

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

November 24, 1977

EVENING SESSION

CONSENT GIVEN TO DEFER THRONE SPEECH DEBATE WITHOUT ADJOURNMENT

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — I would request a moment of the Assembly's time to just present to you a brief problem. Due to the (I suppose) greenness of some of the whips that were involved today because the regular whips were away, due to our own misunderstanding and because of the fact that the House sits tonight, I am afraid that we have come to a position in which, in order to co-operate and get on with the Throne Speech, it was our understanding throughout, by the whips and everyone else, that I could call it 5:00 o'clock tonight and then they could go on with the Throne Speech tonight and tomorrow I would be able to pick it up with 20 minutes of radio time left. Unfortunately, if I had adjourned debate at 5:00 o'clock or asked for leave to adjourn debate at 5:00, that meant that we couldn't go on with the Throne Speech tonight.

I wonder, because of the unique circumstances of this particular Address-in-Reply and because of the unique circumstances of what occurred today, would it be possible for you to request the House, on a one-time basis — on a unanimous basis, to allow me to speak tomorrow and not adjourn debate so we could proceed with the Throne Speech tonight without me doing it — by leave?

MR. SPEAKER: — I realize the predicament that the member is in and I will ask the House for consent. But, however, before I ask the House for consent I must caution the House about the situation we are in, namely, that the speaker that was on his feet at 5:00 o'clock must continue to speak at this time or will have lost his right to speak and if, in fact, he adjourns the debate at any time between now and 10:00 o'clock that will conclude the discussion of the Throne Speech for today, and he would be precluded from getting back into the discussion tomorrow.

What we are doing if we give consent to the member to do this, unanimous consent of the House, is that we are saying in effect that a member can ask to debate and then get out of the debate and then get back into the debate at a later time. This gives the member an advantage, although the member may not be seeking that advantage in this case. It does give the member an opportunity to make some remarks, step out of the debate, come back in later and rebut remarks which had been made between his first appearance in the debate and his second appearance in the debate. Having drawn your attention to these items I will now ask the Assembly if there is unanimous consent to allow the member of the debate to continue with other members interceding and the member for Nipawin going tomorrow, as I understand it, on the last 20 minutes of air time. Consent agreed to.

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — I am pleased to have this opportunity to participate in this, what I think, important Throne Speech debate, and at the outset allow me to add my personal congratulations to the mover and the seconder. Their individual perception of this Throne Speech has indeed, I think, been positive, and I congratulate them both on a job well done.

I was, Mr. Speaker, however, disappointed with the evaluation of members opposite in

terms of their participation in this debate, because I always think that Throne Speeches have traditionally provided a general assessment of the economic and social realities of the province, and at the same time provided in most general terms an indication of future initiatives which the government will present during the course of the legislative session.

Members opposite appear to have difficulty in understanding this fact of life. I would have to say that the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) was critical because there weren't enough specifics; there wasn't sufficient detail. Judging from past performance, the member for Nipawin and the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, I would say, should be the last people to complain about lack of specifics, because I believe that that if ever there was a party unwilling to attach itself to specific policies in relationship to any area of government responsibilities, that is the position of the Conservative Party.

They say that they would do away with Land Bank. We have heard that quite frequently. They would eliminate the Potash Corporation. They would radically cut out government involvement in many ongoing programs. They would stop this and they would end that.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe it is well enough to tell the people what you are against, but I think that what the people want to know and what we want to know and what the public demands is 'what are you proposing to do as an alternative? Where are your policies and your programs?' The public is asking them to hold them up for public examination. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Conservatives in this Legislature soon come to grips with the real issues that are facing this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to offer this Assembly a few thoughts in relationship to this Throne Speech.

On the issue of national unity, the Throne Speech articulates what I feel is a very, very important assessment of our province in terms of the confederation framework. And I quote, and I'm quoting from the Throne Speech:

The efforts of my government are directed towards finding new ways of defining confederation so that Canadians from all regions will feel a renewed sense of commitment and loyalty to their nation.

"A renewed sense of commitment" — the key phrase, Mr. Speaker. The vast majority of Saskatchewan people I feel are committed Canadians, yet they feel, and with justification, that our role in confederation and the contribution we are able to make has been effectively diminished. No one questions the loyalty we all share in terms of a united Canada. Yet, several reservations we share with other western Canadians have prevented the solidification of commitment, which many feel is necessary if we are to become equal partners in a united and unified Canada. Issues such as tariff protection, transportation, resource policy, multi-culturalism, are, Mr. Speaker, but some of the major issues which come to mind when we examine the concerns we have about the status quo relative to confederation. These concerns, however, do not prevent us from continuing to pursue a renewed commitment in terms of our nation. In fact, I feel the concerns of Quebec people and the questions they have raised will in the final analysis contribute to an over-all examination and an eventual new basis for the Canadian federation.

The challenges before us are all indeed immense. It will take, I think, a collective effort, a by-partisan effort. I say to you that the stakes are high, too high, to allow the debate to

be compromised by partisan politics. Granted, many of the serious policies, questions, are the result of political decision-making. Yet I am sure that we can attach ourselves to the collective ideals of all Canadians without being sidetracked by narrow, political ideology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Canada is a great country. Its greatness did not just happen. Sacrifice and dedication were needed by many to ensure its growth and its development. The concerns of Quebec are well known. The great Quebec debate has perhaps had a positive side effect. The questions raised by that province have started a process involving all Canadians, in terms of their own personal evaluation of Canada as a nation. The Quebec debate has enabled us all to develop a better awareness in terms, Mr. Speaker, of our individual relationship to the federation, and as to what it means and what changes are needed.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, Canada will survive. I am confident that out of this present crisis will immerge a much stronger nation, a nation of greater commitment, a people with more understanding and governments with greater knowledge.

Now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to say a few words about our economy. In many respects our province stands out as something unique and apart from the other provinces of Canada. As other provinces struggle to offset the tremendous pressure being imposed on their economy as a result of rampant inflation as a result of rampant inflation, high unemployment, declining gross national product and a rising trade deficit, Saskatchewan has been able to shield itself from this economic recession. Might I remind you, Mr. Speaker, our good fortune didn't just happen. Members opposite perhaps find it convenient to ignore the facts, yet the facts cannot be disputed.

In many respects, our good fortune, can be attributed directly to the policies and the programs of this New Democratic Party government. Responsibility, and stability, are two fundamentally important factors in relationship to the economic growth of this province in the past six years. Our record in agriculture stands out as a model of commitment for prairie farmers. Our commitment to Saskatchewan agriculture is unyielding, which is something members opposite cannot state honestly.

What was the record of the former Liberal government when Saskatchewan farmers were faced with economic pressures? Where were they, when support programs were needed to provide some stability to the agriculture industry? Where was the former Liberal government when the problems of land tenure started to intensify? Where were Saskatchewan Liberals when Saskatchewan farmers were pleading for support and marketing programs to assist them in the marketing of their produce?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the questions are many and members opposite still cannot figure out why they are sitting in the opposition. And what about the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker. Where are their agricultural policies? What will they do? We know they will abolish the land bank and several of our other popular grants and support programs but I ask you what is their program in relationship to agriculture. I haven't heard it. Conservatives don't seem to have many planks in their platform but I suppose that I could assume Mr. Speaker that their federal leader speaks for them when he says he supports competition in the marketing of all prairie grains. So I say to you, Mr. Speaker,

that I challenge the Conservative members opposite to set the record straight. Is it their policy to allow the private market system to compete with the Wheat Board? Are they in favour of this direct assault of the marketing system of the Canadian Wheat Board and if they do not agree, why don't they tell the public? Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this province want to know where they stand on this fundamentally important issue?

Another key factor relative to the economic stability we enjoy in Saskatchewan is the position of this government in terms of resource development. Members opposite can't, or won't accept our premise that the people of Saskatchewan should enjoy more control and receive a greater share of our natural resources. Let me remind you, the recent announcement by INCO that they are pulling the pin on thousands of Canadian workers in Sudbury and Thompson, Manitoba should reinforce our commitment in terms of resource policies of this government. The fact that this large multinational corporation should be able to just pull up stakes at a whim and take all their profits with them to explore resource potential elsewhere, is indicative of where Tories and Liberals stand in relationship to resource policy.

