

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 10, 1979

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

SGEA Strike

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – My question is to the Premier. In view of renewed charges and more inflammatory and irresponsible comments by your Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer), will you agree that this minister's actions are damaging to the tense situation existing in the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) negotiations?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, the matters referred to by the hon. member are of course a matter of concern to us all. We are pursuing a policy of getting an appropriate agreement with the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association by negotiation. I am sure there will always be difference of view as to what type of statements contribute to that result. I think it is not useful for me to agree or disagree with the hon. member's stated opinion.

MR. TAYLOR: – Mr. Premier would you agree then with your conciliator, Mr. Sig Walter, who states and I quote:

It is better to be closed-mouthed at this point. It is a delicate situation. I wouldn't want to jeopardize things by comments at this stage.

Would you agree with your conciliator?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I would certainly agree that those are appropriate comments from a conciliator, whether or not they are appropriate comments from the parties to a dispute, I think, will be something which the parties themselves will decide upon. Certainly the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association has pursued a policy of making many comments in the press and on radio. We all have seen advertisements and we have heard radio spots. I, for example, made comments this morning on television, and whether or not these public statements add to or subtract from the possibility of a settlement will I think be a matter of judgment in each case.

MR. TAYLOR: – Final supplementary. I am sure, Mr. Premier, that the comments of the Executive Council in the province are important. Because of the damaging actions by this minister, have you, Mr. Premier, reprimanded him and taken any action to restrain him from further foolish comments?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is attempting to convey information rather than to seek it with his explanatory comments. To answer the question, I have not reprimanded the minister. Whether or not in the future the minister will make comments of which the hon. members opposite approve, I suppose, remains to be seen and I suppose equally well, whether my colleagues make statements of which I approve will remain to be seen. We are expecting that all hon. members will be making comments that they believe will contribute to a speedy settlement.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – A question to the Premier. There seems to be on the press statements a great deal of personal animosity developing between the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) and the executive director of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association. Would the Premier not admit that this personal animosity is not conducive to the collective bargaining process and that perhaps the minister should be restrained from making comments?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, I think, essentially expresses an opinion that vigorous statements which may appear to have a personal element do not contribute to arriving at a settlement. I am not challenging the opinion of the member for Qu'Appelle. I don't think it is necessary that all members of the House necessarily agree with it.

MR. LANE: – By way of supplementary, the attacks by the minister on the executive director would seem now to have the sanction of the government opposite in its reluctance to take action. Would the Premier indicate to this House whether or not Larry Brown's continuance as executive director is an express or implied term of the collective bargaining process and whether or not the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) will be required to dismiss or get rid of Mr. Brown in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order! I will take a new question. The member for Estevan (Mr. Larter).

Poplar River Power Project

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in planning the Poplar River power development, the projection and requirements of the SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) called originally for a 1,200 megawatt station. The minister of SPC did not communicate with the people of Coronach and area and the people of Montana as soon as these plans were conceived. Does the Premier not now believe that because of the arrogance and the lack of concern of the minister the people of Saskatchewan are now being rewarded with one-half of a planned power station?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I am not personally familiar with the matters raised by the hon. member and will take the question as notice.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Premier, your minister in charge of SPC, a few days ago, reiterated that whatever decisions were handed down by IJC (International Joint Commission) he was prepared to live by the laws of Saskatchewan and Canada. The minister is quoted as saying:

It is not our obligation to abide by the laws of a foreign jurisdiction.

But do you not believe, Mr. Premier, that this lack of communication and co-operation by your minister has been the cause of our problems at Coronach?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, since I am not familiar with the matters raised by the hon. member, as I indicated in the first question, I am unable to respond and will take notice of that question, as well.

