

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 25, 1983**

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you today, and through you to the other members of the Assembly, a group of 22 grade 11 and 12 students seated in the west gallery from the community of Goodsoil. Mr. Speaker, we have . . . as all of us know, we have a good number of students that come to watch the proceedings of the legislature over the course of any session. We very seldom get a group of students who come as far as 400 miles as these students have done. I think their principal, Mr. Purves, who is here today — Mr. and Mrs. Purves — and Mr. and Mrs. Johnsrube, and their bus driver Mr. Hetlinger, are to be commended, as well as the community and the school of Goodsoil to be commended, for the dedication they show in order to, to have this event happen. They come in alternate years, every second year, and I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming them here and wishing them an enjoyable and an educational day here in Regina.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you today, the future leaders of our province and Canada. We have in the Speaker's gallery a group of grade 7 students, their teacher, bus driver, from Swift Current. Well, we can't boast 400 miles, only 155. We do boast an excellent educational system. I will trust today that they are going to find this Assembly educational, to say the least, and I will look forward to meeting with you after question period. I would ask that these members warmly welcome these children today.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Domotor:** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through this Assembly, a group of 28 students, grade 8 students, from the Bruno High School, accompanied with their teachers and chaperone, Linda Billow and Lisette Dettileux, and bus driver Lloyd Willison. I'm especially pleased to introduce, through you, to this Assembly, since I also taught in Bruno in 1963 and '64. So, I have a soft spot for that area. I trust that they will find their tour interesting and informative, and I'll be meeting with them at 11 o'clock. I'd like to welcome them to the Assembly.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Maxwell:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of some 22 high school students from the town of Leoville in my constituency of Turtleford. Although our students probably didn't travel quite as far as those of the Minister of Tourism, they did brave the elements for some 300 miles, which just proves how tough, strong, resourceful we are up there in the Jewel of the North, as we are known around the rest of Saskatchewan.

It is a pleasure to welcome them. The students are accompanied by Roy Goertzen, who we know as Tiny, for obvious reasons, Mr. Speaker, if you cast your eyes to the east gallery, Sally Sudur, Monica Goole and Mr. Lafond. I look forward to meeting with you shortly after the question period this morning. I hope you have an informative and a very pleasant stay. And I know everyone here wishes you a safe, safe trip back to the Jewel of the North. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you, a group of 21 from Sonningdale High School, seated in the gallery behind me. They are accompanied by their teacher, Art Klassen, and Mrs. Sturhan. I'd like us all to give them a warm welcome here today, and I wish you a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Sale of Drag-line by SPC

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Labour and the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation recently negotiated, or is it in the process of negotiating, a sale of a drag-line, for a substantial sum of money, and if so, would the minister outline in general terms what are the price and terms of the sale?

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. leader's question is yes, we are looking at some financing for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. It's not new. Your administration did the same thing with a drag, or with a drag-line, in the past. It is being sold to Manalta Coal for \$45 million. It cost us \$33 million to buy. And we are getting a good rate for it, and after 20 years their drag-line will be ours again for \$1.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, a supplementary. Is the sale of the drag-line in association with any transfer of any rights of any kind through coal leases or coal title?

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Mr. Speaker, the deal is extending the contract which Manalta Coal did have for the mining of the coal. There was about a seven-year term left in the contract and we have added 20 years to it, so it's a 27-year contract for the coal contract.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, would you advise the House whether or not SPC or any other agency of the Government of Saskatchewan, of which you are aware, has undertaken to guarantee \$45 million, or thereabouts, of securities of Manalta, which will be offered to the public?

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — I'm not too sure on that, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon? We have entered into the contract with Manalta. We will guarantee that the price of the drag-line will be covered. But with the increase, or with the money coming to Sask Power, we are going to save \$500,000 a year in the mining

of the coal.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. Would the minister advise whether or not SPC is guaranteeing any obligations of Manalta and, if so, whether any guarantee fee is being paid to SPC?

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — I'll have to take note of the question and advise you tomorrow or on Monday.

### SGI Rates

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. By the way, Mr. Minister . . . By the way, Mr. Minister, I might inform you that the increase in the deductible is 43 per cent. My question, however, has to do with the application filed before the public utilities review commission which discloses precisely what the deductible is all about. It is an attempt to shift the cost . . . It is an attempt to save SGI money and shift the cost of those savings to the consumer. In your application it's revealed that it will cost the consumer an additional 3.3 million in the last six months of this year, 7.1 million in '84, 8.5 million in '85 and 10.3 million in '86.

Will you now . . . My question, Mr. Minister, is: will you now have the decency to admit that the increased deductible is nothing more than a back-door rate increase introduced so you could pretend that the rate increase was not above 6.7 per cent?

**Hon. Mr. Rousseau:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I have no intentions of admitting something as silly and as ridiculous as that.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure what correspondence school the hon. member received his law degree from, but I would . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . He has in front of him the application to public utilities review commission.

I'd like to outline in very plain, simple English, which I took the pain to write out, and I used a kindergarten pencil to do it with so that he would understand what we are doing, I'll outline it and I would hope that he would get the message, and I would hope he will understand what's going on. I'll read it out, then I will send him a copy. He'll have it in front of him, and I hope he will understand what is going on with our application.

Mr. Speaker, SGI has applied for a rate increase. SGI's applying for an average 6.7 per cent increase. Two, part of the package presented to public utilities review commission is an increase in the deductible from \$350 to \$500. Three, the public utilities review commission, by its legislative mandate, will review the whole package and decide on whether or not a 6.7 per cent rate increase is appropriate. Four, apparently the public utilities review commission believes that they can have some control over the package of insurance that SGI offers. On the basis of this belief the courts are being asked to give a ruling on what control public utilities review commission can exercise over the deductible increase. And, five, SGI has legal advice that the public utilities review commission has authority to control the rates of the automobile accident insurance coverage offered by SGI. The corporation also has advice that cabinet controls the content of the insurance package.

Mr. Speaker, I would send that over to him so that he'd maybe understand it in plain English.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister, arising out of the comment which was just made. I gather the minister is not, is now telling the House that there is an application before a court to determine the validity of the deductible. If the minister is admitting that, then it is a fair assumption that the minister is admitting there is some doubt about the legality of that increase to the deductible without getting it approved by PURC. With that admission, will you now agree to postpone that increased deductible until after you have the decision of a court as to whether or not it is valid?

**Hon. Mr. Rousseau:** — No, I said . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, I sent over to the hon. member the information. I hope you'll take the pain and the time to read what it says . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — And weigh it.

**Hon. Mr. Rousseau:** — . . . and weigh it, perhaps even weigh it, yes. No, we said we would, we would introduce the deductible in July. We have asked for legal advice and for appeals to the court and you can look it over, read it over. You'll see what's on the sheet that I've just sent to you. As a matter of fact, I would even go so far as, at this point, recommend to the hon. members that any further questions respecting the application be directed to the commission. That's what they're there for.

In 11 years of your government, you didn't bother establishing a public utilities review commission. When we were in the opposition, Mr. Speaker, we promised that we would have . . . and introduce a public utilities review commission, and we have done that. As a government, we have done that. The opposition today seems to want to take the credit for having a public utilities review commission. It was our suggestion while we were in opposition. We put it in, we put it in when we became the government, and they have access to the commission to appeal, to intervene, to offer suggestions, to discuss it with them, to ask all the question in the world, Mr. Speaker. He's got the book. He can study it. He can put it in plain English to . . . When he is prepared to take it to, his intervention, to the public utilities review commission.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question. I recognize, I would recognize anywhere Don Black's printing. It's apparent he's had to put it in this form so the minister will understand it. But I appreciate, Mr. Minister, your sharing your briefing notes with me. That's very generous of you.

My question, however, Mr. Speaker, relates to the public utilities review commission, which is not an agency which will ever go before the crown corporations, I may add. Who has made the reference to . . . Who has referred the question of, of the legality of the deductible to a court? Who has made that reference? Is it the Attorney General, or is it the Ombudsman? Or is it the chairman of the board, rather?

**Hon. Mr. Rousseau:** — Well, my understanding at this point that we take — we're considering it as a matter of fact — taking it to the court of appeal, and . . . But I'll take notice of your question because I'm not just too sure where it stands at this point . . . (inaudible) . . . commission is.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, let me go on to a different aspect of the . . . Let me ask the

question, let me . . . A new question, then Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General . . . It is the Attorney General who would refer the matter to a court of law. Is the Attorney General considering referring the legality of the deductible to a court of record, and if he is, when do you expect the decision to be made on this reference?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — We have received no request from the public utilities review commission for a reference. I would just like to add to the hon. member, though, that I think in the interests of the public, and the position of the members opposite on the SGI and the rate increases, if the NDP opposition wouldn't consider making an appearance before the public . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'm attempting to communicate a message to the opposition. I would hope that the opposition, Mr. Speaker, would intervene before the public utilities review commission, that it would make its position known to the public utilities review commission. I would hope that the New Democratic Party would make its position known to the public of Saskatchewan where it stands on the rate increase, where it stands on the question of the deductible (if it has a difference of opinion), that, thirdly, that where it stands on the losses that SGI has, and perhaps be questioned in an independent public forum as to what responsibility it bears for the tremendous losses that SGI has.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of SGI. He has given to us a written statement, and I will quote part of it:

Apparently the public utilities review commission believes that they can have some control over the pack of . . . package of insurance that SGI offers. On the basis of this belief the courts are being asked to give a ruling on what control PURC can exercise over the deductible increase.

Now that is your statement, Mr. Minister. The simple question I ask is: who is doing the asking?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I respond on the, on the, the obvious legal matter to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. The advice that we have is that the public utilities review commission is getting its own legal opinion as to the position. We have been not advised as to their formal legal position and I believe it has not been made clear. If they have a legal opinion, it may well agree with the, with the government's position. Should their legal opinion, however, differ, we will have to consider the situation at that time whether a reference is the proper course of action and, and we are not ruling it out nor are we committing to it at this time. We, we'll await for the public utilities review commission, what formal legal position they're taking. It may cause the government to reconsider its position. We're open on it. We think that we're taking a . . . We have legal advice as to our position.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm, I'm perhaps having difficulty getting my, my point across. My point quite simply is, is that the public utilities review commission, Mr. Speaker, is to the best of my knowledge obtaining legal advice. The legal advice may well come down on the side of the government. It may well not. We will determine a course of action when we get further advice. And that's that simple, from the public utilities review commission.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. You are now telling us that you are going to determine your course of action later. So I'm not therefore directing a question to you. I'm directing a question to the minister in charge of SGI who has told this House, and in writing, that the courts are being asked to give a ruling. Now the minister of . . . The Attorney General has made clear that it's not being asked by PURC because he doesn't know what PURC is doing. I am asking the minister. You just told us, and in writing, the courts are being asked to give a ruling. Would you please tell us who is asking the courts to give the ruling?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Again . . . Well, except that, you know, I'm frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm very surprised that, that I've been in office. I've been in office for approximately 11 months and my understanding that the Attorney General of the province of Saskatchewan is the chief, chief legal officer, law officer of the, of the government and there's been no change in the legislation to the best of my knowledge. And I'm surprised that members opposite do not understand that. I've made it quite clear what our position is. I've made it quite clear that, that it may well be that the legal opinion that the public utilities review commission received reinforces the government's position. And I think that it's highly speculative of the member's opposite to prejudge, prejudge, the, the position of the public utilities review commission. It may well be that they ask one of the lawyers opposite, Mr. Speaker, and get a totally wrong legal opinion that nobody has any confidence in. I doubt very much that that would happen. I would doubt very much that that would happen, Mr. Speaker. But the legal position is clear.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. I think the hon. minister is going far beyond the needs of answering the question, and, I would ask him: stay on the subject.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask a new question to the minister in charge of SGI. From the comments of the Attorney General, I hope he is not saying that no government agency in Saskatchewan can make any application to the courts, except the Attorney General. I don't think he said that, therefore I am taking the minister in charge of SGI at his word. He is saying . . . And, word in writing so I didn't misunderstand him. 'The courts are being asked to give a ruling,' now, that is what he said. And, I think it is a fair question simply to ask him: is that true? Are the courts being asked to give a ruling (it's in the present tense not the future), and, if so, who is doing the asking? I simply ask the minister to clarify his statement.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I ask the Leader of the Opposition to listen very, very carefully. I think it fair to say, and I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition will agree, that in fact the position of the government will be a policy position; it was a policy position regarding our interpretation of rates and deductible. And, I'm sure that is a policy; we also have a legal basis for our opinion. It's a government policy position whether, if there is a further disagreement with the public utilities review commission, of whether we intend to have a reference, let the courts decide. It may well be that the interpretation is reasonably close; it may be in agreement. And, I suggest to you, quite simply, that it's far too soon to make a decision whether a reference is the best way to go. And, I've simply said it, and I've said it three times now, that should the public utilities review commission choose, in its wisdom, to communicate to us that they have a fundamental difference, a legal opinion that is different, that the matter should be resolved, we are prepared to consider it at that time.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask a question to the Attorney General. I understood the Attorney . . . I understood the Attorney General's answer to say it is far too soon to decide whether a reference should be made. And, I think that's a fair summation of what he said. If that be so, then, would the Attorney General agree that the statement, on the basis of this belief the courts are being asked to give a ruling, is a false statement? Would he agree with that?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — The statement may, in fact, not reflect accurately the existing position, but I think it . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I think it, I think it fair to say as well that the, the public position that has been out, that has been perhaps misinterpreted by some of the press articles I've seen — that it was automatically going to the court. My understanding is that the public utilities review commission indicated that it was getting a legal position, that a possible course of action was, was a reference, as opposed to a definite course of action because I would wonder how, how the public utilities review commission, for example, could make a direct reference to, to the public utilities review commission, for example, could make a direct reference to, to the court of appeal. And I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition agrees with that.