Right now in the House of Commons the debate continues on taxation adjustment which will, if approved actually give INCO \$70 million. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, \$70 million as a reward for putting 4,500 Canadians on the unemployment roll. That's what's happening. And who is the only party opposing the legislation? I ask you, who is the only party? Are the Conservatives against it? Of course not. How could they oppose legislation which would help INCO, when we are told INCO contributes massive sums to the Conservative party election coffers, so why would they oppose it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is only the New Democratic Party which has the determination and commitment to stand up against such inequitable legislation. The entire INCO issue brings up a very important question. I am sure members opposite might say — why bring that question up? That happened in Manitoba and in Ontario — we're interested in what has happened in Saskatchewan. I can hear them saying that. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the question is important because if members opposite ever get the change to govern this province, multinational resource companies will be at the doorstep with the same deal for Saskatchewan and Tories and Liberals will say, 'go ahead'. That's what worries me. We say, Mr. Speaker, 'No', 'No', to this kind of development and our determination is already paying dividends; dividends members opposite would unilaterally turn over to the bank accounts of their corporate friends, if given the opportunity to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech succeeds in providing a positive assessment of the economic and social activities of Saskatchewan. I am proud to be associated with a government which has the determination to meet the challenges of Saskatchewan in a very positive and straight forward manner. We believe that progress has been recorded. We feel our initiatives have had a positive influence on our growth and development. I say to you, we do not pretend, however, to possess all the answers. The responsibilities to govern are indeed immense and no one knows that better than members of the Legislature. But we have been entrusted to build a better Saskatchewan and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that each member of this Assembly has been given that responsibility. Each member has the opportunity to contribute to that process and I say to you with that in mind. I sincerely wonder when some members opposite are going to begin to honor that commitment and fulfill that obligation.

I am particularly concerned about members of the Conservative caucus. They have had more than two years now to fulfill that promise and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that unless they

adopt a complete turn-about, that we won't be seeing many of them around after the next election. Time is limited for them. Saskatchewan has a tradition, and might I remind you, Saskatchewan has a tradition and history of progressive government. They demand sincerity and unqualified commitment from their government. I say to you that Saskatchewan will not tolerate anything less. It is my sincere hope and my challenge, Mr. Speaker, for members opposite to start thinking about that fact, and start thinking in the very near future because only then will their support and shaky credibility stabilize.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that from my remarks that you will notice I will obviously support the main motion because the Speech from the Throne is, I think, consistent with our ongoing commitment, and that commitment is to build a better Saskatchewan and it is because the amendment is not consistent with the confidence we share with Saskatchewan and its people, that I will be voting against the amendment.

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in the Throne Speech debate of this 4th session of the 18th Legislature, I would first like to congratulate the member for Pelly on taking his seat in the Legislature. It appears we haven't held his attention long enough and he has already left the House. And it seems to me that the PCs are too much worried about where they sit in this Legislature and it seems to me that the government opposite are too worried about the PCs as well. Why the PCs worry about where they sit is because there are so few of them here most of the time, they could almost sit any place in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the people in the agricultural industry were very fortunate this year in the Assiniboia-Gravelbourg constituency. Our crops were better than average and the majority of the high protein wheat was also in the top grades. The rain during the summer brought a good hay crop and the pastures produced rich grass for the many herds of very fine livestock of our area.

The price of grain appears to be moving up slowly and the beef price was much better than it was a year ago. We get a little tired sometimes of the doom and gloom coming from that other side. We are looking forward to a brighter future for agriculture.

I am pleased that the Premier was able to come to the constituency this summer to witness our very fine area. On his showcase tour it was not surprising that he reported the major concern appeared to be the deplorable condition of the provincial highways in our area. It is more surprising that nothing has been done to improve that situation. He should also have realized that his many aids detoured the worst highways and took him the long way around to get where he was going to ensure that the bus arrived with all the wheels on it.

I was most disappointed when the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan hustled off the members of the media out of a controversial meeting in Coronach. There was disappointment because the Premier was not better informed on the problems of that district. Rather than bring answers the Premier left more unanswered questions. I was also very disappointed that the Premier didn't go up and take a good look at the Bishopric area and the sodium sulphate plant that this government shut down.

Mr. Speaker at the risk of being repetitive I would like to tell the Premier and the minister in charge of SPC all is not well with the Poplar River Power project. I am sure the people appreciate the naming of the dam and the reservoir after two resident pioneers but they wonder why the government continues to harass and abuse the children and the

grandchildren of other pioneers of that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the farmers are still losing their farms through expropriation. Corridors for the power transmission lines are being expropriated without regard for the farmers. These transmission lines angle and turn through the best parts of fields when they could well have followed between fields for much more suitable routes. When the poles were being let off on these strips of expropriated land large machinery, semitrailer trucks and heavy equipment used the farmers' fields to make Uturns on to dump these poles. They ruined crops and packed down that land. Roadways were made through crops of lovely grain yet unthreshed when just a few 100 feet away vehicles could have driven on SPC expropriated property.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — A 300 foot corridor some six miles long between the coalfield and the power plant was also expropriated and where did it go? It curled and angled through the farmers' fields without any regard for individuals. And the minister knows right well without difficulty it could have followed the road allowance and caused much less hardship.

I witnessed the arrogant procedure in the area myself when I saw heavy equipment bulldozing down a young farmer's 40 bushel crop when he was pulling on the other end of the field with his combine. Mr. Speaker, it is little wonder the Minister in charge of SPC keeps far away from Coronach.

The Hart Butte municipal council were not surprised when this same corridor road was pushed across their road allowances without their permission and without any agreement for any safety devices on those crossings. After all this government has a power plant and a fence standing much of it on municipal road allowance property and they have no permission to be there with it. Arrogance has been very common to the local people when dealing with this government.

I want to tell the minister the well water problem is not satisfactory and there are more problems down stream from the dam. Wells there aren't short of water, they are running over and a higher water level necessary in the reservoir will only increase this problem. The farms on both sides of the river downstream are already deteriorating. The land is turning white as the water pushes the alkali to the top of the soil. This will spread for miles on both sides of the river and many miles and even south into Montana. I would strongly recommend immediate attention be given to this urgent problem before the farms are completely worthless. I again urge the minister to reach agreements with local people and local governments before proceeding rather than the continual practice of pushing through his plans and then talking after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — If his arrogance continues he may well be looking for another confrontation in the Coronach area in the very near future. The Minister in charge of SPC and the government of Saskatchewan are flirting with a very explosive problem with regard to the Poplar River power project. The non concern of the minister and the very light way he treats letters and requests from government in the United States could well cause an international incident for which he will be directly responsible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — The Premier as well must be held accountable when he allows the Minister of Highways of this province to visit Montana State capital on highway business and return saying all is well as far as problems in the Poplar River project is concerned. Did the Premier really send this Minister to quiet the pollution problems? I say that's a little like a farmer throwing a coyote in the chicken coop to quiet the chickens. Then the Premier has the audacity to blame Ottawa for poor communications. The Minister of the Environment in a letter of October 17, 1977, he assured there was no problems, all information requested was being forwarded to the United States government.

The Minister in charge of SPC in a letter of October 24, 1977, appeared to believe all information was getting through to the US. I have spoken to many representatives of the Montana government on several occasions and their opinion is quite different. Their briefs to the International Joint Commission certainly maintains the fact they are not pleased with the communications with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation or the Saskatchewan government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from testimony given by the Hon. Ted Schwinden, Lieutenant-Governor of the state of Montana to the International Joint Commission public hearings on the Poplar River water quality in Scobey, Montana, November 2nd, 1977 and I quote:

I am well aware of the water quality reference being considered here today and the earlier one on appropriation and they do not concern air quality control. However, with your permission, I would like to briefly tell you why we are seriously concerned of their quality.

Saskatchewan Power has given no indication it will attempt to control the sulfur dioxide emissions. No industry in Montana would be allowed that luxury of this neglect.