Relationship with State of Montana

MR. LARTER: — This continual confrontation attitude by the minister with IJC and the people of two countries, on this matter, has done irrevocable damage. My question to the Premier is, what has your government done to mend the fence particularly as it relates to the harmonious relations between the people of Saskatchewan and our good neighbors of Montana?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I refer not to the earlier matters raised by the hon. member with respect to alleged plans for a 1,200 megawatt station and the like, with respect to which I have taken notice. But on the matter of relations with the United States of America, we have been, I think very careful in our dealings with the IJC particularly. I have met with the Canadian chairman of the IJC on number of occasions – two Canadian chairmen. I have met with the American chairman of the IJC. I have met with members of their staff. I know this is equally true of other ministers in our government.

There have been occasions on which ministers of our government, both the hon. member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) and the hon. member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) – the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Minister of the Environment, and it may be the previous minister of the environment (I am not sure of that) – have met with officials in Montana. Certainly I know that the current Minister of the Environment and the current minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation have. A good number of efforts have been made in order to keep relationships with the Government of the United States and the Government of the state of Montana on the highest possible level. I think a good deal of access has been achieved, although not total success so far as the government and some private groups in Montana are concerned.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the Premier. One of the matters of concern which has only been lightly touched upon but which is becoming a national concern is the matter of acid rain. Would the Premier undertake to ask his minister to supply to the Assembly and the public any studies which the provincial government has with regard to a potential acid rain problem from the Coronach project?

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take the next question – the member for Wilkie.

International Flights

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, question to the Premier in light of the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources (Mr. Gross) not being here today, or the Minister of Transport (Mr. Kramer).

Mr. Premier, your Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources, in a press release, stated that he is welcoming international flights from Saskatoon, Regina to Minot and Denver, Colorado. These flights will not provide us weekend service between the two major cities in Saskatchewan. Has your government done anything to obtain flights on the weekend between Saskatoon and Regina?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I regret that I can't answer the hon. member's question. The question raised by the hon. member with respect to international flights is one involving flights which originate in Saskatoon or in Regina and terminate in Minot or Denver, as the case may be. It is customary in those situations that the international carrier would not carry domestic traffic, i.e. would not carry traffic from Saskatoon to Regina. That would, I think be necessary in order to protect the existing

franchise of Norcanair. That being the case, I am not aware of what other discussions may have taken place between the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan, or between Norcanair and the Government of Saskatchewan about weekend flights. But they would not in any way be connected with the attempt to obtain for Saskatchewan an international north-south connection.

MR. GARNER: — Supplementary to the Premier. Mr. Premier, since last spring not only myself but other businessmen and tourists travelling to Saskatchewan, either to Saskatoon or Regina, have asked for weekend service. When is this government going to start accepting the responsibility and provide service for the businessmen who want to travel and the tourists coming into this province?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member will know, air traffic is not a responsibility of the Government of Saskatchewan, but is a responsibility of the Government of Canada and if there is need for an air service between Regina and Saskatoon, the Minister of Transport, Mr. Mazankowski, is the person who has the responsibility of seeing that that service is in place. And I would recommend that hon. member opposite ask their colleagues in Ottawa why they are not providing the service which they are required to do pursuant to the constitution of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, it couldn't be because maybe Norcanair has some political connections in this province and the people of Saskatchewan are outside of this little vicious circle we have in Saskatchewan and no other air carrier gets the chance to come into Saskatchewan or to Saskatoon and Regina and provide that service. Will the Premier please answer me if his government has been in touch with Norcan or any other carrier and has invited them to provide this service.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, Norcanair operates pursuant to a licence granted by the Air Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission.

May I advise hon. members that whatever political influence we have, it does not notably extend to the Air Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission. We do not have the ability to have that committee or the commission determine what carrier should operate. It is my recollection (and I may be wrong in this) that Norcanair is acting on a subfranchise basis from a licence which is granted to Air Canada. I may be wrong in that recollection but that is my recollection.