But certainly the possibility — and I'm sure that's what is intended — is, is there. And I've indicated that it is a possibility, but it's far too soon to make a, make a decision.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — A very short supplementary, Mr. Minister. In the light of the Attorney General's remarks, may we now take it — and I perhaps direct this to the Premier — may we now take it that statements by ministers as to what is now happening — 'something is now being done' — shall be interpreted in the light of meaning that that is not being done, but rather it may be done in the future, perhaps, on the light of future advice?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — No.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, by way of background, let me remind the minister (and I may spare him the pain), but I might remind the minister of how often he has misinformed the House on this subject. My question to the minister is: will you undertake to inform yourself of the facts before you enter this Assembly, so that we may have something, some information that we may rely on? Will you take to inform yourself in the future before you come to the Assembly?

**Hon. Mr. Rousseau:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that what we have in the SGI, the AAIA (Automobile Accident Insurance Act) situation . . . There was a mess that had been taken over by our party that they created over the period of 11 years. It's a mess. It's a mess that has been . . . that they didn't understand. They didn't understand it when they had it; they didn't understand it when they tried to operate it. They were, they created some losses amounting into the tens of millions of dollars. We have made application for some rate increases to, to alleviate some of those problems, to correct some of those situations. We have made application at public utilities review commission for a 6.7 per cent increase. I've reiterated that. And I challenge, I challenge the members opposite, I challenge the members opposite to, to, to intervene with the public utilities review commission, to make their presentation. They could go, all eight of them, and do it one at a time. They can take all the time in the world; they can study what they have in their hands; they can use the courts; they can use whatever vehicle they can like. They could get it settled on which . . . to their satisfaction.

### **Lay-offs at Prince Albert Pulp Company**

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the minister in charge of the crown investments corporation.

Approximately three weeks ago, Mr. Minister, you announce that . . . Approximately three weeks ago you announce that there would be hundreds of job lay-offs at Prince Albert Pulp Company. And also at that time you indicated to this House that there would be multi employees at Woodland Enterprises also being laid off starting, I believe, in May. By the way of information, Mr. Speaker, the minister also indicated that the 90, the 90 employees of Woodland Enterprises would be offered jobs, summer jobs, planting trees — jobs, jobs, Mr. Speaker, that are ordinarily taken for summer jobs by students.

My question to the minister is: since the American demand for wood products has improved greatly and since your government claims that the demand for lumber for the housing industry, that you claim is booming in Saskatchewan . . . Will the minister reconsider the massive lay-offs which will have a severe impact on summer employment for students in the province of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Rousseau:** — I won't repeat that.

**An Hon. Member:** — Sure, go ahead.

**Hon. Mr. Rousseau:** — Well, I have just been informed that the pulp — and you should know this — that pulp has nothing to do with the lumber industry. However, I will take notice of your question.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Reorganization of Government Departments

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, it . . . I want to take this opportunity to make a series of small, and not so small, announcements.

I am happy today to announce a major reorganization of government departments and agencies, to be implemented starting April 1st. The reorganization results from an extensive review of government operations, which began last summer, and involves creation of new departments and realignment of certain functions between existing departments. It is designed to meet three key objectives: one, to improve government productivity, overall effectiveness, efficiency and economy by co-ordinating similar programs; two, to consolidate related functions under single departments, to ensure greater accountability; three, to improve public access to government by simplifying communication and reducing confusion.

There will be a new department of advanced education and manpower which will, in additions to its general responsibilities for adult education, provide the vehicle for meeting Saskatchewan's projected long-term need for skilled labour. It will also be responsible for any new employment initiatives, such as student employment.

The department will consist of the old Department of Continuing Education, together with the apprenticeship, training and manpower planning functions of the Department of Labour and the employment opportunities program of the Department of Industry and Commerce.

A new department of small business and tourism will be formed by consolidating the



small business programs of industry and commerce, and the tourism programs of tourism and renewable resources.

The mandate of the new department will be to serve and develop small business, including the private sector tourism industry, recognizing the importance that industry has to the provincial economy. The remainder of the Department of Industry and Commerce will become the new department of economic development and trade. It will concentrate on expansion and diversification of Saskatchewan's private sector through opening up new export markets and promotion of new products and investment opportunities within the province.

There will be a new department of parks and renewable resources, amalgamating the renewable resources component of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources with the historic parks division of the Department of Culture and Recreation. This will ensure better co-ordination with respect to marketing, promoting and administering all aspects of park and resource programming in the province.

A new department of revenue and financial services will be established by combining the Comptroller's Office of the Department of Finance with the revenue division of the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services. The new department will also have responsibility for the public employees' benefit agency.

There will be a new department of supply and services, consisting of supply and services component of revenue, supply and services, and the old Department of Government Services. This will allow for a single contact agency for private sector firms wishing to provide supplies and services to the government.

The Department of Rural Affairs will be strengthened and renamed the department of rural development. The Department of the Attorney General will become the new department of justice. It will be expanded to include adult corrections from the Department of Social Services. This will allow integration of all aspects of the justice system to strengthening planning, to strengthen planning, pardon me, co-ordination and evaluation. The juvenile corrections program will continue to be the responsibility of the Department of Social Services.

In other changes, there will be a realignment of the various activities of the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs. The constitutional affairs branch will be incorporated into the new department of justice. The communications branch will become part of the Department of telephones. The Indian and native affairs branch will become a separate secretariat, responsible for developing and monitoring Indian and native policy. The remainder of the department, including intergovernmental co-ordination, the protocol office, the Ottawa office, the office of the agent general in London, England, will become part of the Department of Executive Council.

The Department of Health will be expanded and strengthened. The continuing care division of the Department of Social Services, which includes level 2, 3 and 4 nursing homes and the home care program, will be transferred to the Department of Health. This will ensure the responsibility and management of health care rests with one department, in order to ensure consistent planning and delivery of services.

The responsibility for the role of women in the public service will be transferred from the Department of Labour to the public service commission, and amalgamated with

other internal government affirmative action programs.

Responsibility for employment issues will rest with the department of advanced education and manpower.

The Transportation Agency of Saskatchewan, now with the Department of Agriculture, and the highway traffic board, will be consolidated under the Department of Highways and Transportation to form a single agency responsible for all aspects of the transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, legislation concerning the reorganization will be presented to the legislature in the near future.

With respect to portfolios, the following are the ministers who will be assuming responsibilities for the new departments. The Hon. Gordon Currie, who currently has continuing education, will have the new department of advanced education and manpower. The Hon. George McLeod, tourism and renewable resources, will have the department of small business and tourism. The Hon. Paul Rousseau, who is now Minister of Industry and Commerce, will have the new department of economic development and trade. The Hon. Neal Hardy, who is now Minister of Environment, will now have the responsibility for parks and renewable resources. The Hon. Joan Duncan, departments of supply and services, revenue and financial services. The Hon. Bob Pickering, who is now the Minister of Rural Affairs, will be the minister of rural development. And the Hon. Gary Lane, the Attorney General, will be the new minister of justice. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the material provided by the Premier, and I thank him for providing me with a copy of the statement as he stood up to read it. I would first comment, make the obvious comment, that reorganizations of government do not in themselves create any benefits or detriments. It depends upon how the reorganization works and the, the proof as one might say, is, is in the pudding and we will see how the reorganization works. Certainly, governments must continually be reorganized, since governments are continually changing their emphasis if they are responding to the needs of the public, who, increasingly, change their emphasis on what they expect their government to do for them.

I think there are some interesting aspects of this reorganization, particularly with respect to the, the, the priorities which it discloses for the government, and the interesting base it lays for some comments which are undoubtedly going to be made in the future about what the government is doing. We will see a fairly major move of, of functions from the Department of, of Social Services to the Department of Health. I frankly do not agree with much of that. I believe that the problems of, of level 2 in nursing homes and home care are more social problems than they are health problems, and are dealt with better by a department which is oriented to the, to the social problems rather than the purely technical health problems of the citizenry. But that is admittedly a judgment call.

What we are undoubtedly going to see is claims of greatly increased spending on health, and there's no doubt that one can move functions from the Department of, of Social Services to health, do nothing different than you ever did, and claim you are

spending a great deal less, a great deal less on welfare and more on health.

I expect we'll see the same with respect to corrections, and I do not agree with that, that particular transfer as well. The people who are in Saskatchewan correctional institutions are almost overwhelmingly short-term sentence people, who are minor offenders. The average sentence is 59 days. These are minor offenders, and the question is whether or not they are best dealt with by the justice system, which is oriented to guilt or innocence, and all that flows therefrom, or a social services system which is oriented to rehabilitating lives. And my own view is that they are best dealt with by social services. Again, a judgment call.

With respect to the amalgamation of the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services with government services, again — obviously a judgment call. We found that we were able to . . . We essentially sought different kinds of staff between those who were organizing the building programs of the government and had expertise in construction projects, and those who were attempting to buy through and provide services through the purchasing agency and the, and the office services office and the like. We, we found we were looking for different kinds of people, but I am not to say that they cannot be combined in one department. We found it more effective to do otherwise.

There is no doubt that there is a serious undercutting of the emphasis on affirmative action for women in this reorganization. You will note now that there is a strong affirmative action for women component in the Department of Labour. It is being stripped off, and divided, divided between the public service commission and I would gather the new department of advanced education and manpower, and I do not think that that will be nearly as effective, nor I think will women's groups feel it will be nearly as effective as a group, an advocacy group in the Department of Labour; and I have, we have been pleased that the minister has not dismantled that up to now.

One further comment before I take my seat. The combining of the transportation agency, the highway traffic board, and the Department of Highways into one department indicates a change in emphasis by the government. Not particularly the highway traffic board which could be a part of the Department of Highways at any time, except that it is an administered tribunal which performs quasi-judicial functions, and accordingly must be at least that one step away from, from any line department. But the point I really make is that the transportation agency was an agency whose virtual sole function was to deal with the issue of the Crow rate, rail handling and transportation, and it was there because the previous government put a very high priority on having an agency whose sole sole function was to protect farmers against adverse changes in the rail handling and transportation system. I cannot believe that to amalgamate that with the Department of Highways, where the senior staff will have many other obligations dealing with the construction of roads and bridges and the like, I cannot believe that that will result in anything but a substantial downgrading of the emphasis of this government on protecting farmers against adverse changes in the grain handling system.