Montana encourages the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to use the best possible controls, both particulate and gaseous emissions. If the corporation uses the best possible controls on unit one, we believe that there will be no significant deterioration of the quality of Montana's air. On the other hand, if the best possible controls are not used, or if additional units are constructed there is a strong probability that there will be serious environmental impacts on human health, as well as vegetation growth and crop yield.

MR. MESSER: — Tell us about the water quality in Montana?

MR. NELSON: — You just sit there, Mr. Minister, and listen and pay attention.

MR. MESSER: — I'll do that.

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, does this sound like someone who agrees that all is well as the Minister of Highways professed?

November 24, 1977

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from a telegram sent September 28th, 1977, to the chairman of the United States section of the International Joint Commission in Washington, D.C., from the Governor of Montana and I quote:

I agree that critical information gaps presently exist including confusion regarding the conclusion of the burn test of the coal at the Boundary Dam station on December 18, 1975. Moreover, coal and leachate samples previously requested from Canadian officials have not been received as of this date. The lack of data makes the evaluation of potential transboundary effects, for all practical purposes, impossible at this point in time.

We in Montana, feel that it would be irresponsible to consider additional units to the Coronach complex when information on Unit 1 is inconclusive. I am convinced that a more responsible position would be to declare a moratorium on the future plant construction until a more proper evaluation can be made on the effects of Plant 1. Sincerely, Thomas J. Judge, Governor of Montana.

Mr. Speaker, does this sound like the government of Montana is satisfied with the information supplied by Saskatchewan, as our Minister of Natural Resources claims?

I would like to quote from testimony presented to the IJC in Scobey, November 2, 1977 by representative, Dennis Nathe of the Montana State Government.

Air quality agreements . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Now, some says this is Saskatchewan, well, mister, you better start worrying about our neighbors too. There aren't walls around this province, mister member from the north.

Air quality agreements were supposed to have been reached about three months ago, prior to a test burn of coal and these agreements were based on a 40 per cent retention of sulphur dioxide in fly ash particles. There still exists, critical data gaps on the test burn analysis which has not been supplied by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. That percentage of sulphur dioxide retention in the fly ash has never been adequately proven. It is just supposition. Indications are that this retention will only be in the order of 8 to 10 per cent. This amount of sulphur dioxide will definitely cause violations on our side of the border.

Mr. Speaker, these people are not satisfied with the information supplied by the government of Saskatchewan.

More feelings were expressed in a letter to Jerry Sperling, CBC, from the Lieutenant-Governor of the State of Montana, and that was dated October 21, 1977, and I quote:

In response to your telephone call earlier this week, we have prepared some information relative to the issues of data deficiency, delay and continuing concern.

Although there has been a voluminous and continuing exchange of information between Canada and the United States concerning the SPC development on the east fork of the Poplar River, critical data gaps still remain.

Since August, 1975, the State of Montana, the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the State Department have attempted to obtain specific technical data from the Sask Power Corporation. Specific substantial time delays have occurred in obtaining test burns, test burn procedures, fly ash distribution in the boiler system, delayed information of the physical plant layout, coal over-burn samples and trace elements analysis results on split coal samples.

Again, this letter indicates the very little data that they have actually received. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his government must realize that there is no clear understanding in Saskatchewan let alone south of the 49th parallel.

The government has the authority to proceed with one 300 megawatt plant only. Yet, when anyone visits the power plant at the site, and they ask, they are shown where each of the next three generators will be situated. While SPC is proceeding with haste, surely it would be wiser to get permission from the proper authorities before frightening the citizens of Saskatchewan, as well as the citizens of the United States.

The story of the Poplar River project has always been the same. Rush headlong into a situation and worry about the consequences later. Expropriate, never negotiate. That, Mr. Speaker, is a wrong attitude in a democratic society.

This government is not prepared to put the best pollution equipment on the smokestacks at Coronach. They know they will be dumping sulphur dioxide into the air. They believe the first stack will stay under reasonable standards. This government knows the best equipment available would stay well within that standard. They are not prepared to use it. They also know the second stack will be questionable whether or not it will stay within that standard for air quality.

The sulphur dioxide will be dumped into the atmosphere. It will be picked up by the moisture in the air and it will come down on the people, the crops and the cattle as a weak form of sulphuric acid. If it comes down on the grain in the flower stage, the yield will be affected. Damage to human health, to plants, to trees, to livestock will certainly happen. The people's concern over the possible damage is so great, Mr. Speaker, south of the border, that the federal government of the United States of America in Washington, D.C. has allocated \$620,000 to that area just south of the Poplar River power project. This \$620,000 was appropriated to gather baseline data and assess the environmental impacts of that project. This continual testing of the air, water and soil could well be the basis for damage against this province should any pollution or crop damage occur in the future. The price for the best safeguard equipment may look cheap at that time.

Sadly enough, the answer this government gives to the Americans is, that they believe the prevailing winds are from the south, so that the people in the United States won't have too great a problem. The Americans are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the wind generally blows from the north, and they believe the pollution will be dumped on their country.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not in the least concerned what direction the wind blows. I want our clean air not polluted. I don't want pollution dumped on the citizens of the United States or on the citizens of Canada. If equipment is available to do a better job, let's install the best safeguards. Not only for the protection of the citizens living today, but let's keep our atmosphere clean for the future generations as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time we asked the governments of both Canada and the United States to include air quality in a treaty similar to the 1909 Boundary Water Treaty which deals with water quality. Under such a treaty, the governments of both countries could honestly negotiate problems and questions such as we have in the Coronach area. Hopefully, then we could discuss concerns and resolve them in a mutually satisfactory way to the benefit of the environment of the peoples of both countries.

Air is no less important to the wellbeing of our citizens than is water. In my opinion, a treaty on air quality between our two great nations is long overdue. It is my hope that some day our children and grandchildren will recognize our contribution to a better world because our citizens had the foresight to establish a treaty on air quality.

Mr. Speaker, another issue that is most important to the entire province is that of reclamation of land. I can find nothing in the statute books of Saskatchewan suggesting that land that has been used for farming and producing grain and food for the world that has been disturbed for mining or whatever, should be brought back to a state where grain can again be grown on that land.

We, in Saskatchewan, more than anywhere else, know the value of good farm land. Yet regulations under the Mines Regulation Act failed to mention the return of land to a state where grain can be produced.

The area being torn up in the coal fields that will supply the lignite coal to the Poplar River power project is some of the richest, most productive land in south Saskatchewan. While there has been an attempt of this government to convince the people of Saskatchewan that this coal is being mined in waste land — that is not a fact. The pictures, and I will show Mr. Speaker the pictures on the annual report of the 1975 Sask Power report, is a picture of a rock formation from the Poplar River power development. That same picture is being distributed by SPC throughout Saskatchewan in literature to the citizens of Saskatchewan. This, Mr. Speaker, was and is a snow job. . . a snow job by the minister and his department. That rock takes up a few hundred square feet on a hill that is approximately 25 acres, and is very lonely on the level farms above the level coal fields.

I ask the government to give more than lip service to the reclamation of land in the Coronach area. This land must be returned to a condition as good as it is now so that grain will again flourish on the fields after that coal has been removed.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the amendment.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say that I welcome this opportunity to join in this Throne Speech Debate. I want to extend to the member from Pelly and the member from Meadow Lake who moved and seconded the Throne Speech my congratulations on a job very well done.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It clearly indicated, Mr. Speaker, why they are members of this Legislature representing their constituents. Their abilities and their dedication to their constituencies and to the needs of Saskatchewan people are in good hands and were well displayed.

Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to make a brief comment on something that has occurred in the last couple of days. The Supreme Court in Ottawa has overruled the Saskatchewan Courts in finding Bill 42 unconstitutional. And this decision, it is said by some, could take over \$500 million from the people of Saskatchewan and turn it over to the foreign owned oil companies who control 90 per cent of Canada's oil. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, clearly and without any hesitation that I will fight against this threat of taking this money from the people of Saskatchewan and giving it to the oil companies with all the energy that I have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, the resources of this province, as the resources of any province, are the resources of the people. They belong to the people of Saskatchewan, and they should be able to benefit from those resources, Mr. Speaker. And as far as I'm concerned, if I may make my personal point of view, I don't think that those oil companies ought to get one single red cent of that money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, it is clear and the record will show that the Liberals and the Conservatives fought against Bill 42's claim to this money for the people of Saskatchewan in the first place. They took, Mr. Speaker, the side of the corporations. Today they still take the side of those corporations. And what do you hear from the Liberals over there, in the debate of yesterday? You hear that you should sit down and negotiate with those oil companies and give them some money back. That's the Liberal position, now, Mr. Speaker, what about . . . it's funny how sensitive they are about that one, Mr. Speaker. What about the Conservatives, over there? Well you know the member from Nipawin, the leader of that party, has now stated clearly, precisely and on record that we should give the oil companies any access over Alberta's taxation rates. I'm sure the members seated over there would agree. He would, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make this very clear, he would thereby be giving them over \$250 million. The Conservative Party's position and the member for Nipawin's proposal would cost the average family of four over \$1,000 now and over \$200 a year from now on and forever. Do you think that oil companies need the money more than the people of Saskatchewan do? I don't think so.

Mr. Speaker, does anyone think that it is their right to take away the benefits of the

nonrenewable resources and do what INCO did with their profits and their liberal tax concessions and their liberal tax deferments? I don't think so. But, as I said earlier, I intend to fight as a member of this Legislature with everything that I have to prevent . . . (Interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, what I was really trying to say is that I intend, as a member of this Legislature, to fight in every way that I can to prevent the Saskatchewan people whom I represent from losing what is rightfully theirs.

Now, the Conservative members, do you know what they say, they say you should take your cap in hand and you should run to the federal government, the federal level of government . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — The enemy.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Oh, I heard the member from Biggar say, "It's like putting a fox in the hen house." It's like putting a skunk in the hen house. Let me tell you why, because when CIGOL went to court to get this decision of the superior courts of Saskatchewan overturned, it was the federal government and it was the Attorney General's department of the federal government who joined CIGOL in the case against the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I forgot now but maybe somebody remember who the Attorney General of Canada might have been at that time.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who appointed him? That's what they said yesterday when I wasn't here.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — They didn't say a word about that.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that the eight largest oil companies in this country, foreign owned, contributed an average of \$546,000 to Liberal and Conservative campaign coffers in any non-election year, and they will go around and claim that they are the defenders of the Saskatchewan resources and they can best fight this battle that we are now facing. I say to them, knowing that, how can anybody possibly believe that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may say a few things in the area of health. Over the years the province of Saskatchewan has established a reputation and a tradition of providing leadership in the health care field for this country. That tradition and that leadership has been established in spite of the constant and continuous opposition and resistance by both of the parties who sit on the opposite side of this Legislature. From the very beginning, Mr. Speaker, until now — from the days of the introduction of the hospitalization plan to the present, with the introduction of a dental care program for children, prescription drug plan for all people, the decentralization of all kinds of services to communities — every step of the way Liberals and Conservatives have been bitter opponents of the introduction of these programs and the record will show that. They have opposed and they have criticized and attempted to discredit.

In spite of this, Mr. Speaker, we have established this tradition in Saskatchewan, and I want to make it clear and put on the record of this Legislature at this time, that we intend to continue to maintain that tradition. We will maintain that tradition, Mr. Speaker, because the health of our people will always be a priority as it has always been. We will maintain that tradition because this government is not interested in playing politics

with the health care of Saskatchewan people as members opposite choose to do. We are only interested in doing what must be done to provide the best possible program in health that we can with the resources that are available to us.

In the four months that I have been the Minister of Health I have visited extensively the hospitals throughout this province, with representatives of the major health professions, with local community groups and with consumers of health care. One of my initial aims when I took up this office was to make time in my schedule to visit health agencies widely throughout Saskatchewan and to have frequent and frank talks with the providers and the consumers of health services. Over the past year or so, you know, Mr. Speaker, there has been much criticism of the health system reported in the press and on radio and television, attacks on hospitals and our health systems by Tories and Grits. And when I began my visits in the health system, I expected to find evidence to support this criticism that we have all been hearing. I can report to you here today, Mr. Speaker, that I have not found a floundering health system. I have not found widespread criticism of the health system among either the providers or the consumers. I have not been shown evidence of any falling standards of health care and I have not encountered demoralized health workers.

Sometimes when I read the constant criticism that members opposite bring about to try to discredit the people who run our hospitals, I am convinced of what I once heard said by someone who spoke to the Health Care Association annual meeting that what we find in much of our press is a crisis of overdose. Indeed, I can tell you that I have been reassured by seeing the high performance standards in our health programs and by talking with a wide cross-section of clearly competent, committed, and reasonably satisfied health workers, administrators and professionals.

In rural Saskatchewan I have seen some impressive hospital facilities and I have heard repeatedly of the enormous pride which rural residents have in their local hospitals. I have also observed the commitment that these people have to the support and the development of their local hospitals and other health services.

Our government is equally committed to the improvement of rural health services and to the continued support of rural hospitals.

Now the results of a recent Gallup Poll reported in the Regina Leader Post reflects the kind of impression that I am receiving from my visits. The Gallup pollsters surveyed Canada to find that people thought that they were getting good value for a number of public services.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What did they find out?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Just listen and you will find out what they found out. The public services included medicare, they included garbage collection, fire protection, police services, postal services and education. To our credit, Mr. Speaker, in the prairie region 93 per cent of the people stated they were getting good value for their medicare dollars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The kind of difficulties in the health care system that I have been told about during my visits are usually unique in a single community or institution. They are generally matters that can be solved with a little more effort and co-operation

between the groups involved, whether they be the hospital boards, the administration, employee groups or the Department of Health. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this government is making a renewed effort to assist our health facilities in every reasonable way to solve their problems.

During my conversations with community groups and others, I have learned that some areas of the health system do need to receive closer attention. The hon. member for Nipawin and others and the hon. member for Eastview in the last session, they state that our health programs are in trouble, they are underfunded they state, and I want to underline that they are frills and are not meeting the needs of our people. They are trying to convince the people of Saskatchewan that our government has taken money from the health programs and other needed social programs and is spending this money on buying potash mines. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is simply not true and they know it. Now the hon. member for Nipawin who seldom attends, except for the odd question period, contends that (maybe) the "Health care in Saskatchewan (and I'm quoting him now), has slipped in the past few years." Like so many other conclusions reached by the member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Conservative Party, this one on our health care system is a mystery.

Mr. Speaker, the facts don't support the Leader of the Conservative Party and neither do the observations which I have made as I have toured facilities throughout this province. CCF and NDP governments have always considered health programs to be of paramount importance and by any index of the quality and availability of health services, Saskatchewan stands in the forefront in North America. Prior to forming the government in 1971, our health care system in Saskatchewan had been neglected, utterly neglected for seven years and deterrent fees had been imposed and small hospitals had been closed, and the large city hospitals required major renovations which were going to cost well over a hundred million dollars. The chronically ill, the elderly, the handicapped children in many rural communities were crying out for needed services, which had not been provided by the former Liberal government. We have had to rebuild our health programs since 1971 to bring them in line with the real needs of people.