May I advise hon. members that if my recollection is right, we do not have political influence with Air Canada. It may be that members opposite do and if they do I urge them to use their best efforts to see that that political influence is used for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Federal Pioneer Oil Spill

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman), but in his absence I will go to the Premier. I much prefer to go to the Premier because the Minister of the Environment does not know how to answer questions anyway. Would the Premier . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! If the member has a question rather than a comment, I would be pleased to allow him to proceed.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier inform this Assembly what has transpired with the removal of the 5,000 gallon oil spill at Federal Pioneer? For your information, Mr. Premier, because of your lack of knowledge of environment hazards in this province did you not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I'll take the next question. Member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau).

Cornwall Centre

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for the Cornwall Centre.

Last week, you stated the government's share of profits on the Cornwall Centre was 51 per cent after expenses. Now, that would amount to a 12 per cent return on the money advanced or about \$6 million a year. Since Chartwood's share is 49 per cent of the profits would you not agree, Mr. Minister, that a windfall profit of over \$210 million on a \$2 million to \$3 million investment, plus a further subsidy of some \$60 million is nothing short of a sellout for the Saskatchewan taxpayers to eastern interests at a cost of some \$300 for every man, woman and child of this province?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): — Mr. Speaker, no I would not agree. Obviously the hon. member must have had a nightmare over the weekend to be able to come up with these kinds of calculations because none of the figures that the hon. member has quoted are in any way related to reality, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. If they are not, then you gave us false information in this House last week. You said in this House that it was a 51 per cent share of the profits. My question again is will you please restate your position you stated last week, revise your indication of what you gave to the members of this Assembly or agree with the statement I made in this House today?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to restate the position that I gave the House last week that in terms of the agreement, it provides for a rental of the land lease that was arranged with Chartwood and Eaton's of \$480,000 a year and then, on top of that, Mr. Speaker, after the first year of the agreement we will be receiving 51 per cent of the net cash flow.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, then I must ask the minister to correct a statement he made last week and I quote from the Hansard, 'net cash flow 51 per cent.' No, just a minute, it was the day before. Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me. The minister indicated a 51 per cent profit after expenses. Am I right or am I wrong on that, Mr. Minister? You indicated also on Friday that this represented 12 per cent on the money that has been advanced. It's on page 184 of Hansard, December 7. Am I correct or am I wrong on your statement you made in this House?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I have not checked the Hansard at the moment, if the hon. member is quoting Hansard then hopefully he has taken the words exactly from Hansard and I stand by those statements; 51 per cent of net cash flow is equivalent to

51 per cent of net profit that we'll be receiving and based on the current calculations (and this is, Mr. Speaker, a minimum situation) equivalent to 12 per cent net profit.

MR. LANE: — A new question to the minister. If you are getting the type of profits you say at 51 per cent, then Chartwood has to be getting approximately the same at 49 per cent which puts that figure the hon. member has given of roughly a 2000 per cent profit to Chartwood if you take the figures that you've given.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with the hon. member's assumptions.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, if I may, a supplement to the question of the hon. member. If you don't agree with the statement, why did you make the statement in the House? You said and I quote and I read it to you a minute ago and it's in Hansard. If you have Hansard in front of you, look it up. Twelve per cent on the money has been advanced. You've advanced \$55 million (\$35 million on a mortgage, \$14 million on land that you purchased for the project plus a \$2 million to \$3 million investment by Chartwood); that adds up to between \$50 million and \$55 million. A 12 per cent return on that is \$6 million a year. Now, we're getting 49 per cent of the profit. If your share is 51 per cent, theirs is 49 per cent and your profit is \$6 million a year, then it works out to 210 million plus the subsidy on the \$14 million purchase of land on which you are only charging \$450,000 a year.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member should stay in the used car business. I think he's probably doing better there than trying . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — . . . to figure out how retail shop developments come into being. It's pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservatives in the House and the defeated Conservative candidates are opposed to the downtown revitalization of Regina. We can, on that basis, assume they're opposed to the downtown revitalization anywhere in this province and they have stated their position on record. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with their assumptions or their figures. The agreement that was reached speaks for itself and is supported by the city of Regina. It is supported by the merchants of this city and I'm sure it's going to be supported by the people of Saskatchewan.