It was over with the Department of Agriculture before, under the Minister of Agriculture, and that's where I think it still should be, if farmers are to be protected against the ravages that would beset them if there was a major change in the grain handling and transportation system, such as is now being proposed by the Hon. Mr. Pepin.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

#### 100th Anniversary of Transfer of Seat of Government

**Mr. Speaker:** — Under orders of the day I'd like to make just a brief statement this morning. I would like to inform members of the Assembly that this Sunday, March 27th, 1983, marks the 100th anniversary of the transfer of the seat of government of the Northwest Territories from Battleford to Regina. A comment of the day in the *Manitoba Free Press* described the site of Regina as 'in the midst of a vast plain of inferior soil, with about enough water in the miserable little creek to wash a sheep. The place has not a single natural advantage to commend.'

Hon. members will know that the debate over the choice of Regina as the seat of government did not end in 1883. The new capital was located on Dewdney Avenue, and the first Saskatchewan legislature met there in the former territorial government building from 1906 until 1912, when members first met in the Legislative Building where we meet today.

### 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 the Hon. Mr. Blakeney.

**Mr. Sauder:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's again a pleasure to rise in this Assembly to take part in this debate on the throne speech, a throne speech which I am proud to say is a further indicator of the initiatives of this Progressive Conservative government, the initiatives this Progressive Conservative government is taking to deal with the issues and problems which are confronting the people of this great province.

I must take this opportunity to congratulate the new member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake on his excellent speech in moving the throne speech. It certainly is a great pleasure for me to take, to welcome him to this Assembly and say that I'm looking forward to working with him over the next few years — many years. Many years, right. The people of P.A.-Duck Lake can be assured that they have made a wise choice and will be well represented by their new member.

I must also take this opportunity to congratulate the new member for Morse for the job well done in seconding the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, we've heard a number of fine speeches over the last number of days from the members of this Assembly; some not so fine, also. First, I would like to deal with the ones made by the hon. members to your left — the few that are left — to attempt to carry the feeble flicker of socialism in this wonderful province. By and large, they've been following in a traditional rhetoric of gloom and doom. It is quite understandable how they could have such an outlook on life, and on the future, after the fate that has been following, has befallen them in the last year. Why? To have thought that you were doing such an excellent job of fooling the

people in this province for the many years into believing that you were actually doing things in their best interest, and then having the people suddenly wake up to the realization that they were being hoodwinked, and forthwith rise up and toss you out of office and literally decimate you. It is easy to see how such an experience would put you in a gloomy state of mind.

It appears that instead of recognizing the error of their ways and attempting to get in tune with the people of the province, it is much easier for them to wish and pray for hard times on everyone else — a classic example of the old saw, 'Misery loves company.' Mr. Speaker, for all their 'Chicken Little' attitude of running around calling, 'The sky is falling in,' I would suggest that the people are not falling for their lines. People are not gullible enough to believe that everything which that, to believe just everything which that motley crew tells them any more. After having been misled and after having had their economic affairs so bungled and mismanaged for the past 11 years, people are not about to begin putting too much faith in the predictions of the crew with the death wish.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, trust and credibility is something that has to be earned. If that group had been watching over the last 11 months, they would have seen how that process works by making commitments to the people and then fulfilling those commitments: commitments such as the removal of the 20 per cent road tax on gasoline, and then doing it within minutes of taking over government; commitments such as the protection of people's homes against the ravages of high inflation and high interest rates, and doing that in the first session as a government; commitments to the farmers that they would be assisted to buy and own their own farms instead of having, of being turned into share croppers, and doing that in the first eight months of being government; a commitment to the farmers that we supported the Crow rate, before, during, and after the election, and then putting that commitment into positive action against the proposed Pepin plan. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, these were all things that that motley crew said we couldn't and wouldn't do, but we did and they voted for each and every one of them.

Mr. Speaker, that is how we have gained credibility with the people of this province, and that group has lost out, as witnessed by the recent by-election in P.A.-Duck Lake — a by-election which proved that the people of Saskatchewan did not make a mistake last April, as the Leader of the Opposition kept predicting and saying throughout the by-election campaign. Well, Mr. Speaker, enough of the negative. I should like now to deal with some more of the positive and realistic things I have heard in this Assembly in the last while. I have heard the realistic assessment, albeit we may not like it, of the economic situation of our country and our province. Along with that, I have heard in the Speech from the Throne some of the positive things which are being done by this government to deal with that problem — positive things such as the Build-A-Home Saskatchewan program, a program designed to not only help people own their own industry and to create jobs at a time such as this when there is high unemployment. Positive things such as a commitment that our government would be introducing other measures in the future to deal with the problem of high unemployment. Positive things such as the rural gasification program, a program with a threefold benefit, benefits the consumers by giving them access to a cheaper and more plentiful supply of fuel, that also will create jobs in the drilling and exploration industry as more gas is needed to fill a larger market. And it creates jobs now in the construction period of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I have also heard many more positive things in the Speech from the

Throne. I should like to deal with only two or three more, especially as they relate to my area of the province, the great constituency of Nipawin. As you know, it is one of the most beautiful areas in the province and I suppose also one of the more diversified agricultural areas. We have four fairly major agricultural industries which have developed in that area to a greater degree, I believe, than anywhere else in the province, industries which have taken the people away from the straight wheat and livestock base. These industries are the honey industry, the forage and grass seed specialty crop industry, the canola crushing industry and the alfalfa dehydration industry. Mr. Speaker, these are industries which have been developed in the past by individuals and groups with much foresight and initiative, people who did it almost completely without government help and, I might add, government intervention. Mr. Speaker, the people in rural Saskatchewan believe that there is much more we can achieve and attain, and they are certainly happy to see the government making a commitment to new initiatives in the area of agriculture research and market development. Another area I would like to touch on is the issue of resources, Mr. Speaker. The people of the north-east are looking forward to a more responsible government in the management of resources and in particular in the area of forest resources. They have watched over the years as the previous administration plundered our forests for the short-term gain and didn't put anything back for the future generations. Mr. Speaker, the former government appeared to be so wrapped up in their mining programs of the non-renewable resources of this province that they carried the same philosophy over into the renewable sectors of the resource industries — mining instead of farming the renewable resources. Mr. Speaker, that is one more example how the former government lost credibility with the people of north-eastern Saskatchewan, one more example of why this government is being looked on more favourably all the time. Another part of the throne speech that the people of the North are excited about is the improvements in the education system, especially the expanded technical school in Prince Albert, a facility which is going to give the people of the North an opportunity to gain skills needed to take advantage of the opportunities in the resource industries that will be developing in the North, industries that were never allowed to be born previously, because of the birth control measures against free enterprise and private initiative which the former government had in place. Mr. Speaker, there are many more things in the throne speech which I . . . Have been well put out, pointed out in other speeches. And I do not want to take more time going over them again. I would just like to point out, and I'm sure you can see from my remarks, that I will be supporting the motion on the throne speech and will not be supporting the amendment thereto.

**Mr. Weiman:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is again an honour to be able to stand in this House, to be able to give my address in reply to the throne speech. It's again an honour to address my constituents, and also, through them, all those fine people of Saskatchewan.

My first intent and inclination this morning was to reply to the throne speech by going through it by component and dealing with specific parts of it. However, after sitting in the House for the past week and listening to my colleagues' convictions being espoused — listening to their clarity, and to listening to their determination and eloquence — I thought better of the matter. It's very hard indeed to try to do better than they have already done.

I thought what I would want to do was talk about the meaning the throne speech holds for myself and my constituents. Now, contrary to past practices of past governments, the throne speech that was presented into this House is not one that was brought up

through manipulative scheming. And it's not a product of tone that was meant to perpetrate and to perpetuate a government in office to keep it there. Rather, I would say, the throne speech that was heard in this House this past week was one that reflects deeply the needs and the aspirations and the wants of the people of Saskatchewan.

We listened; we took heed; and we introduced those aspects, not only in our campaign, not only in the opening of this government, but in this throne speech. If anything can be said about the throne speech, it is the throne speech of the people of Saskatchewan.

To have the opposition fully comprehend the meaning of the throne speech to myself and to the people in my constituency, and again the people of Saskatchewan, I think it is very important to introduce the opposition to those people of Saskatchewan. They have forgotten those people of Saskatchewan. And I would like to try to attempt that by discussing the people in my constituency — to introduce you once more to those people that you ignored, to those people that you forgot.

Mr. Speaker, my grandparents had a dream. They dreamed and they believed that if they worked hard, and through their perseverance, and through their initiative, they could build a secure future for their children. They were willing to share the responsibility and the burden of a society; they were willing to put their trust in a government that would take care of their needs in an equitable and fair way. They were willing to work hard. In other words, put their backbone and, and replace rather their wishbone with a backbone. This was a dream of my grandparents. This is the dream that I share, and the dream that my colleagues share, a dream that was announced to us very, very clearly by the people of Saskatchewan that they wanted to continue in sharing that dream.

But that dream was interrupted for awhile. They were introduced to a government of the past that played games, that told them that they cared, that the solution to problems was the government would take care of every need and care that you have. However, that care that started out benevolently, a reared its ugly head into a form of control, control of which I will speak more later on in this speech.

As a new member sitting here these past months, Mr. Speaker, I've been dismayed, disappointed. I would go on to say that I was shocked by the antics and the lamentations that I've heard from that side of the House since last April. I do not believe that the opposition fully comprehends, or is willing to admit, what really happened on April the 26th to this province, and repeated itself again on February 21st. It is because they are not willing to admit the approval of the populace to our past programs, programs that they needed, that their perception of the future and the perception of our throne speech is clouded.

I think there is a need for a few moments as a little bit of reality therapy. I've heard, as I've indicated, these past months the wailing and the bemoaning and the denouncing of a future for those people that they forgot. And after awhile, in all honesty, it starts to affect even a positive thinker. There is no excuse for the opposition to have spent these past 10 months, instead of being the loyal opposition, to offer criticism to move this, this province forward into its future that it should have. There is no reason for this opposition to be blaming the electorate for turning them out.

And that's what we've heard of the last 10 months. How could those people turn us out? How could they have denied us the right to govern? The fact of the matter is, the

people of this province shouted to us programs, their aspirations and their needs, and we carried them out.

Just as they look forward to the thrust that we have indicated in the throne speech, they await that future, and they will not be put off, or put down by the negativism across the floor.

When I think of the antics of the opposition I can't help but remember a story that was told to me many years ago by a high school teacher regarding negativism. I am sure that the hon. member will pass this on . . . the hon. member opposite will pass this on to his colleagues later on, after they come back from their coffee . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Member?

**Mr. Weiman:** — Member. The story suggests that Robert Fulton, the inventor of the steamship was unveiling his first product at the shores of the Ohio River. There was man in that whole crowd, one man who was negative towards this new invention. The rest of the people were ecstatic — it was something new. Here was something that was going to increase transportation, enable them to go up and down the Ohio, to make their transportation costs lower. This one gentleman kept yelling, 'You'll never get it to move.'

**An Hon. Member:** — Don't let 'em take it away.

**Mr. Weiman:** — 'Don't let 'em take it away.' After the ship had taken off from the port and had gone down the river, rather than hanging his head in shame, this man still had the audacity to shout out, 'But you will never stop it.'

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — I think that is the attitude of the members opposite. We have built a ship and there are many more ships we are going to build, and they will move. I will change that story one tad, 'And we won't stop it.'

The problem that you cannot understand, hon. lone member, is that your ship sunk. If I were, if I were in your position, . . . And I don't believe that I'm going to be in your position for a long time, as I listen to the people of my constituency. But if I were in your position, I would change that attitude. I would determine right now that I would be, hon. member, a member of Her Majesty's Royal and Loyal Opposition. Then maybe, some day in the future, you may . . . And I want to qualify that and put in quotations, 'You may become a member of Her Royal Majesty's Loyal Government.' Because, if you do not change that attitude I can guarantee you that you will definitely become a member of Her Royal Majesty's loyal citizenry.

I mentioned reality therapy. What did the people of Saskatchewan want from a government? I mentioned my grandparents' dream. Why did they deny you that right to govern? I'd like to offer with you . . . offer to you a couple of stories that may highlight that, how you lost touch with the people of Saskatchewan.

As an example, you'd like to use the phrase, 'The people of Saskatchewan grew tired and fearful of a government that became more and more government, that talked about it, acted like a collective manipulator.' A collective manipulator . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm not. If anything that I'm referring to the actions of this



government, we believe in collective individualism. And there is a great deal of difference there.