In 1977-78, our gross expenditures as a government for provincial health care will be in the neighborhood of \$420 million, an increase of 196 per cent since 1971. Over this same period, hospital and related expenditures have increased from \$94 million to \$280 million. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that we also removed the deterrent fees in 1971 and then removed medicare premiums, first for senior citizens and then for all citizens in 1974. The elimination of these consumer charges alone saved the Saskatchewan people over \$25 million per year and increased their buying power by that amount. Since 1971, we have had to spend in excess of \$55 million to improve hospital facilities. New hospitals have been built in rural areas and we are in the process of major expansion and regeneration of the University Hospital in Saskatoon, which I know the member for Eastview will welcome and all of the Regina hospitals. The cost of the improvements in Regina and Saskatoon will be well over \$100 million. Now certainly, Mr. Speaker, such additional expenditures and improvements cannot imply an erosion or a slip of the quality of health care provided by our provincial health institutions. To meet more of the health needs of the elderly, the handicapped, the disabled and the chronically ill, we developed such programs as our Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living, our Hearing Aid Plan, the Prescription Drug Plan and the Children's Dental Plan. We expanded alcoholism treatment facilities. We developed the first Awareness Program for the responsible use of alcohol and the list of other important but less dramatic improvements in the health system is so long, that I can't

spend the time today reading them out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite call these programs frills and they say that these programs are programs which are not meeting the real needs of Saskatchewan residents. They accuse us of developing programs without a defined objective in mind. They claim that we think up the objectives after the programs are started. Do they believe that providing dental care for children is not filling a real need in Saskatchewan? Can anyone believe that providing information on the abuse of alcohol is not really necessary in our province? Can anyone believe that the elderly, the chronically ill and handicapped do not need wheelchairs, or walkers, or hearing aids or prescription drugs and so on? Are these government programs really frills? Mr. Speaker, that's what they say. They say that they would abolish them. Mr. Speaker, I think any critic who calls these programs frills is really insulting the people who need to use these programs. If you need a wheelchair to get out of bed, it is most certainly not a frill. If you need a hearing aid, it is not a frill. If you have children who need their teeth fixed and you have little money to pay for the service and no dentist in the area, our dental plan is not a frill.

These are the kind of encouraging comments I have heard while visiting with the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, our health services are basically in good shape and there are some specific complaints about our health services which seem valid and we are working on improvements. Mr. Speaker, I have concluded that our health system would benefit by having more opinions and comments heard from the professional associations and from the hospital community and from health consumers. There is no single way that this additional opinion can be heard by me or my department.

One vehicle for additional discussion and consultation and exchange of information will be a new advisory committee on hospital services to be established in the very near future. I have also directed my department to make a much greater effort to seek the opinions of the health professional groups and the organized hospital sector on a large range of policy questions which are being considered by the department and myself. While I realize that contact between the department and the health professional community has always been very extensive, more contact will exist in the future on many important issues.

Now, Mr. Speaker, recently we have been hearing a number of erroneous statements made by the hon. member for Nipawin about the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan. I wish he was here because he made some comment after the Premier spoke and offered a challenge and I am prepared to take up that challenge. You know, he seems to have a habit of making statements and allegations that cannot be supported. That member for Nipawin apparently feels that we should copy the plan introduced in Manitoba. The Conservative Party passed a resolution committing itself to that and perhaps maybe it would be useful if we were to take a few minutes to provide the member for Nipawin with some of the facts.

I can tell you that before we implemented the drug plan we knew that the relatively small number of people were bearing the cost of prescription drugs in Saskatchewan. We also knew that the drug industry was charging prices for drugs which were far too high and by essentially bulk purchasing the drugs for Saskatchewan people we now have the lowest cost of drugs in Canada. Now that we can actually prove who is using the drug plan we know that the elderly citizens who constitute 11 per cent of our population, use 30 percent of the drug plan's expenditure, support expenditure. That percentage supports people over 65 years of age. Now one must keep in mind that the drug plan

was set up to significantly reduce the cost of prescription drugs. If no plan had been in place in 1976-77, families who were beneficiaries of the plan would have paid an average of \$66 for their prescription drug requirements. The fact is they paid an average of \$21, a saving of 68 per cent. These figures indicate that the drug plan is doing what it was set up to do — reduce the cost of drugs. The member for Rosetown should listen because obviously his leader needs a little bit of information that you should take to him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin's suggestion that a prescription drug plan similar to that introduced in Manitoba be implemented in Saskatchewan would cut out over 250,000 families from the plan; it would dramatically increase the cost to Saskatchewan families and it would impose an unnecessary burden of red tape on the elderly, the chronically ill and families. The Tory leader a little while ago protested the fact that the Premier had indicated that two-thirds of the people who are benefiting from the Saskatchewan plan would be cut off by the Conservative commitment. The Conservative Leader has a tendency to not use the facts when he makes these generalized statements which seem to make headlines from time to time. For example, he said that it costs the government of Manitoba and I say clearly, for the same number of people, less than \$5 million a year: that's a quote. Now let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the Prescription Drug Plan costs \$16.5 million in 1976-77. In Manitoba it cost almost \$10 million, not \$5 million. Mr. Speaker, it even costs more than that because in that almost \$10 million figure that I used is not included the costs of programs for diabetics and paraplegics and cystic fibrosis patients and others of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, in 1976 about 70,000 families benefited from Manitoba's Pharmacare Plan. In 1976-77 over 330,000 families benefited from the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan, not the same number as the Leader of the Conservative Party tries to pretend to the people of Saskatchewan. Had the plan as proposed by the Conservative leader been in effect in Saskatchewan (and if they ever get elected it will be) less than 30 per cent of the eligible families in Saskatchewan would be beneficiaries. That fact is, 81 per cent of Saskatchewan's families were beneficiaries of the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan. He and Conservatives are committed to cutting out over 250,000 people from those benefits. Mr. Speaker, under Mr. Collver's plan, consumers would not benefit from their drug until they had accumulated over \$50 in prescription drug bills. For amounts in excess of \$50 the Conservative plan would pay 80 per cent of the prescription drug cost, and this means that not only would the consumer pay the first \$50, but he would continue to pay 20 per cent of the prescription costs about the \$50.

MR. ROLFES: — That's almost worse than suggesting the people ought to pay \$10 a day for hospitals
...

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We'll get around to that in a minute, member for Buena Vista.

Not only will the implementation of such a plan in Saskatchewan put a monetary burden on individuals and large families and elderly people and chronically ill, but they would have to save and submit each and every prescription drug receipt. This in itself, Mr. Speaker, would be a deterrent and a burden on those needing help the most.

Mr. Speaker, under the terms of the Conservative plan, the average cost per family in 1976-77 for their prescription drug needs would have been over 150 per cent more

than it actually was.

Saskatchewan also maintains a formulary system which encourages the use of therapeutically effective drugs of high quality. The Tories object to that because they want to do everything in their power to help the pharmaceutical companies. They don't care about the quality of the drug plan. And the Leader of the Liberal Party groans. They don't care about the quality of the drug that's used, they don't care about the therapeutic value of the drug that is used. They just say, load it on.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Drug Plan is a superior plan. It has dramatically reduced the cost of drugs in general, and also to those who need to use them. This proposal that the Tory leader talks about is a pretty clear example of what Saskatchewan people could expect from a Tory government. You know, Mr. Speaker, they will promise to keep the good and the popular NDP programs, but let me say that if ever elected, the Tory Party would establish every conceivable deterrent to persuade or force the people who need the services the most, not to use them, as the Liberals did when they were in power. It should be known, and I think this is important, Mr. Speaker, that one of the first contacts made by the new Conservative government in Manitoba with our department of Health, was to ask about the deterrent fees that were imposed on Saskatchewan people by the former Liberal government. You see, Mr. Speaker, already they are searching for ways to tax their sick and their old.

Every Conservative province in this country has deterrent fees and there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that the Saskatchewan Conservative Party even though they pretend otherwise, believe in them as well. They cannot deny that the member for Swift Current and Yorkton in 1974 spoke and gave his personal support to introduce deterrent fees. They cannot deny that the member for Rosetown in this House said, "People would gladly pay \$10 a day to get into a hospital." I quote the right words, and they're right here, in Hansard. The member for Nipawin asked if the Premier would restate that. I just did. It's right here. I've got a photocopy of Hansard and the member should read it. They cannot deny that the member for Thunder Creek said in this House, "It is fair to say that the universal concept of medicare where there are no user charges involved for using that system has failed." He believes in deterrent fees, Mr. Speaker. If some of those other Conservative members would ever say anything, they no doubt would make the same claim favoring deterrent fees. The unstated policy, except by some individuals, is clearly one of being in favor of deterrent fees in various places. They may call them by different names. The member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) would make people pay the first \$50 for drugs and deter them with red tape. The member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) would call them 'user charges'. The Conservatives would say, make sick people pay for being sick, as Liberals used to do. The sicker you are, the older you are and the longer you are off the job because of sickness, the more you pay.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP has always opposed deterrent fees. We removed them. We oppose them now and we will continue to oppose them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Now, Mr. Speaker, it is likely that Tory members will rise in this debate and deny that they favor these fees. The question then, Mr. Speaker is: who can believe them? The Tories in Manitoba said that they would not but they are looking at how to do it. The Collver Conservative record of unsubstantiated allegations made for sheer cynical political opportunism is one that shows that they cannot be believed and they cannot be trusted. The behavior of those members in this Assembly is the first

evidence of this. They first broke a written agreement on the introduction of the Budget, I believe, in 1976. They have constantly shown a complete disregard for the traditions and the procedures of this Legislature. They accuse you, Mr. Speaker, of being unfair and biased, knowing it not to be true.