Meewasin Valley

MR. R.A. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A question to the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) in the absence of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). Mr. Premier, the Attorney General indicated in the House the other day that he hoped there would be major amendments to the Meewasin Valley Authority. Now in the absence of the Attorney General, can the Premier advise the assembly of the progress of that development and whether we can anticipate amendments to that authority in this session?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we're proposing to give notice today of amendments to The Meewasin Valley Authority Act. We'll put the notice in now. It will be recalled that that act was an act, the terms of which were agreed to by the city of Regina and the University of . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — City of Saskatoon.

MR. BLAKENEY: — City of Saskatoon, thank you, the University of Saskatchewan and

the rural municipality of Corman Park. There may be some delays in getting all of those bodies to agree to the amendments to the act as well but we anticipate that that will not happen and we will be able to come forward with amendments which are acceptable to all the parties. If it is the wish of the other parties that the act be repealed, we would presumably consider that as well although I would think it would be rather surprising for us to repeal an act that had received the unanimous support of this House and the support of all of the other parties. When the groups came forward with agreed amendments, which I anticipate will, in fact, be the case, we expect we'll be able to move forward rapidly.

Tabling of Public Accounts

MR. ANDREW: — A new question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier (Allan Blakeney) as well, in the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Tchorzewski). It is my understanding, Mr. Premier, that presently the public accounts of the past year of the Government of Saskatchewan have now been printed. As well, the rules of the Assembly do not require the tabling of those public accounts until some 15 days after the session. Can the Premier give the assurance to the members of this House that if those public accounts are in fact ready and this House does not sit the 15 days, that they would be tabled so the members could study those public accounts prior to the spring session?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm simply not informed on whether or not they are printed or what state they are in so I will take notice and ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Tchorzewski) to reply.

MR. ANDREW: — A supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I will take a new question.

MR. ANDREW: — Should that assumption be true and they are, in fact, ready, will the Premier give the assurance that we shall have those documents so that we are not going to be unduly delayed in the reviewing of those expenditures?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I simply am not informed on whether there be any reason why they wouldn't be available for tabling even though they are printed, but I take the point of the hon. member. If there aren't any reasons of which I am not now aware, I would see no reason why they couldn't be made available to members for study. Certainly there is every evidence that the members opposite would profit from studying the accounts.

Delays in Driver Licensing

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) who is responsible for the driver licensing division of the province.

Mr. Minister, I have had numerous complaints from school bus drivers and people simply needing a driving test, that it is taking up to six weeks to complete the tests. They are required to drive in and take the written test, then make a second appointment and drive in again for the driving test. Why, Mr. Minister, is it necessary to drive in for a written test and make the second trip for a driving test?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, I know that

there have been some problems with some delays in certain areas, mainly because of a shortage of staff and distances and so on. I am aware of the problem that the member raises. We have taken action to see that this situation will be corrected and I am sure it will be. If it is not I would appreciate hearing from you to let me know if the problems continue.

MR. SWAN: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. You said that you have taken action but you didn't say what the action was. Could you advise this Assembly what action you have taken?

MR. KRAMER: — The action I have taken was to bring those problems to my new chairman of the highway traffic board for him to correct as speedily as possible. I have not yet received a report on his action.

MR. SWAN: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In talking with the highway traffic board, they tell me it is simply a matter of having only 28 people to do the tests, and 114 different points in the province to move to. They tell me that if they had local people who could do the actual . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I recognize the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Answer to Question on Development of SEDCO Property

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, on December 5 last, the hon. member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) asked the Premier a question in my absence, which the Premier said he would take notice of. The question says, "Would you reconsider your position and put up for public tender the development through the private sector, and recoup at least some of SEDCO's losses?" (referring to the study that is being made at the SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) centre).

I would like to inform the hon. member that we are not near any developmental stages on the SEDCO centre. We are merely making a study and that study could take an awfully long time. When the times comes that we are ready for development, if he questions our sincerity he will be able to raise it.