For a simple example for the member opposite, collective individualism is that aspect when you go into your backyard and you and your neighbour build a fence. You don't mind working together towards a common goal if you determine what that goal is and not have it put upon you from above.

What is collective manipulation? An incident that happened during the campaign. And at the same time, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I want to put to rest a myth with this story. We were told by various people, and particularly the NDP, 'You will never get any support from those fine union members out there. Those fine union members are solid NDP. They like listening to their leaders. They like doing what they're told to do. They like being manipulated as a collective group.'

Well, that myth could not be any further from the truth. There is that aspect of collective manipulation, though. In the middle of my constituency there is a union centre. That union centre, during the campaign, was plastered with what I call orange poppies, all over. And I would not even have been dismayed about it had it not been brought to my attention by many of those union members who, I was led to believe, did not care about the dream for the future, who — I was led to believe, did not care about taking risks, did not care about taking chances, did not care about working towards a future goal. That is how I found out about it. And the reason these men and women phoned me was because they were angry at their union executive for the type of manipulation that was placed on them, because they went as citizens of Fairview to that union centre and asked to put up a PC sign, and they were told no.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — That brought about a backlash to those members that you thought you had in your hand, those members that you thought were just pawns of yours to play with. They are free-thinking, free-choice, motivated people and you tried to play the game of collective manipulation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — Another aspect that destroyed that myth . . . I knocked on the door, and I knocked on many doors. I was talking to this one gentleman, asking his views, willing to listen, and I noticed he had this beautiful sports jacket on with the emblem PCS on it. No sooner did I get to the door and he said to me: 'You're wasting your time; go away from here.' Again I could not help but thinking, well maybe this is a union member and I'm not supposed to talk to a union member because union members do not believe in free enterprise. What a myth! He told me, 'Go away from here. You're wasting your time because you have my vote. Go out there and find other votes.'

Well, I was a bit shocked. I said, 'I'm sorry; I don't understand this. I've seen all the red poppies, I've heard all their literature, I've seen all the literature.' I said, 'I don't understand this.' He said to me . . . He said to me, 'Tell Grant (the Hon. Grant Devine), tell Grant that the unions out of Cory are not against him. Tell him what PCS stands for. Tell him we knew and anticipated lay-offs the previous December. We see the piles of potash. We are not stupid. We see the pile of potash that are left there without a tarp on them, without a covering on them. Tell Grant that we will not blame him,' he said, 'because PCS does not only stand for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, but

Progressive Conservative Sympathizers.' And that's what that gentleman told me.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — Let's go a little bit further with this scenario of collective manipulation that brings about a control of people — a control that people do not want.

You know, if you cannot control a people through your ideology, if you cannot convince them of your rightness by your policies or your plans, you go one step further. You do one step further. You can try, or attempt to, control them though, through the work place, because then you put that aspect of fear in an individual, the fear of his children and the security of the money to be able to pay for that security of his children. And this is what you tried to do.

What did we have in Saskatchewan? What did we have in Saskatchewan? We were fast approaching a situation in Saskatchewan where we were becoming all employees of the government. And, you know, it may not have been so bad to be employees of the government, but I would not ever put up for, and neither would the 22,000 people in my constituency, stand for being the employees of the NDP Party.

What was the mentality? '75, very briefly: you can't win through legislation with the potash corporation; you can't win because you were defeated in the courts; you can't win with a royalty structure through the courts. So, what's the best way, if you can't win that way? Buy them. Buy it. You started off with the potash, and then you went on a buying rampage, went on a buying rampage . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What have we bought?

Went out to buy potash mines — they are now your workers. They work for the government. Go out and buy uranium mines. Go out and buy airlines — anticipated in buying airlines. Go out and buy packing houses. Make sure that your finger is out into every aspect of the individual's life in this province. The people did want that. That buy . . . that mentality of buy, buy, buy led to the homonym, bye, bye, bye Blakeney.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — It is amazing. It is, is amazing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . good, now we're down to, back to, one again. I'll enjoy talking to the hon. member opposite.

Is this the same group who, for the past couple of months, have been waiting and pouncing upon and belittling the Hon. Minister of Labour because, because potash is not selling as well as it used to under their government, because of lay-offs? And that's a legitimate concern of ours too. We don't like people being laid off. But is this the same group of people who were willing to spend \$2.5 billion expanding that potash industry when those pads remained full?

You know, when I was talking to my constituents, they cannot . . . It's difficult at times to comprehend what exactly \$2.5 billion means.

I think it's recognized in this House, and it definitely is in my constituency, that a very very soft spot, a dear place for education . . .

Let's put it around another way. \$2.5 billion — it buys or builds 2,500 elementary schools in Saskatchewan. It builds 250 high schools in Saskatchewan, enough to put a

school in every village, every town, every hamlet, every truck stop in Saskatchewan, because we don't have that many, and if I or the Hon. Gordon Currie would even suggest or hint at spending \$2.5 billion on that kind of scheme, you would think he was nothing short of mad. That is what that \$2.5 billion scheme of yours was.

It wasn't as if we didn't have any potash in Saskatchewan. We own a few mines. It was that irresponsibility that the people of Saskatchewan would not tolerate any further.

I must for a moment touch on one aspect of the throne speech, again because it deals with education.

It's not an education of the past, not an education of history, but an education for the future. There is nothing stopping the will of the people, when determined, to bring about vast changes in this province, as we have witnessed in other technologicalized countries of the world. High technology is the wave of the future. All you have to do is talk to a young child. I think at times they've seen it before we have as adults. That is the wave of the future. We are committed to trying to do something to implement that high technology in Saskatchewan. We have the people. We have the resources. We have the intellectual and academic resources, as well, with that fine institution, the Saskatchewan Research Council.

We are looking at an innovative curriculum, a curriculum that is meaningful to the 1980s and the 1990s, a program as suggested by the hon. member from Turtleford, a program in which education will be accessible to the people of Saskatchewan. Adult education programs expanded, and, a particular one, an opportunity for those people particularly the single parents, to learn new skills to make them viable in the job market, to make them feel whole, to make them feel contributors to this great province, and not as a commercial.

My other colleagues will more . . . will expand much more on the programs within our throne speech.

I touched on controls that the people would not any longer tolerate the types of controls that they see . . . had seen coming down the line, the manipulations. But you know, there's an aspect to it that I haven't talked about yet. When you control people, you make them apprehensive. You make them afraid. A grandparent's dream did not include fear.

I knocked on another door during the campaign. This one had the orange poppy on the lawn, and that's because I wanted to talk to everyone in my constituency, and I wanted to listen to their views. And I knocked on the door and I said to this lady, 'Ma'am, I appreciate and I respect your loyalty to your party. Are there any questions that you have of me? Is there anything that you've wondered about our platform, our campaign?' She said, 'No.' Well, I said, 'Well, I hope you have a happy day. I hope you get out to the polls to vote, and support your candidate,' She said, 'No, I'm not going to vote.' I said, 'But Ma'am, it's your right. Go and vote.' 'But I'm not a citizen of Saskatchewan.' I said, 'What?' 'I'm not a citizen of Canada yet.' I said, 'What? What's the sign doing on the lawn?' 'Sir, a man from the government came and asked me if he could put up that sign.'

Play on the fears and defencelessness of this lady who came from a country that was Marxist, that came from a country when a man from the government asked you anything, you did it. And that did not happen once, that did not happen twice, that

happened in the majority of my new citizens in my constituencies in their households.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — As bad as controls and fear are . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Oh, that is serious. The hon. member . . . The hon. member of the opposition, I would wish he would continue because there was a story I would love to share with you, but there are other colleagues that would like to speak yet, When I . . .

I will share it with, with the hon. member from . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, yes, from Shaunavon also. A lot of people don't think that city people, city boys and city girls, don't think the Crow issue is important. Well, it is very dear to us. But that again is another aside.

I lived practically all my life in the city because we could not make a go on the farm. But, as was the custom of my father, during the summer holidays he would take me to go visit my uncle occasionally, on the farm, and I looked forward to that. I looked forward to the fresh air; I looked forward to the friendship; and I looked forward to the animals — to see it in all these. And particularly when my dad had mentioned that my uncle had just, my uncle had just obtained some donkeys. Well, I'd seen what donkeys were in books in school, but believe it or not, being a city boy, I had never saw one in the flesh. I went out with my father to the farm, and as a young lad, in my curiosity and the things I'd read about donkeys being dumb animals and being stubborn, I wanted to see if that was true. So, my inquisitiveness just drew me to this donkey. And I tried as best as I could to motivate this donkey to get it to move. But in my father's eyes, he saw it another way. He perceived it another way. And he came up to me and he said, 'Duane, don't bother that donkey. Don't pester that donkey. If there's one thing you're going to have to learn, Duane, about donkey's, is some day they will come back to haunt you.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, Deputy Speaker, in this House at this time, my father's story has come true.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — I must apologize for that story. I must apologize for that story, Deputy Speaker. I must apologize — I did not intend to embarrass the donkey.

As I was saying, as I was saying, more insidious than their aspect of controls that the people of this province did not want on their shoulders any longer, and more insidious than the fear is that cancer of hopelessness — when you would knock on a door, when you would visit a constituent, and they would say, 'It make no difference. One government is the same as another government. You aren't going to do any better.' That despair, that hopelessness. I've spent many hours convincing these people, or attempting to convince these people, that that was not the truth, that this government would make a difference if elected. And I was not alone. I must pay a special acknowledgement to my colleagues, because these fine ladies and gentlemen believed we could make a difference, believed that we could serve the people of Saskatchewan. And many of those fine ladies and gentlemen who now form our caucus, this government, left . . . pardon me, left lucrative jobs in the job market. They made sacrifices to come here to serve the population of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member of Regina North is a terrific example. And that is because they were determined to bring about a future for this province that has been denied it for the last 11 years. They were so determined that they were willing to make those

sacrifices. A special acknowledgment must be given to those original seven, who through their tenacity and determination would not let that lamp of free enterprise and free thought and expression die out in this province, that made possible me sitting in this august House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — These members believe that they can make a difference. They are talented, they are responsible, and they look forward to any work and all work they can do through the government to the people of Saskatchewan.

What happened April 26th, to close up my story that I started with, what we witnessed on April the 26th is not only an exercise in democracy, but an exorcising of those elements of democracy that you led the people of Saskatchewan to believe. They did not want to see their democracy, their province, fall into decay and disuse, to be controlled by a handful.

Now I'm convinced, speaking personally, that I did not win because my constituents were so in love with the PC Party, or with Grant Devine, although you'll have to admit it's awfully hard not to. I did not win because of that. I did not win because Duane Weiman was such a terrific guy. No. I did not win by garnering just the PC support in my constituency. I won because the people of my constituency wanted a change — wanted a new chance — an opportunity to dream again, and those people who brought me here were not only PCs, were not only Liberals, but they were the very members of your party who were disenchanted with the things that you had been doing these past three, four years.

There is so much more I would like to continue with. I think what I shall do though is wind down. But before I do I just want to make one more mention of my constituency.

What I'm about to say is not intended to bad-mouth that hard-working candidate who was my opposition. He didn't lose, the party lost. What I'm going to continue to say is not to blow my own horn, because I've indicated I did not win, the people of my constituency put me here. But I want to . . . I want to say it to underline that feeling that was my constituency, and I believe was throughout the 64 constituencies in this province.

People of my constituency voted me here to bring you a message, a message to change your ways, a message to start dreaming new dreams with them. And they wanted to shout that message out so clearly to you that they were unwilling to accept a fly-in candidate. They were unwilling to accept a candidate that was groomed for the spot. They wanted to be sure that you understood their message. So much so that they returned me. They brought me here by over a two to one margin at every single poll, so that you, the loyal opposition, would get a clear message, as a clear message from the constituents who sent all my fellow colleagues here that it's time for you to change your attitude. And that is what I started with at the beginning of this throne speech. Your attitude is wrong, absolutely wrong for 1983.

Don't ever underestimate the will of the people for change and the will of the people to want to continue dreaming dreams.