When a member of this House says he will withdraw a letter that was clearly a breach of privilege, then steps outside to restate what he said in that letter, neither he nor his colleagues can be trusted.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, even the Leader Post in an editorial says it very well. I don't want to take too much time of the House, so I will quote bits and pieces. In today's Leader Post it is stated, Mr. Speaker, and I quote, "For a group that only recently seemed to set great store for decorum and deportment and parliamentary propriety in the Saskatchewan Legislature, the Conservative caucus surely has some explaining to do over the Berntson letter affair." It goes on to say that the letter has been branded and quite rightly as a breach of parliamentary privilege. It says that the affair is being regarded as an act impugning the integrity of the Legislature and its speakers as it should be.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That can't be the Leader Post!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It is, surprise, but it is!

AN HON. MEMBER: — It must be the Commonwealth!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I quote further, Mr. Speaker — we would even accept this in the Commonwealth — I quote further, "Berntson even compounded the matter by reiterating the charge on a radio newscast, seeming to cancel out any chance that the affair might be handled by the letter's withdrawal and apology." It concludes by saying, "Decorum deportment, parliamentary propriety, Conservative leader Dick Collver's prescription for his caucus House behavior indeed has a hollow ring to it now."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Further to that, Mr. Speaker, there was the allegation that Saskatchewan hospitals are filthy. The member for Sutherland said, and I quote, "We could bring documentation to this House showing that hospitals, which are supposed to be the holy sanctum of cleanliness are filthy. "You wait," he said, "It's coming. There will be lots more."

Mr. Speaker, we are still waiting. An allegation made, a headline in a newspaper but no evidence to this very day. The allegation by the Conservatives had cast a cloud over 130 hospitals in the province. I have visited many of them Mr. Speaker, and they have not forgotten.

This summer, the Leader of the Conservative Party attempted to interfere with the judicial inquiry into the correctional institutions. Again, he made accusations but when confronted by the Attorney General, could not provide any evidence at all. An allegation made, Mr. Speaker, a headline in the press and no substance to the statement or support. He runs and he hides.

Mr. Speaker, probably the most glaring example to show how that group of members in the Tory caucus would go to any extreme and to any length to achieve their end is an incident during the Pelly by-election. An article in the Leader Post said it well when it

stated, and I quote:

The Progressive Conservative may have gone too far in the Pelly by-election when they ran a radio advertisement in Yorkton about an NDP promise — alleged.

And this statement, Mr. Speaker, was a reference to an advertisement read by none other than the Progressive Conservative leader, and he doubted that the government would keep certain alleged (and I underline alleged) promises and then proceeded to attempt to create resentment between Indian people and white people in the area. And the member for Nipawin was clearly trying to create racial tension in the hope that he and his colleagues would somehow gain some votes from it. How can such a leader and how can such a party be trusted, Mr. Speaker? How can anyone believe anything that they say when they would even go so far as to ignore basic human rights and try to set people against each other all for the sake of cynical political opportunism?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the tactics of some members opposite in the last two years can only be defined as tactics which are deceitful and completely unacceptable in an open, free, and democratic system of government such as we are fortunate enough to have in this country.

Surely it is not difficult to understand that there would have to be great fear and hesitation if a Tory government in this province were ever elected. One has to seriously consider what would be the implications on liberty and freedom and human rights if a government were to be elected that uses those kinds of tactics that the Conservative members of this House use as members of an opposition.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the closest parallel that I can think of would be the arrogance and the heavyhandedness of the former Thatcher Liberal government in this province prior to 1971.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as an MLA for a rural constituency, I was pleased with the references made in the Throne Speech to the issues that are of concern to farmers and rural people in general.

While both Conservative and Liberal parties show no concern about the purchase and ownership of farm land by foreigners, this government is going to bring in amendments to The Farm Ownership Act to maintain the ownership of Saskatchewan farm land by Saskatchewan residents.

My constituents, and other Saskatchewan people, have often stated the need for such legislation. They will not accept the position of those parties that farm land should be owned by people and corporations who do not live in this province and its communities, and who make no contribution to those communities, but reap all the benefits from the products that are produced here.

Rural Saskatchewan has been strengthened by policies of this government. It can remain strong only with the existence of the family farm and if the family farm goes, so do many rural communities.

Now the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, in some of the comments made in this debate, have complained about the references made to this government's defence of the Wheat Board, and the crowrates and the Hall Commission, in the Throne Speech.

Why do they protest so much? Why are they so sensitive every time these important issues are raised? I can tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because both of them, both Tories and Liberals, have attacked these institutions from time to time. And the federal minister who represents this province has quietly been implementing the Federal Task Force Report of 1968 piece by piece, fully supported by his provincial Liberal counterparts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The Task Force on Agriculture said that the crowrates must go. It said that two-thirds of our farms must go and it said that the private grain trades, the Winnipeg Grain Exchange should have more control. This control, Mr. Speaker, is clearly meant to undermine and eventually destroy the Canadian Wheat Board. And the federal government, supported by provincial Liberals, has been inching its way towards that objective.

The NDP and this government will fight with every effort that we can to protect and indeed strengthen the Canadian Wheat Board. We will fight to have the crowrates retained and we have and we will continue to do all we can to strengthen the family farm. We will fight Liberals and Conservatives both of which at this time, as ever before, would allow all of these things to go down the drain.

From time to time, Mr. Speaker, they protest across the way about someone saying these things, and once again I ask, why do they protest so much? They protest because they know that what they pretend and what they really believe are not the same.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Leader of Canada, Mr. Clark, has come out in opposition to orderly marketing. His party, to a man, is on record in the House of Commons as having opposed orderly marketing and that means the Canadian Wheat Board, because that's orderly marketing. The Liberal record itself, shows its own sell out to those who would destroy the Wheat Board, the crowrates, the branch lines and the family farm.

(Interjection of laughter by some members.)

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, members laugh. The members laugh, Mr. Speaker, but they should listen because there is some evidence to support that. First of all there is some evidence of support for the Tory position against the Wheat Board. If they were not helping and supporting those people who would destroy the Canadian Wheat Board, why was there a director of the Grain Exchange actively involved and working hard for them in the Pelly by-election? He must have had something at stake.

Mr. Speaker, what about the Liberals? At the recent Liberal convention in Saskatoon they passed a resolution, as I read in the newspaper, not to oppose Cargill Grain. I am sure that is correct. You know they are great believers in some kind of (along with the Tories) an unrestrained free market place. Mr. Speaker, they advise that the free and unrestrained play of the market place should prevail. They ignore the fact that the unrestrained play of these very forces would lead, as they have in the past, to a loss of freedom of the individual farmer, because of his enslavement by the multinational corporations over which he could not even have a small influence.

(Interjection of laughter by Mr. Cameron.)

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The member laughs again, and I ask, what influence would he have or could he possibly have on Cargill Grain?

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Conservative Party has spoken on many occasions in support of this free market place. And he is on record as supporting Cargill Grain. By doing that, Mr. Speaker, he is in clear opposition to farmer-owned wheat pools. You cannot support an international grain company like Cargill which has sales in the order of \$9 billion annually, in which you cannot buy shares, which you cannot influence in any way the manner in which it operates; no one can support such a powerful giant and at the same time support the Wheat Board and orderly marketing or the Wheat Pool.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called open market place does not exist. It has been replaced by a market manipulated by expanding multinational companies which represent a major threat to our land, our resources and our personal freedoms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The member for Nipawin would have that system imposed on Saskatchewan farmers. And his opposition to the Cargill Grain (or his non opposition to the Cargill Grain) and support of the open market system sounds superficially attractive to some people, but that 'open market' I dare say is a myth. He knows it, but he still persists in being the mouthpiece for concerns like Cargill.

