Opposition — Sid came through and knocked him off by approximately 900 votes and ably deserved the victory.

I would like to say that I am in favour of the motion and I am against the amendment.

I'd like to thank the House for their patience during this presentation. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. DIRKS: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Regina North West for stirring and most inspirational speech full of political and economic common sense the likes of which we have not seen in this Assembly for a long, long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. DIRKS: — He engaged in flights of oratorical excellence that I am sure the members opposite will not be able to duplicate either. I think the only appropriate response that we could make to such a speech would be for all of us to silently leave this Chamber and to reflect upon that which the member has spoken to us.

For that reason, I beg leave to adjourn debate, Mr. Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could revert back to Introduction of Bills. We moved to Orders of the Day at a time when radio was on air. I would like to give notice to introduce five bills.

Number one, I would give notice that I shall, on Wednesday, March 23, 1983, move

March 21, 1983

first reading of a bill to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act.

I give notice that I shall, on Wednesday, March 23, 1983, move first reading of a bill to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

I give notice that I shall, on Wednesday, March 23, 1983, move first reading of a bill to amend The Public Works Act.

I give notice that I shall, on Wednesday, March 23, 1983, move first reading of a bill to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act.

I give notice that I shall, on Wednesday, March 23, 1983, move first reading of a bill to amend The Education Act.

I would move the House do now adjourn.

The House adjourned at 9:59 p.m.