All we have to do is look down south. One of the greatest periods in American history was through . . . was under the governing of John F. Kennedy. He offered a dream to

the people and the people accepted that dream, so much so that that dream put a man on the moon. It was that dream that brought us the technologies that we were talking of earlier that we take as commonplace now in the market-place. It was that dream of John F. Kennedy's that after 100 years ended segregation in the United States.

But closer to home, what can these dreams do? It was a dream of John A. Macdonald that unified this great country of ours — Canada. And it is the dream, I contend, of the parents of the children of this province to allow them an opportunity to move ahead, to move ahead and to fully enjoy their existence in this province. Don't underestimate the power of their dreams.

We have said on many occasions there is so much more we can be. It is a bit of a misnomer because we are, as people of Saskatchewan, so much more than we are given credit for. We've already got that head start. We're not . . . (inaudible) . . . We're not those hicks from Saskatchewan, those stubble-jumpers. Our province is filled with an energetic and dynamic people living in a dynamic and forward-looking land.

I'll save the last ten pages for my next opportunity to speak. However I would like to leave you, hon. member of Shaunavon, with a couple of thoughts. A great Canadian . . . That great Canadian Sir Wilfred Laurier was once quoted as saying, 'The 20th century belongs to Canada,' I want to add to that, and I want to make sure that in my next — this is 1983 — in my next 17 years in this House that I will ensure that the 21st century belongs to the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weiman:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, and colleagues, and opposition, my grandparents had a dream. And myself and my colleagues are determined that with the guidance and help of those people who share in that common dream that we will do our utmost to make every one of those come true. I have no other alternative, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but to vigorously oppose the amendment and to whole-heartedly endorse the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, members of the Legislative Assembly, I would like to thank the people of Cut Knife-Lloydminster for their support in the last general election, which enables me to be able to stand before this Assembly and enter into the throne speech debate on their behalf.

I want to say it took team-work from the people of my riding to elect me, and I would hope that I may hold that team-work, that team, hold it to the measures of which I can carry that forth into caucus and maintain that team-work in caucus, which is so ever important.

I would also like to say that I hope this team-work and togetherness will remain in this legislature from all members through the mutuality of that Chair. I believe that this has been a tradition of our parliamentary system in order to achieve goals that are in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan, indeed Canada. It is this togetherness which enables, enables all of us to arrive to a consensus through this Assembly.

I would like to take a moment to welcome the hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake, Mr. Sid Dutchak.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — I would like to congratulate him on his most recent victory, and also congratulate him on moving the throne speech.

I would also like to recognize the member for Morse, Mr. Harold Martens, and congratulate him on seconding the motion of the throne speech.

There are many important aspects of the throne speech that I would like to deal with. The first one is operation clean-up. Mr. Speaker, you know and I know, and all the members know, in fact, it was proven April 26th, that the people of Saskatchewan knew we as a Progressive Conservative government, were going to inherit many of the previous government's costly errors. Costly errors, Mr. Speaker, that had placed an unbearable tax burden on the people of Saskatchewan. The NDP, the previous administration, had 11 years, 11 long years, to bring about a standard of living to Saskatchewan second to none across this country and across North America, indeed, the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, here is just a small indication of what the NDP accomplished in that time period, and I want to say it's not much of a track record to be very proud of. The high taxation which drove industry, drove industry along with the . . . drove industry, along with it, drove jobs and opportunities that my family, and your family, and everyone's family could have, could have enjoyed, out of Saskatchewan, drove them completely out of Saskatchewan, drove them out of Saskatchewan into other provinces and countries to allow other governments and families to enjoy what has been rightfully ours.

The hon. members, the hon. member from Elphinstone, Mr. Blakeney, had indicated, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there wasn't much content from the throne speech, that it appeared to be barren. Well, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the NDP record, I would suggest that with all the men and women, all the boys and girls who were driven out of Saskatchewan because of a lack of jobs, that this province may have become a lot more barren under their administration, and if that administration was allowed to have carried on.

It has always been the way, it has always been the ways of the hon. members opposite to build their empires while keeping the people of Saskatchewan at their lowest levels. Theirs was a government that says it gets its support from the poor, the underprivileged, the hungry, and the forlorn. The NDP had an incentive, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an incentive to keep them, keep them that way. The members opposite were the past government that gave the people of Saskatchewan a feeling of emptiness, a picture painted only of gloom and doom. People in my constituency ask what I see on the other side of the House as official opposition. My answer to them is: I see nothing. I see nothing but wounded ducks sitting there continually getting their feathers plucked and their wings clipped.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to go on now and say that we, as government and through the throne speech, have given the people of Saskatchewan new hope, new life, a real good feeling of accomplishments. Accomplishments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because through their support on April 26th, we were able to

accomplish the abolishment of the gasoline tax, the home interest reduction plan to 13.25 per cent. We were able to enact the Saskatchewan home building assistance plan of \$3,000, the farm purchase program, health programs, social service programs, education programs, energy programs and tax incentives. And Mr. Speaker, yes, the list goes on and on.

But, Mr. Speaker, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the previous speakers have spoken of the numbers and figures of those programs, so I won't be repetitious.

I would like to go on to what I know, what I know is the most important topic at hand and that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Crow. But I don't want to bore this Assembly with repetition to the Crow rate. I would like to bring to this Assembly a new approach, one that hasn't really been discussed in this Assembly. Mr. Deputy Speaker, transportation has always been a part of the national policy. It was the bond that brought the five original partners together over the inter-colonial railway.

The Rideau Canal system was part of the defence of eastern Ontario to get goods through to southwestern Ontario. The CPR was Canada's response to the U.S. A's grab for land on the Prairies, and to bring British Columbia into the federal system, into the federal union. The CNR was a federal take-over.

The St. Lawrence Seaway was to bring Atlantic shipping right to Toronto, Chicago and Thunder Bay. The Hudson Bay railway and the Pine Point railway were both undertaken in the national interest. Air Canada and the Trans-Canada Highway were largely financed by, by the federal government.

Roads to resources in the provinces and in the province and the territories were part of a national policy. Pipelines, communications, etc. . . . One could go on. It has not been the history . . . It has not been an untroubled history. The number of studies and royal commissions tell the stories, tells the story. The present situation has been allowed to develop to a point that real fears exist among many, among many producers of grain. Not one of us is free from that blame.

Ever since the '30s all institutions and individuals have tended to put their affairs into the hands of specialists or experts. This applies to government. This applies to government s, corporations, volunteer organizations, churches, universities and farmers making out their income tax returns. At first, these experts just advised government s. Now, they are running the show in many cases.

If you go back . . . Pickersgill has modestly admitted that he was one responsible for 80 to 90 per cent of decisions when he was a civil servant under St. Laurent. Several of these experts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have become politicians, so they can show their expertise more publicly. The trouble with this rationale — approach to policy making — is that in turning decision making over to the few elite who know so much, is that if they make a decision wrong, then the pain that results is borne by many. The Crow decision of 1982-83, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can be tracked back to the decision of leading European economists that to stabilize agriculture that farm production should be controlled. They called this supply management. The theory was vigorously pushed along among the civil servants at both Washington and Ottawa. The Americans succumbed to the logic, and the farmers got land banks and payments for not producing. Canada went the other way. We tried to accelerate sales, made it legal to form combinations for exports and research, set up programs to stabilize both income



and price, set up the farm credit corporation with a statutory interest rate of 5 per cent, and started to put ARDA (Agriculture and Rural Development Act) program into action to raise income of the 60 per cent of the farmers who could be called marginal. In the mid '60s an agricultural task force was set up. And it looked ahead for 15 years and recommended that Canada should reduce the number of farmers to one-third, and prairie acreage by half. It was supply management with a vengeance. Everybody here will recall Eager Beaver Otto, who talked about user pay, and who introduced the LIP (local initiatives program) program. He said that he had the support of the farm organizations, but it turned out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it turned out that over 90 per cent of the rank and file were opposed. One would think that politicians, one would think that politicians would be smart enough to learn from mistakes, but not Whelan. He has taken up the cry of supply management, and refuses to do anything, refused to do anything for the beef farmers until they bow down and accept centrally controlled marketing boards. The government should, the government should have, have taken heed to the warning of Alvin Hamilton about the wisdom of turning the grain farmers over to Gilson who had helped draft the supply-management-oriented task force, task force report. His reply was that he was all for change and that the government 's proposals would help the whole country. Well, the proposals are before us now. The farmers of Canada know instinctively that if one group of farmers are gunned down, all will eventually suffer. The farmers of Quebec have made it clear to the PQ and the Liberals and these two provincial parties have come out against the Pepin proposals. The Government of Saskatchewan has not only asked for support from the official opposition, but has taken the lead to enlist all provincial governments in opposing the Pepin proposals. So, the political battle has begun. Whelan has launched a \$350,000 advertising campaign in Quebec to tell the farmers that the livestock farmers of the West will not benefit from the government's proposals.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . NDP or Liberal down there? I get 'em mixed up.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Well, my colleague brings to light what is very true. Who put those people there? Their colleagues, their federal colleagues of the members opposite, put what we have, the Trudeau government there.

The main, the main backroom public relations expert of the Liberal Party has been in Saskatchewan to announce the Liberal Party will win the West with their, with their Crow Policy. There's a great belief in the power of the media to win the battles for political parties. If we are to win this political battle, there must be more, there must be more than rhetoric in our words; there has to be substance.

We all know that the present situation in transport cries out for improvements. In my opinion, Canada would need a population of over 45 million people before all modes of transport, transport could make money with present rates and, and traffic.

There are several main ways to balance the budget of a business. One is to retrench at cut cost, and cut costs. It has been tried with the passenger service; it did not work. It has been tried with grain; it is not working. The reasons is elementary. Railways have large percentage of, percentages of cost which are fixed.

To illustrate with a simple example, let us assume that fixed costs are 50 per cent, and variable costs are 50 per cent; that the revenue for carrying of some items was \$100; and if total costs were \$100, there is no profit. If the volume was doubled at the same rate, the revenue would rise to, to \$200. But the fixed costs would remain the same; only the variable would double. Therefore, there would be a profit of \$100. So the common sense way to, the common sense way with a fixed-cost industry to make more

money is to increase the volume.

This is what, this is what happened to the CPR in the '60s. They were crying the blues about losses on the statutory rate on grain. They put their 1958 figures before the Macpherson royal commission. When the figures were rejected by two other groups of accountants, then, then, another event happened. The grain companies supplied figures, their own figures, of tonnage shipped on each railway line from 1955 to '65. The total had more than doubled in the period since 1958. The railways were making a profit off the Crow rates in that period.

Parliament finally completed the National Transportation Act in 1967. It took the power to watch over the railways away from the department and gave it to the new transportation commission. It laid down directions as to how the transportation commission was to act. It failed to give the power to direct, because the NDP leader thought they should trust the experts. It did not set up the statutory committee of parliament to oversee the new transportation commission. After the fact . . . After they after the act, pardon me, was passed, Pickersgill got himself appointed to the head of the commission. Once the commission was in safe hands, the CPR continued its public relations campaign. It continued to let its lines deteriorate and use an absolute, and obsolete fleet of grain cars. Passenger service was to go. Obligations to the Maritimes were dropped. Governments punished the railways by setting up Via Rail and giving them modern grain cars. Still the pressure came back to raise, to raise the Crow rate and the Crow rates kept up, and the pressure of the Crow rates kept up.

The government set up the Hall's commission on grain and rail in western Canada in 1975. It's reported in 1977 that recommended keep the Crow. Let federal government pay any losses, if proven, to the railways. Abandon 2,000 miles of line and put another 2,000 miles under, under the prairie rail authority until they began to make money. The Canadian Wheat Board to set up a grain co-ordinator. The railways use each other's lines. There should be economic development of the whole western and northern area to provide more traffic for the railways and benefits to the whole of Canada. The government's response was a rail action committee to hurry up the abandonment of lines.

The election of 1979 brought a brief respite. Soon Pepin was put in charge to get a issue off the plate of the government. Gilson was appointed to interview a select farm organizations but not the Canadian Wheat Board which, which has, has had the apparent support of the farm organizations.