Advocating an unrestrained open market place in this day and age is tantamount to running up a white flag of surrender to the multinationals which thrive under these conditions, to the detriment of individuals — individual farmers and individual small businessmen.

In Saskatchewan, I believe a family farm, owned and operated farm is the most common symbol of freedom for rural residents. Preservation of the family farm is a cornerstone of this government's policy and we have implemented measures designed to achieve that result.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The Land Bank, Farm Start, subsidies to livestock farmers, a hog price stabilization plan, a comprehensive crop insurance program and many other initiatives have been taken. The New Democratic Party has battled for equitable freight rates and an equitable rail transportation network. You know, it is said in the Throne Speech that powerful voices — more powerful voices than the member across — still call for rail line abandonment and an end to the Crow's Nest Pass freight rates. They have allies, Mr. Speaker, in Conservative and Liberal politicians — Conservative and Liberal politicians who are so committed to their corporate friends that they won't even listen to their constituents, the farmers, the small businessmen and workers and others. When the old line parties defend Cargill Grain, what is it that they are defending? Or, if they are not opposing Cargill Grain, what is it that they are not opposing? They are defending a huge international grain company which has been involved in a number of United States investigations, including class actions over alleged price fixing, a company which has been investigated by Interpol, the international police agency, for: forged weight certificates, forged grade certificates, tampering with scales and

fraudulent account sheets. They are supporting an outfit that admitted illegally shipping American buckwheat into Manitoba on trucking back-hauls, a company guilty of being part of an illegal squeeze that pushed Chicago wheat futures up to an artificial high and which pressured the United States Interstate Commerce Commission to restructure railway rates so that they would be more economical for the corporation but not the farmers. Mr. Speaker, when Conservative or Liberal members of this province say that they will not oppose the establishment of inland terminals by Cargill Grain, they say that they are in favor of these kinds of actions. All for the sake of some thousands of dollars that might be contributed to their party coffers. Mr. Speaker, those members opposite would sell out the freedom of our farmers and the existence of the family farm for the sake of getting corporate money to try and get elected.

Now the Conservative Leader, Mr. Collver, the member for Nipawin, he's going to go around the province and deny that this is so. Well, the record shows, Mr. Speaker, that when an amendment was introduced this year to a resolution in parliament in support of orderly marketing, both Liberals and Conservatives voted against it to a man. That was an NDP amendment, Mr. Speaker. Liberals and Tories voted against it. And why? Because they are prepared to do everything possible to help people like Cargill Grain and the Grain Exchange to take over. The record shows, Mr. Speaker, to the horror of even people who used to support the Conservative Party, that the national Tory leader, was reported to have said in August in Manitoba and I quote:

Expansion of the Wheat Board's selling efforts, but permission given to private organizations to sell grain competition with the Wheat Board.

Mr. Clark said:

Private organizations working alongside the Wheat Board would stimulate the board's efforts.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Because Conservative politicians, nationally and provincially, want to do everything possible to help Cargill Grain and the commodity exchange and other corporate grain traders chip away until they finally take over.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about Peter Lougheed?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We'll get around to that.

Mr. Speaker, the records shows that several months ago Dr. Hugh Horner, the Deputy Premier speaking for Peter Lougheed, of Conservative Alberta, said to the Hall Commission, and I quote:

The Alberta government supports the concept of inland terminals on the basis of increased competition, improved handling and further rationalization of an outdated elevator system.

They were saying that the Wheat Pools were outdated. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's plain English. The Conservatives stand for inland terminals, Alberta Conservatives, national Conservatives and Collver Conservatives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Saskatchewan Conservatives continually talk about local

control. Why don't they stand up and defend our locally owned and locally controlled elevators and the branch lines that serve them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Instead, Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin has stated in a news release, once again it's in print, "It is our opinion," he said, "that the Crow Rates are not to be tampered with" — but here is the punch line, "until an assessment of freight structure is completed." Now what does that mean? What does that mean — that clearly means that the Conservatives have in no way any commitment to the crowrates and that they are just couching that in language which is confusing. They want to only have the crowrates until an assessment of the freight rate structure is completed, and we can only assume from that that once that's done the crowrates go.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1930s and the 1940s, prairie farmers saw the need for orderly marketing, for the Canadian Wheat Board. The New Democratic Party and the government of Saskatchewan stands four square behind the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Canadian Wheat Board. We believe in the family farm as being the heart of rural Saskatchewan, and we will continue to make these institutions a major priority and defend them against those who would tear them down.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the high priority given to business and industry in the Throne Speech, and when one looks across Canada, it is readily evident that the Saskatchewan business community is doing far better than in most other provinces. Our economy is healthy, we have seen manufacturing shipments in Saskatchewan more than double in five years, total investment tripled, and new manufacturing investment increased four times. Employment in manufacturing increased by 35 per cent.

Our government's commitment to provide additional help to smaller communities to revitalize their commercial areas, and to identify promising business opportunities, is based on the support by our government for the small businessman. We appreciate the very important contribution made by small businessmen in the development of our province. Many of them feel frustrated, as the Throne Speech has indicated, in the face of government regulation at all levels; whether it is federal or provincial or municipal. And I have always believed that there was a need to take a hard look at this situation and so the establishment of a minister's advisory committee on small business in Saskatchewan to advise on ways to improve opportunities for small businesses in Saskatchewan is a very welcome to me, as I know it will be to the small business people of Saskatchewan, and I congratulate the Minister of Industry and Commerce for taking this initiative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, the NDP has always supported the interests of small business. The initiatives taken to improve rural communities in the past years since 1971 have made a major contribution to keeping them strong, and in so doing keeping the small business community thriving and strong.

Nowhere in Canada in recent years has the climate for small businesses been as good as in Saskatchewan. Assistance from SEDCO and the Department of Industry and

Commerce has been very significant in starting new businesses and improving and expanding existing ones.

An NDP government is the only type of government in Canada that can truly be considered a government in the best interest of the small businessman. This is because it is the only government that is prepared to stand up to the large corporations who are a constant threat to that small businessman.

In this area, just as in the farming industry, the marriage of the Conservative and the Liberal Parties to the large corporations makes them cast aside the interests of the small businessman. There is a mood fostered by Tories, especially, about so-called big government, about individual freedom, and individual rights, and on and on. What are they talking about? Well, essentially they are saying it is everyone for himself, no regulation, no protection for the small businessman against the large corporation, no protection of the Canadian Wheat Board and the Wheat Pool against the Cargill Grains of this world. This is the Conservative model of free enterprise.

But for whom is this freedom? Let me tell you for whom it is freedom, Mr. Speaker. It's freedom for the big, wealthy and powerful to do what they want at the expense of most other people. A recent report put together by the Canadian Press showed rather vividly who controls those old line parties, and the report stated, and I quote the report:

For Liberals and Conservatives, the big money comes from banks and corporations.

In the 17 months ending in January 1, 1977 Conservatives gathered \$1.1 million from corporations. In that same period the Liberals got \$1.8 million from private companies. More than twice as many individuals contributed to the NDP than to the old line parties.

The old saying, Mr. Speaker, "he who pays the piper plays the tune" is still pertinent. Is it any wonder that day in and day out the member for Nipawin, the Conservative Leader, gets up in this House and attacks in this House and attacks our policies on agriculture and on resources. Not at all — he is unequivocally the spokesman for the multinational grain companies, resource companies, and the banks. They pay his party well for his services, and maybe they even have Swiss bank accounts.

What is the Conservative plan for business, for industry and for the economy? How would they provide jobs and people to live in our communities? Well, there is a very prominent spokesman of the Conservative Party in Ottawa. His name is James Gillies, and he is a Toronto economist and he sits for the constituency of Don Valley. Mr. James Gillies, the Tory member for Don Valley is quoted in a newspaper as saying, and the headline reads:

Canadians seen hewing wood.

It says: one of Opposition leader Joe Clark's top financial advisers said Wednesday that Canadians should be content to be hewers of wood and drawers of water in the current economic climate. There's nothing disgraceful about being a hewer of wood and a drawer of water if that's where you have your comparative advantage. He said Canada should concentrate on developing and selling its natural resources.