Ministers began to say that they had the support of the farmers. Fortunately the politicians in Saskatchewan got into the act and the Liberal Party in the province almost disappeared. All these things are well known by most people in Saskatchewan. The job is now to get the people of, of all Canada interested. The obvious point is that for every dollar taken out of the grain farmers' pockets, it costs the other parts of our economy \$2 to \$3. This will hit the industrial areas of Ontario and Quebec who are now seriously depressed, therefore the educational work we should do being that the working men in industrial areas of Quebec and Ontario, indeed, all of Canada . . .

There are many sectors of the Canadian economy that would respond to an intelligent approach to their self-interest and sense of fairness. The media deserves special attention. To my knowledge, I know of no news stories on the Pepin announcement that compare with the Hall's commission report to the government's decision. Many . . .

(inaudible) . . . will appreciate being reminded of another view on the Crow rate.

But in conclusion, there are many more things that I could suggest, and many more things you could suggest, but the job, in a nutshell, is to hold up the legislation until the new crop year. There is no use believing that the government will accept a major change, so we must hold up that legislation and then we will deal with it when it comes to a federal election. The government wants it through by June 30. Our thoughts have to be on how now it can be delayed when the government has got it into its habit of applying closures quite regularly.

Mr. Speaker, I know everyone's thoughts are with us, but the pressures has also got to come from outside this legislature — the parliaments of Canada. They have to come from all across Canada. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, as an MLA and a member of the Government of Saskatchewan, I will continue to work hard in opposition to the Pepin plan, and work hard towards the assuring of the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada of a good and equitable transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, transportation is the key factor in this development policy. Naturally, south-eastern Saskatchewan will benefit. The railways, power lines, and pipelines, and trucks will have lots to haul. Sure, the banks and railways will make money, but so will we. If we can learn that you never make money if you destroy your customer, so can they.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks in support of the throne speech and the Government of Saskatchewan are representative of my constituents and, for the most part, a majority of the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this Progressive Conservative government will continue to have my support and the support of the people of our great province for many years to come, as long as it continues to listen to the people. Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence that this new government will listen and will respond to what it hears, and therefore we look to a long and productive term in office.

Mr. Speaker, with what was said from my address through you to this Assembly, I would now like to inform this Assembly that I do support the motion and I will not support the amendment. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the mover, the new member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake, and I would also like to congratulate the seconder, the member for Morse. I feel that they did a credible job, especially with the type of throne speech that they had to work with.

Before I get into my speech on the throne speech, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate a senior basketball team from La Loche — senior boys. This is a first for northern Saskatchewan, and last week in Saskatoon, last weekend, the La Loche senior boys won the provincial 2A basketball championship. This is quite an accomplishment for a community and a team from La Loche. They only had a gymnasium since 1976, and for the last two or three years have been breathing down the necks of southern Saskatchewan teams. Last weekend, in Saskatoon, they finally accomplished what they were set out to do, and winning the championship. And I want to congratulate that basketball team and their coach, Greg Hatch, and in particular I want to mention, in the final game, that La Loche senior boys defeated Maple Creek 76 to 44. Now, that's a pretty good score. And I also want to mention one Julius Park of La Loche who scored,

in that game, 38 points. That, in itself, is quite an accomplishment.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — I was very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech and what the throne speech contained, especially for citizens of northern Saskatchewan, the senior citizens of this province and for the students of this province who are looking for summer jobs, and . . . The Throne speech was quite bare. A matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, all we really heard from this government is about the projects that are going ahead, that have been initiated and started under the former NDP government. And Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't for the projects that were started by the former New Democratic Party government, Saskatchewan, while it's in serious problems right now with its unemployment . . . I tell you it would be in real serious problems if we didn't have projects such as Key Lake.

They Key Lake project was started under the New Democratic Party government. As you're aware, the province of Saskatchewan has a 50 per cent share in that operation at Key Lake, one of the, one of the largest, if not the largest mining project in the world today, being carried out in Key Lake. It's a project that is worth \$600 million. That is the amount of money that will probably be spent to bring that mine into production later on this summer' providing over 2,000 construction jobs. And when it is completed, Mr. Speaker, it will provide another 500 permanent jobs, and I might add, well-paid permanent jobs at Key Lake. And a lot of them jobs, due to the surface lease agreement, are going to Northerners — 50 per cent Northerners, 50 per cent Southerners. And this is a great boost to northern Saskatchewan, not only just to the labourers, the 500 constructions workers in the permanent jobs that will be coming out of that project, but also to the northern contractors who have done a lot of work in, in putting the Key Lake project in place as it is today. And in all probability that Key Lake project will come in a little bit under, under the estimated cost of \$600 million, and that is a credit to a labour force that we have in Saskatchewan.

Another project that is going ahead and is providing much needed labour and, and jobs for Saskatchewan, the construction jobs now in the second phase that is going ahead at Cluff Lake, and in the wisdom of the New Democratic Party government . . . when they were in power, they purchased 20 per cent share in Key Lake, and that 20 per cent is most certainly paying off handsomely for the citizens of Saskatchewan.

Another project that was started by the New Democratic Party government, and the Conservative government continually tried to take credit for, and that is the hydro project at Nipawin. While they did put a stop to that project for awhile when they got in, they have now got it going full blast, and I tell you that is a breath of fresh air to the folks around Nipawin and in the east-north-eastern part of Saskatchewan.

Another thing that we hear so much about, and so much criticism . . . And I can remember in 1975 when the New Democratic government of the day decided that they were going to nationalize the potash industry, and we sat in this House for many months with a filibuster from the now Conservative government. Many of their members sat in this House and filibustered for week-in and week-out, and it turned in to be month-in and month-out, trying to stop the government of the day from purchasing 50 per cent of shares in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the potash industry. I tell the members opposite that that was a move that was made and it was a good move, and it's a good move today. And I know when I listen to the opposition talk about everything that's going on . . . They talked about the Key Lake, the hydro thing at

Nipawin — the project. They talk about potash, the potash industry and, and how good it is today, and they realize that today we need that. We need that industry, and it was a smart move, and it was a smart move to purchase 50 per cent shares in the potash industry of Saskatchewan. All these projects were started under the New Democratic government. These are the main projects that is keeping Saskatchewan going today, Mr. Speaker. I tell you if that projects that I have just mentioned were to shut down, we would have complete chaos in this province. And I take a look out in the, in the, in the legislature today, and I see all the, the carpenters, the labour people that are in here, and they tell me that they just can't get work anyplace. Things are bad in Saskatchewan.

We also had a 10-year program to expand the potash industry in Saskatchewan, and that 10-year program was a \$2.5 billion expansion, and that would have been a tremendous boost on this province. And what we decided to do in our wisdom with . . . If we were going to have a \$2.5 billion expansion over 10 years we wanted to make sure that we had long-term contracts with that potash. And we set up Potash International to, to sell potash, and to secure long-term contracts for, for the benefit of all Saskatchewan.

Within days after the Conservative government got into power they cancelled Potash International. And we were using Potash International to, to sell potash a long-term contracts to such, to such countries as India and China And Brazil. And that was security, security for the people of Saskatchewan. And one can just imagine the, the jobs in the construction phase of a \$2.5 billion expansion of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and the permanent jobs that would have come out of that.

And I'm very pleased to see, Mr. Speaker, that the present government in their wisdom has decided to go ahead with the \$400 million expansion of the potash corporation at Lanigan. I think that's a great boost to the economy of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Labour is very proud of that. I see that, and I'm very proud of it myself.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, I hear the opposition continually talking about the projects that I have just mentioned, that we have started, and they continually go back to the gas tax. Always going back to the gas tax. They took the gas tax, the road tax, off the gasoline. This government has camouflaged the true cost to the public of many of its measures. There is no better example than the removing of the gas tax. That saves Saskatchewan motorists \$140 million, the government claims. They forgot that a fair chunk of that \$140 million came out of the province's motorists, that particularly from out-of-province truckers. Many of those truckers go straight through the province and make no contribution to the road system they use.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when they removed that gas tax, they also took away \$28 million of the 20 per cent of that road tax that always went into SGI to cover costs that were lost, and to keep insurance rates down in this province. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the citizens of Saskatchewan, if SGI had the \$28 million that they lost from the taxes that this government has removed from gasoline, SGI wouldn't be having the problems that they have right today. And they wouldn't be talking about taking windshield deductibility out of, out of the policies. You now have to have \$100 special policy if you break your windshield, if it's a \$100 deductible. It's not covered anymore under the insurance. They now have put on a \$500 deductible which will be going on to our license plates, and that \$500 deductible is accidents that the party at fault is going to have to pay that \$500 deductible. And, as I said, that \$500 deductible, the other premiums that they're putting on insurances, had they not removed that gas tax and SGI would've had the \$28 million that they ordinarily would have got, we wouldn't be faced

with these problems.

Well, let's just take a look, Mr. Speaker, at what, what this \$500 deductible means if you are at fault. Let's just assume when we have a snowstorm or at any time when the roads are tough and we have an accident, and who is at fault? I tell you there that the people who are going to benefit from this is going to be the lawyers in this province, because there is going to be a lot of cases going to the courts to prove who was at fault, especially when we're dealing with \$400 deductible. And I see that the lawyers in this House are going to be happy, because they're going to get a lot of extra work on that one.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that this government can take credit for. I think that we have to be fair with them. They've only been in government for a year now, and there is a number of things that they can take credit for. And I think that they have to take credit for the 1,400 employees that were laid off at Ipsco. I think that they have to take credit for the some 200 jobs that have been lost at SGI.

I think that they have to take credit, Mr. Speaker, for the 300 employees that are going to be laid off at PAPCO this summer. And I think that they have to take credit for the 90 employees that are going to lose their jobs at the Woodland Enterprises in Prince Albert. And they also have to take credit for the fact that they are going to offer the jobs for the employees from Woodland Enterprises to plant trees this summer — jobs that were ordinarily kept for the high school students and university students for summer jobs. They have to take credit for that.

Mr. Speaker, they're going to have to take credit for the 19 per cent increase in Sask Tel rates that they are now proposing. They're going to have to take credit for the automobile insurance's that are increasing, and the power rates that are continually going up.

Mr. Speaker, they're going to have to also take credit for some of our towns, especially in my area, that are having problems, the business communities that are having problems because of their policies in the wood industry. And I give Meadow Lake as a good example, Mr. Speaker, where the business community is having a lot of problems.

But yet this government, in their wisdom, decides to have only one shift work at the Meadow Lake sawmill. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if that sawmill was to run two shifts, it would be a great asset to the forest industry in the Meadow Lake area and to the business community in Meadow Lake.

Mr. Speaker, I want to now turn to northern Saskatchewan. I was very disappointed in the throne speech to see that there was absolutely nothing mentioned about northern Saskatchewan, except a municipal, a new municipal act that they are proposing for northern Saskatchewan, and that is very vague.

I knew, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens of northern Saskatchewan were in trouble as soon as this government took power. It only took a few days for me to realize that, for the citizens of Saskatchewan to realize that, when the Minister of Transportation cancelled our bus route from La Loche to Meadow Lake to serve the communities through that area. He just chopped it right off — cancelled it. It didn't take him long — only a few days — to cancel that bus route. And he said in crown corporations, 'We will put that bus route in, but we want input from northern Saskatchewan, from the citizens of northern

Saskatchewan.'

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, every community on that route from Meadow Lake to La Loche have sent in written submissions and requests to the Minister of Highways and Transportation, to have that bus route implemented. And to date, he has continually said no.

I look forward to that budget on Tuesday night to see if that bus route is going to be in there. The Minister of Finance indicates that it's not going to be in that budget. I, I think, I'm not too sure what the citizens of northern Saskatchewan can look forward to in that budget. But I tell you, things are very bad in northern Saskatchewan.

Since this government has taken over, we have unemployment rates from 80 per cent, and some of the times close to 100 per cent. And when you take a look at the magnitude of that and what it does to the citizens of northern Saskatchewan, it is demoralizing. It's back to the pre-1971, when everybody was on welfare and there was no opportunities.

During the last seven years, Mr. Speaker, northern Saskatchewan has seen many, many improvements: to the highway system; to the road system; bridges; new schools; new hospitals; sewer and water systems; telephone; power lines. All this took place in the last seven years. Now, Mr. Speaker, one year later, after the Conservative government has taken power, housing has come to a complete stop, road-building has come to a complete stop, highway construction has come to a complete stop.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing in the throne speech to indicate that that's going to be changed. And I think that the citizens of northern Saskatchewan deserve a lot more than they're getting from this government, than welfare and unemployment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — And that's what they're getting. Well, I look forward to the budget on Tuesday evening to see just what is in the budget for northern Saskatchewan. And I sincerely hope that this government won't forget northern Saskatchewan the way they have in their first year in, in this province, this term. I hope that there will be many, many opportunities . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Minister of Finance is going to, going to be putting a lot of money in Prince Albert-Duck Lake, and rightly so. They've just come through with a victory there, and probably that's where all the money for northern Saskatchewan is going to go.

**Some Hon. Members:** — — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — I sincerely hope, I sincerely hope that the budget, the budget that the minister brings down won't be as, as cruel as the one which was just brought down in Albert today. They, they have . . . Families will be paying hospitalization rates, 34 per cent; 48 per cent increased, individuals. Hospitalization in Alberta — just came down today — 37 per cent increase, staff cuts, no capital projects. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what that's going to mean in the economy of Saskatchewan. We have all the Alberta labour forces come into Saskatchewan now, and now with, now with a budget like this and a over \$800 million deficit, we are going to have many, many more Albertans coming into Saskatchewan looking for jobs. And they are going to be taking the coffers, taking the money from social services and taking jobs away from Saskatchewan people.

A good example is the, is the new project that was started in Saskatoon, given to an

Alberta firm, and what are they doing? They're bringing in Alberta labour. That's right, Mr. Speaker, they're bringing in Alberta labour. And this . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings under rule 13(3), and to put the question on the amendment at this time.

(Just prior to putting the question on the recorded division, Mr. Speaker requested those members who had entered the Chamber after the division bells stopped ringing, to leave. After those members left, Mr. Speaker proceeded with the recorded division.)

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 6**

Blakeney  
Koskie

Thompson  
Lusney

Lingenfelter  
Yew

**NAYS — 34**

Devine  
Muirhead  
McLeod  
Katzman  
Hampton  
Tusa  
Petersen  
Hopfner  
Young  
Dirks  
Zazelenchuk  
Dutchak

Birkbeck  
Sandberg  
McLaren  
Currie  
Weiman  
Hodgins  
Glauser  
Martens  
Gerich  
Hepworth  
Johnson

Andrew  
Hardy  
Klein  
Smith (Swift Current)  
Bacon  
Sauder  
Schmidt  
Rybchuk  
Domotor  
Myers  
Baker

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the member for Cumberland is speaking in this debate and wishes, I know to, to continue to speak. There was some suggestion that, that, that we take condolence motions at this time, and I simply want to invite the House Leader to give a brief statement. I'm, we are perfectly happy to have either arrangement.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, originally what was planned in House business would be that the, both members would speak prior to the vote at 12:30. The timing of speeches dragged on. Of course, the vote must come not later than 12:30. The intention of the process now would be for the hon. member from Athabasca to speak . . . Cumberland to speak, following which time the debate would be adjourned. At that point we would deal with the motion of condolences to Mr. Woods, former Mr. Woods.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, members of the Assembly, for the recognition. Earlier in the debate, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talked about what was missing in the throne speech. He talked about the forgotten people, and rightfully so — the people that this government has no time for, it seems, no compassion, and very little concern. Among those people, among those forgotten people, I am sorry to say, are the people that I and my colleague, the member for Athabasca, represent in this legislature — the people of northern Saskatchewan,



Mr. Speaker.

In just a few days this government will have completed the dismantling of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan — the one biggest single cut in government programs and service to any one group of people in our province, province's history, Mr. Speaker. And what does this legislative plan for the 1983 session say to them in terms of the throne speech? Little or no mention at all. No mention of northern Saskatchewan, except for two lines on Bill 61. Not one word about this government's plans to find jobs, to initiate jobs for Northerners, how this government plans to provide needed services to northern Saskatchewan, to Northerners.

There is a crisis in northern Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker. Last month there were nearly 2,000 people registered as looking for work at the La Ronge district Canada Employment Centre, and only 152 new job vacancies were there. The number of unemployed registered there is up by 38 per cent from February a year ago. In the northern administration district there are now more than 1,700 people on welfare and social assistance. And what is the government's response to this crisis? Nothing but cutbacks, Mr. Speaker. They cut, they cut back more than \$6 million from the budget for the northern highway construction portion of the budget that was introduced last March. Where is the La Ronge hospital? And where is the La Ronge training centre? And where are all the other community projects that were introduced in the last budget of March 1982? On hold, Mr. Speaker, on hold.

The throne speech is silent on an economic development plan for northern Saskatchewan. The speech is also silent on programs for native people. Not once are Saskatchewan's native people, whether they live in southern or northern Saskatchewan, mentioned in the speech. Not once were they mentioned in the throne speech. The NDP budget of last March proposed a native economic development fund, a native economic development foundation, to help the native people build a more secure economic future for themselves.

Today the government members and the government of the day has killed that plan, that initiative. Was there any mention that the government will introduce a new vision, version of a native economic development plan during the session, Mr. Speaker? Not once. The minister responsible for native affairs these days seems to be more interested in provoking a battle with, with the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians than with attempting to work jointly with the native people to improve our economic future.

I was also disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the government included no mention of the recently completed first ministers' conference on native self-government. I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the throne speech didn't contain any reference to that conference. The government reached . . . the agreement reached between native leaders and the premiers and the Prime Minister of Ottawa was a historic achievement. There is still much work to be done but at least the governments of Canada have recognized the right of native people to be at the bargaining table when their future is being determined, and the long road to native control over their own lives looks a little brighter and a little shorter now.

The constitutional agreement requires a resolution by this Assembly. I would hope that the government would bring that resolution forward soon, so that all members of this Legislative Assembly can debate it and turn their minds to the problems facing native people in our province today.

Where the government does take action, Mr. Speaker, as with the dismantling of DNS it seems, it seems to be bent on tearing down what has built up in northern Saskatchewan. Over the past 11 years many gains have been made. Northern people were beginning to see some light at the end of the tunnel. But not any more, Mr. Speaker, not any more. This government's actions, or the lack of it, for northern Saskatchewan has turned the North back a good many years.

There is another area where this Conservative government seems determined to take action that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, and that is legal aid. The Attorney General tells us that the plans to introduce legislation to implement the recommendations of the McPherson report on legal aid. Among the recommendations in that report, Mr. Speaker, is the suggestion that the legal aid clinics answer more to bureaucrats in Regina than to local people. Centralized control is the watchword of that report, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that a move to more centralized control would be bad news for northern people. The legal system is frightening enough and remote enough to most Northerners, particularly native Northerners. That is why when we seek legal aid, they should be dealing with a system that has as much local autonomy as possible. To subject these people to yet another level of bureaucracy that is nearly 400 kilometres away, will only lead to increased suspicion and frustration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few moments now talking about an issue which is concerning a growing number of people, a growing number of people, not just in Saskatchewan, but throughout Canada and around the world. The issue is the global arms race and the need to stop, to put a stop to it before mankind destroys itself and this planet. Some government members have spoken about this issue during the throne speech debate. They seem to want to belittle the importance of this issue, to ignore the threat that the nuclear arms race posed to our future. They also seem to be suggesting that the issue is a concern to only a noisy few. I wish to disagree with that suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

Last fall, municipalities across Canada agreed to put the subject of global disarmament on the ballot. And from one end of this country to the other the vote was overwhelmingly in favour of global disarmament. A Gallup poll in December showed 52 per cent of Canadians opposing, opposed to the testing of the cruise missile in Canada, and only 37 per cent in favour. So, the opposition to stepping up the arms race is not limited to a noisy minority, Mr. Speaker. In fact, support for a global disarmament is coming from some very unexpected quarters these days.

I have here the February issue of *Legion* magazine. The cover story in this issue is: 'The Spectre of Armageddon, the Last Battle of Mankind.' In the magazine there is an impassioned plea for world-wide nuclear disarmament, not from young people, not from an environmental group, not from some peace council, but from a group which calls itself 'Veterans for the Multilateral Disarmament.'

These veterans of war argue that the world has to step back from the brink of the next, from the brink of a third world war, because mankind would never survive a nuclear conflict.

This article also quotes Hans Bethe, the American nuclear physicist who helped to develop the first atomic bomb or bombs, who later won the Nobel prize. Hans Bethe has been a strategic adviser to the United States government for years. Still, when he appeared before the Armed Service Committee of the United States Senate last year, he

said, and I quote:

Our national security, and that of our allies is most threatened by the tremendous size and continuing growth of both nuclear arms and nuclear arsenals.

Hans Bethe was speaking out against Ronald Reagan's plan to add the MX missile, the B-1 bomber, the stealth bomber, the neutron bomb, and the cruise missile to the already huge supply of overkill. But perhaps the government members who have risen in this debate to speak against global disarmament would now be prepared to listen to the warnings of war veterans or scientific experts.

In that case, Mr. Speaker, perhaps they will be prepared to listen to the warnings of a great military leader, Admiral of the Fleet Earl Mountbatten. Before his death, Mr. Speaker, he also spoke out many times about the escalating nuclear arms race. In 1979 Earl Mountbatten said, and I quote:

As a military man who has given half a century of active service, I say in all sincerity that the nuclear arms race has no military purpose. Wars cannot be won, wars cannot be fought with nuclear weapons. Their existence only adds to our perils, because of the illusions they have generated.

That is the words that was uttered by Admiral of the Fleet Earl Mountbatten in 1979.

I tell the government members all this, Mr. Speaker, to simply warn them that the cause for global disarmament are not the noisy rhetoric of a few, but the heartfelt concerns of very many.

Which brings me specifically to the cruise missile and the issue of whether or not Canada should allow it to be tested over our airspace.

I have a very deep concern, personal interest in this issue, Mr. Speaker. My father and I used to trap and fish in the area in northwestern Saskatchewan now known as the Primrose Air Weapons Range. This land has been inhabited by my people for generations. I do not want to see their land, their communities, their homes to be put at risk so that the United States can experiment with their cruise missile. My people do not want to see this area of the province become a part of insanity, of the insanity of the nuclear arms race.

Let there be no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. The cruise missile is not a defensive nuclear weapon. It has been built with one purpose, and one purpose only. It has been built to provide the United States with a first-strike capability. It is an offensive nuclear weapon, the kind of weapon which will be used to start the next nuclear war. It's not a defensive weapon. The United States government will not experiment with this weapon over its own soil, because there is great opposition to those tests, and those tests will be damaging politically for the Reagan administration.

So they turn to Canada, and ask us to submit to the experiments with a weapon that they won't test themselves. That is why . . . That is what they're asking us to do, Mr. Speaker. That is neither fair nor reasonable of them to request from us as an ally. But in spite of the widespread opposition to cruise missile tests in Canada, the Trudeau Liberals have signed an umbrella testing agreement with the United States, and the American request for a cruise missile test is the next step. Listening to Mr. Trudeau the other day,

it is clear that the Canadian government will agree to that request. And shortly the skies over northwestern Saskatchewan will be filled with the next generation of the death machine.

While all this has been happening, Mr. Speaker, what has been the response of our Conservative government here in Saskatchewan? What has been their response? Silence, Mr. Speaker — utter silence.

On March the 7th, in this Assembly, when I asked the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs what the Saskatchewan government's position was with respect to cruise testing, he said, and I quote, 'We have deep concerns. We have deep concerns.' But he then went on to say, 'It's a matter purely to be determined by the federal government.' That's what the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs stated, Mr. Speaker. The minister explained that the national defence is totally a federal government responsibility.

But so is rail transportation a federal responsibility, Mr. Speaker. And that certainly hasn't stopped the Conservative government from saying what it thinks about the Pepin plan. I say, rightly so. But if you can launch a campaign to put pressure on the federal government in one case, why not the other?

I would like to see the minister table all correspondence that his government has had with the Trudeau Liberals about the cruise missile testing. How many times have you contacted Ottawa in this issue . . . on this issue? And how strongly have you worded your protests, if any? Or are you just trying to sit on the fence of this issue?