Obviously he supports the kind of approach that has caused INCO to lay off something

like 4,000 people in Sudbury and Thompson.

Mr. Speaker, the Tory Leader got up in this House after the Premier spoke and he defended the International Nickel Company. He blamed the lay-offs that they have caused on international markets. Well I want to say that he is dead wrong. Those lay-offs were planned, they were part of a long-range plan by INCO, with the help of millions of dollars in tax concessions from the federal Liberal Government, and supported by the Ontario Conservative government. Once again you have to ask, Mr. Speaker, why do they get so defensive, why do they defend INCO? Could it be that in 1976, \$30,885 was donated to the Progressive Conservative Party by INCO?

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to say this, the political battle in Saskatchewan today and in the next election campaign is going to be the issue of whether the destiny of this province would be guided and determined by the people through the government as is happening and can continue to happen through an NDP government, or whether the destiny of this province and the future of its people will be determined by the multinational corporations as would happen under a Conservative or a Liberal government.

Every direction of policy ever stated by the Leader of the Conservative Party for example, when he talks of his kind of free enterprise, would mean that more and more power and control would be vested in the hands of the strongest, and that as the strongest corporations, do not even have any head offices in the province of Saskatchewan and could not and do not in any way care about the future of the province, except to the extent that it may enhance their capacity to continue making profits out of the resources that we have here. There may very well be side issues, and there will no doubt be local issues, but the whole overriding issue will be this one: an economy and resource development controlled by corporations is typified and exemplified by the recent actions taken by the International Nickel Company, or INCO Sudbury and Thompson, Manitoba. The president of INCO himself has admitted that the reason that they could do what they did in this country was because they knew that the government of this country and the Conservative government of Ontario, and now Manitoba, and the federal government in Ottawa would not in any way interfere. That is wrong. It's immoral. It's a complete abrogation of responsibility by elected people to look after the interests of the people who elect them. It is the kind of direction that we have always known that we could expect from Conservative and Liberal governments. Once again there is absolute and undeniable proof in this example that we can continue to expect that this is something that this province of Saskatchewan does not need, and were it to get, would suffer dramatically with massive unemployment as we once did.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that I will indeed oppose the amendment and support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a few remarks to

the Speech from the Throne. First I would like — he's not here — to welcome the new member for Pelly (Mr. Lusney) to the Legislative Assembly. I would like to say, I'm sorry to see the old member go. I didn't know Mr. Larson very long — we had some fiery exchanges — but I learned to like him quite well. I am sorry to see he is not here.

This Throne Speech is more to be condemned for what it doesn't contain than for what it does contain, for it contains very little. It shows, I suppose, a government that is burnt out and who have a dearth of ideas, with which to face the problems facing this province.

Agriculture, the backbone of our provincial economy is facing very hard times, with rising costs and falling prices. This government ignores these problems and mentions it will amend The Farm Ownership Act and give us a new Animal Identification Act. Not one mention is given that there will be any attempts to aid farmers in reducing costs in the face of falling prices for their products. This government should consider a lower price for fuel for agriculture production.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — Fuel costs for machinery operation and for the hog barn dryers and all the specialized equipment which enables our farmers to compete on world markets is essential.

We in the southwest are still facing extreme drought conditions. The water table has dropped. The lakes and dugouts are dry. A study by completed the PFRA shows that initial water storage could be constructed on the Frenchman River, storage that would create jobs in the construction of it, would increase recreational facilities and would draw tourist dollars into a depressed area. More important, it would put many more acres into irrigation production and provide an ample supply of forage into an area that always suffers from such a shortage. We hoped some mention of such a project would be in the Throne Speech. We would urge this government to start considering and asking the federal government for the construction of a dam on the Frenchman River as soon as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — I am sure the government across knows the need is there. They also know that no dam construction can be given without permission from the department of the Environment of the province. That's the way the law reads.

We also notice that there is no mention of highway construction in this Throne Speech. The provincial government seems to be quite interested in rail line upgrading where it has to put in no dollars, but where it can have some leadership, namely, the building and upgrading of our highway system, it has nothing to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDERSON: — The No. 1 Highway becomes quite congested in the tourist season, and is dangerous from Swift Current west to the border. No. 13 Highway that crosses the southern part of the province is an alternative link that would relieve the pressure on the No. 1 Highway. No. 13 Highway is the shortest route between Winnipeg, Lethbridge and the West Coast — it is lacking a 60 mile stretch that prevents No. 13 Highway from being a hard surfaced road from Winnipeg to the West Coast, 35 miles of that missing portion

is in Saskatchewan from Consul west. There is a portion of this road in Saskatchewan from Govenlock to Alberta that doesn't even exist. The highway dead ends, and that's it. The building of this 12 miles to the Alberta border from Govenlock, and oiling the 35 miles from Consul to Govenlock to Alberta would complete this link. Highway No. 13 travels through some of the most scenic and historic parts of this province; it travels a bit north of Roche Percee near Estevan. It goes by the historic Big Muddy Badlands, the Fir Mountains and the new proposed National Grassland Park at Killdeer and Val Marie, just north of Coronach. As it goes further west, it travels to Cypress Hills, passing just south of both the Cypress Hills Provincial Park, in the Fort Walsh National Historic site. When it enters Alberta, it travels through the Milk River Badlands, the Writing on Stone Provincial Park and on to Lethbridge and the Waterton Lakes National Park. This is one of the most scenic highways that crosses the province, it's the shortest route between the point of Winnipeg and Vancouver, yet for the lack of building 35 miles of road, 12 miles to be taken into the highway system, we would have connected.

The towns along No. 13 Highway have in the past two years petitioned the Minister of Highways to complete the missing 12 miles of this second Trans Canada Highway. Every town and every municipality has sent a petition to the Minister of Highways asking to meet with them. He has refused to discuss it. He had the audacity to come down to Maple Creek and Eastend and say he had never heard of it, telling the same people that wrote the petitions and got the answers back, that he wouldn't discuss it. I join these towns and communities, urging this government to give assurance they will connect this 12 miles.

We are interested in seeing mentioned in the Throne Speech that there will be a new regional parks act enacted. We hope it will allow assistance to small recreational areas that provide fishing and camping facilities but because they are near the provincial park or other regional parks they cannot receive assistance at this time.

There have been again this summer, many complaints regarding vandalism and harassment of our tourists in our provincial parks. We hope that the provincial government will increase policing of campsites in these areas.

In our health care little that will be of any help to our rural areas is mentioned. Many of our small hospitals have had beds closed in the last two years. The beds and rooms are there and not being used for medical patients. At the same time these beds are vacant we have a large number of senior citizens in these areas requiring Level IV nursing care. There is no place for these pioneers in their own community. They are shipped off to geriatric centres in Swift Current, Moose Jaw and Regina. This removes them from friends and family and they spend their last years alone and among strangers. Surely the Department of Health and the Department of Social Services can make some agreement whereby these beds can be used for the care of these people who require Level IV care. Our pioneers who have grown old building the farms and small towns in this province deserve a chance to spend their last years in the areas where they have friends and families.

This government seems to have little concern for the businessman in the small towns of rural Saskatchewan. They have allowed farmers both as incorporated farms and individual farmers to deal in everything from tires, to television sets, to cultivator shovels, welders, grain augers, repair shops, body shops, etc. without any restrictions. It would seem to me that this is unfair competition to a small town businessman who must pay business tax and who is forced to supply parts and services to his customers. If the businessman in a small town is going to stay in business he cannot be forced to

November 24, 1977

compete on this unfair basis.

The Throne Speech reflects a government so concerned with nationalizing resources and building up an empire of civil service bureaucracy that it has lost touch with the real needs of the people of this province. I therefore cannot support the motion but will support the amendment.

MR. MESSER: — In the absence, Mr. Speaker, of a member or two, I have been persuaded to undertake to take part in this

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . to adjourn the debate . . .

MR. MESSER: — Well, perhaps I should undertake to ask — I would like to address my remarks while the radio time is on, and seeing that it is not now the time, Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:51 o'clock p.m.