Some members of your caucus, including the Premier, have spoken out in favour of cruise missile testing over our province. The Minister of Intergovernmental affairs says that the government is concerned. The government is concerned. You can't play politics with world peace, Mr. Speaker. To quote one of the Premier's favourite phrases: 'You're either part of the solution, or you're part of the problem.'

I urge the Conservative government today to get off the fence of the cruise missile testing issue. If you have protested to Ottawa about the testing, table the documents to prove it, and to show what you have told them in full. If you have not, then get on with the job of launching a campaign against the Trudeau Liberals and their plans to allow this offensive nuclear weapon over our province.

Mr. Speaker, the testing of cruise missiles in Canada is a very serious issue, one that should be responded with from our provincial government.

I want to turn now, just briefly, to a meeting I attended yesterday with the hon. member from the Meadow Lake constituency. I had the opportunity to, to attend this meeting on invitation, as it relates to the throne speech. The people in this northern area meeting — a meeting of local governments, a meeting of northern communities — wanted to know what the throne speech had in terms of social, cultural and economic opportunities for them. They wanted to talk about serious matters that concerned their communities, and I had the opportunity to attend this meeting with the minister for northern Saskatchewan, along with one of our colleagues, the member for Prince Albert, Mr. Meagher. I made a presentation to the people, to this delegation, and I had very little to report to this delegation in terms of what opportunities there were in the throne speech for the people of northern Saskatchewan. In fact, I could only find two lines that related to the people in the North, and that was the two lines that referred to The Northern

Municipalities Act. The people were concerned, Mr. Speaker. They had their hopes up, very optimistic. They were hoping that the minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, the minister that has been given the responsibility to advocate on behalf of northern people, would provide them with some good news, would provide them with some optimism. But Mr. Speaker, it didn't turn out that way.

The people were there to talk about housing and economic development. They were there to talk about economic development. They were there to talk about training and education. They were there to talk about the surface lease agreements, and they were there to talk about Bill 61, and related matters to Bill 61, in terms of revenue sharing, in terms of corporate boundaries, in terms of The Planning and Development Act.

They had a huge list of concerns and issue that related specifically to them, and they were at the meeting in an open-minded way, in a co-operative way. Just prior to the meeting three of them approached me, and came out with the suggestion that they wanted to avoid confrontation. They wanted to sit down and discuss quite frankly and openly with the minister their very serious concerns and issues. But what happened there, Mr. Speaker? The minister perpetuated confrontation. The minister that was responsible to advocate for those people perpetuated confrontation. I say that because I was there. I don't have to go to details regarding this matter. It is a very serious matter, and one that the members in government will probably feel in coming days to come.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to turn to personalities, not like the members in government have done throughout the throne speech debate. I am not that way, Mr. Speaker. That is not part of my way of life. I believe that the members in government have been given a responsibility. On April 26 of 1982, they were given a responsibility and I respect that responsibility and the judgment of the people in this province. It was unfortunate for the members opposite, but fine, that is something that we have to accept. But I say this to you, members in government. You were given the responsibility, and I would hope that you live up to that responsibility. There are people in the northern administration district that are citizens of this province, that you cannot ignore. Sure, they may be a minority — they only represent 4 per cent of the total voting population in this province, and that's not very much when it comes to politics.

In the past 10-11 months, all I have heard from the members in government is a lot of arrogance, a lot of gloating, a lot of self-congratulatory phrases. I tell the members opposite, or the members in government, that the election was over 11 months ago. It is now time to live up to your responsibility as elected government officials, and provide leadership, provide the kind of service, services, programs and policies that are required by the people of this province — not only the majority groups, but also the minority groups.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned and troubled with the proposal in terms of supporting the throne speech, and when the vote was taken a while ago, I had no other choice but to support the amendment, because of the reality of that amendment, the truth behind that amendment that was presented. I supported the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to reiterate that I cannot support the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to reiterate that I cannot support the main motion. With that, I thank the Assembly for hearing me out. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you pardon the pun, I have a few short remarks to make in reply to the Speech from the Throne; however, I notice that the hour is

drawing near and perhaps it would be best served that I save these remarks for another day. I therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### CONDOLENCES

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney of Regina Elphinstone:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former member of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan. **Everett Irvin Wood**, who died on March 20th, 1983, was a member of this legislature for Swift Current from 1956 to 1975. Born at Swift Current in 1910, he was educated at Swift Current College and the Canadian Pentecostal Bible College at Winnipeg, Manitoba. He served as a councilor of the rural municipality of Saskatchewan Landing from 1947 to 1950, and as reeve of Saskatchewan Landing from 1952 to 1956.

In the Legislative Assembly he served as Speaker of the House in 1961. He was chairman of the public accounts committee from 1968 to 1971, held a cabinet portfolio of municipal affairs from 1961 to 1964 and again from 1971 to 1975, and he was minister of public works from 1971 to 1972.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathy with members of the bereaved family.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, as the motion has already indicated, or implied, Everett Wood served as a member of this Assembly for almost 20 years. He was first elected in 1956, and re-elected in 1960, and in 1964, and 1967, and 1971. He was extremely highly regarded in his constituency by political supporters and political opponents alike. Indeed, it was the conventional wisdom in our party that we didn't know what our party support in Swift Current was. We believed, and on good grounds, that many people simply hadn't made up their minds whether they supported our party or not, because they knew that in any case they were going to vote for Everett Wood, and that seemed to dispose of the issue for them.

He certainly had broad-based support from many, many sectors of the community, and this widespread support flowed from a respect which people had for Everett, respect for an honourable man, and an intelligent man.

I served in, in the cabinet of, of Woodrow Lloyd with Everett from 1961 to 1964. I served in opposition for seven years with him from 1964 to 1971, and then again as a cabinet colleague of his from 1971 to 1975. Everett retired in 1975 because his health had begun to give concern, and there was evidence of the cancer which eventually took his life.

In these years that I have known Everett, I developed a profound respect for Everett at several levels. He seemed incapable of any petty or mean action. He was a man of strong religious convictions, and he lived those convictions, and yet he was tolerant of those who had different views. He was good fun at a party. He could rip out some tunes on the piano with a good solid beat. He liked music. He sang a good deal. He had a

repertoire of, of religious songs, but also of secular songs. He just enjoyed life and had that sort of spirit which made it a pleasure to be around him.

He had a profound knowledge of rural Saskatchewan. He was born on the family farm that's been in the family for 80 or 90 years, a very long period of time. He farmed for many years, and he was a good farmer. He was a councilor and a reeve of the R.M. of Saskatchewan Landing, the area in which he lived, and when he joined the cabinet, he was a natural as Minister of Municipal Affairs. And I think that in my travels across this province, particularly when I was premier, talking with different people, I don't think I ever ran into a municipal person who ever spoke of Everett other than in words of respect, and usually of affection, and that's not always true of all the ministers one has. This is not to suggest that the criticisms at the public levels are justified, but to find an occasion when virtually none are even implied is to find a man who was able to establish a quite remarkable rapport with the people with whom he worked. Everett was not only principled but he was bright and, perhaps even rarer, he was wise. He had a sort of a slow and different way of speaking and this caused some to believe that Everett was a little slow on the uptake. If they fell into that error, they soon knew that they were wrong when a bit of analysis what came out indicated that it was shrewd and very much to the point.

When we were forming our government in 1971, we had many new ministers and a few older ones who had been in previous cabinets and I was very interested to watch the respect which grew among the newer ministers, the respect for Everett Wood who didn't enter the discussion immediately but when he did, had made the salient comment. And it wasn't long before, in many areas, people deferred to Everett and decided to hear him out before people speculated on what was the appropriate solution for a problem. He had that sort of, of wisdom and solid appreciation of what he, what the public was thinking that is relatively rare in public life.

Everett and his wife Yvonne were warm hosts. I've enjoyed their hospitality on many occasions and so have many others and I've met a good number of people at the, at the Wood household from time to time. I've felt welcome there and so did other people.

Saskatchewan public life has lost an outstanding man. That this was evident, at least to the people of Swift Current, was clear by the, by the very large funeral which I attended yesterday. I know that unfortunate weather conditions prevented the Hon. Mrs. Smith from, from being there and I suspect she regretted being there, not being there and I passed on her regrets to Yvonne Wood and to others who were there.

One, in the course of one's political life, runs into, meets with many, many people. I've met remarkably few for whom I had the level of respect that I had for Everett Wood. And I want to express, on behalf of my colleagues, deep sympathy to his wife Yvonne, to their son Duncan, and to other members of the bereaved family.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, as the member for the Swift Current constituency, I rise today with a great deal of sadness and regret for the passing of E.I. Wood. The loss to the family is indeed matched by the respect that the people of Swift Current held for Mr. Wood. On the street level he was probably better known as simply 'E.I.' as opposed to Mr. Wood or even as Everett.

Mr. Wood represented them well for approximately 18 years and he continued to take a very active interest in rural and community affairs, particularly through the Rotary Club and through his church and several other activities of his interest, after his retirement

from politics.

E.I. served as our MLA at a time when that particular constituency was a combination of rural and urban and his ability to understand both the urban and the rural people is perhaps what was impressed upon my mind. It was also an indication of his listening skills and his ability to communicate, but more importantly, his commitment to people first over politics. He will be missed but he will also be remembered and perhaps, in the long run, that is all that we can ask for.

Mr. Speaker, I join with both sides of the House today in paying tribute to E I. Wood, and extending sympathies on behalf of the constituency to the family.

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The record of the former member from Swift Current has spoken for itself, not only in the Assembly, but throughout the province and his constituency. Mr. Wood's consistency, his sense of fairness, his firm commitment to principles in the lifestyle he chose, were an example to, to many, including myself.

I would like to extend to his family my condolences, and on behalf of the rural constituency and municipality which he served, I would like to join with this Assembly in extending my sympathy to his family.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague from Elphinstone and other members of the Assembly who have expressed their sincere sympathy to the family of Everett Wood — Yvonne and Duncan, son, Duncan, who we came to know very well over the last five or six years. I did not have an opportunity to serve in the Assembly with Everett but I came to know him very well over the last few years when I became an MLA, because Everett would get a hold of me quite often with a problem that, that he would think needed to be worked on immediately. And it didn't matter who the person was, whether they were of his political affiliation, NDP, NDP or Conservative or Liberal, he expected you to have an answer back that day so that he could get on with continuing his role, as he saw it, of serving the people of Swift Current and area.

And I think that that says a lot for an individual, and I suppose we can all learn something from Everett in terms of carrying out our duties as MLAs and representatives of different areas — that regardless of whether you're elected with 70 per cent of the support for your party or, or 45, that your job, once elected, is to care for the needs of all your constituents.

But I think the other important thing that Everett brought with him to the Assembly and to the many groups that he belonged to, whether it was the farmers' union or the wheat pool or, or the R.M. council, was that he was a defender of those people who were least able to defend themselves. And in carrying out that duty he made a point of letting people know that he was a defender of people on the basis that each individual was equal, and that power was not based in money and, and finance and worldly goods, but was based in the, in the goodness of people.

I would just like to join the other members in, in bringing condolence, both as an individual and as a representative of the Shaunavon constituency, and as a member of the NDP caucus.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I would join with the other members of the House in this condolence motion, and I, I should say at the outset my, my own association with



Everett Wood was rather brief. It goes back to when I was on the town council in Meadow Lake and Mr. Wood was the Minister of municipal affairs. We had a, a very ticklish situation in the building of our rink in Meadow Lake, and I just wanted to relay this incident to show the principles that the man brought to politics and to government. We . . . It was, it was said by our major at that time and by people that we could contact within municipal affairs, 'If you could, if you could get, as a council, get Mr. Wood to, to come into town and to meet with you and to, to cut through a good deal of, of red tape and so on, whatever Everett Wood says at that meeting will be the course of action that will be followed and you can rest assured that his word is absolute gold.'

And I would say that that was exactly what happened in this particular case, and I, I just wanted to relay that, that incident in, in this particular condolence motion to show that, the appreciation of the people in my area and, certainly, of the areas of all corners of this province, to the types of principles that Mr. Wood brought to, to government and to politics in general. And certainly public life will, will miss a man of his, of his principles and of his background.

So I would join with all members in, in expressing condolences to the family.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney, Regina Elphinstone:

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 this Assembly.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:25 p.m.