Another question the same member asked the same day was about a particular winery that we are hoping to locate on a site adjacent to the SEDCO centre, and he named a few in his question. I would like to inform the hon. member that the winery he named has no bearing whatsoever on the winery that made the request to the province. It is not the Moose Jaw winery. He need not fear. It was just a mere question which came to SEDCO from outside of the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll take the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. SMISHEK: — . . . we could move on to special order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. The request has been made by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Smishek) that we move down the agenda to special order and return later today to conclude the balance of routine proceedings. Is the Assembly in agreement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: — Special order.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Solomon (Regina North-West) for an address in reply and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Berntson (Leader of the Opposition).

MR. C. WHITE (Regina Wascana): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I rose on Friday to take part in this debate, I congratulated various members on both sides of the House on their election or elevation to various posts during the last few months. Had the clock not run out, it was my intent to direct my remarks to a variety of items contained in the throne speech which are indicative of further progress by the people of our province. I intended as well to speak on the needs of students for a bursary program and the desirability of erecting a new home for the provincial archives, the construction of a new archives building perhaps including an art gallery and fine arts facilities would be a worthy project for our province's 75th anniversary. However, certain things which occurred in the House on Friday or on preceding days convinced me that I should devote my time to a single section of the throne speech — agriculture — and the need to support our farmers in their battle for retention of a strong wheat board and the crowrate.

Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, directly or indirectly, is very important to my constituency. If agriculture goes downhill economically, many people whom I represent will be poorer and some of them will be unemployed. Despite the remarkable advances made by the province in the fields of potash, oil, coal, manufacturing and so forth under the Blakeney government, Saskatchewan people cannot prosper if agriculture is in the doldrums. The members opposite have made it quite clear that given the opportunity, they, in cahoots with the High River hero and his sidekicks, would do immeasurable damage to agriculture in this province. They would like nothing better than to destroy the wheat board and abolish the Crow's Nest Pass rate agreement. It's doubtful if one could pick a better combination to insure the people of Saskatchewan of being residents of a have-not province for years to come. It's a combination designed to make paupers of many fine Saskatchewan farmers and their families, a combination for charging the farmer more for transportation and paying him less for his product.

I was nothing less than shocked, Mr. Speaker, by the tirade of the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) against orderly marketing and the marketing boards the other day. Saskatchewan farmers struggled years for the orderly marketing of the commodities they produce. The greatest pillar of the orderly marketing system in this province is the Canadian Wheat Board. When Tories attack the farmer, they go straight for his juggler. The member for Souris-Cannington, Mr. Speaker, convinced me of the accuracy of what some writers have said about R.B. Bennett's re-establishment of the wheat board. It was set up for a second time as part of his new deal just before the federal election of 1935. Some have called it a death-bed conversion — a case of a man grasping for straws to stave off defeat by a fed-up electorate. Bennett has also been accused of running a one-man government, that a substantial portion of his new deal was the product of his own mind rather than a joint production of himself and his cabinet colleagues. Perhaps a great many Tories were not in favor of the wheat board when it was re-established but we can let that pass. What does matter and what I think the farmers and other people of Saskatchewan should know is that the Tories of today,

both federal and provincial, sound just like Tories at the end of World War I when the first Canadian Wheat Board has been established and the question of its future was under discussion.

Let me tell you what they had to say of the wheat board and you be the judge as to whether or not the member for Souris-Cannington and other Tories are not of the same stripe. R. J. Manion, Tory, Fort William and one-time party leader – and all of these quotations are from Hansard:

I feel at this time, that the war being over, the government would be wise in considering as far as they can the de-control of everything we have been controlling in this country.

De-control, Mr. Speaker, for de-control's sake.

Donald Sutherland, Tory, South Oxford, Ontario:

I do not think it is wise or in the interests of the people themselves to have nursing legislation under normal conditions. I think the sooner the people are thrown on their own resources in such matters in every respect the better it will be for all concerned.

I have other examples, Mr. Speaker, but two are enough to show that old Tories never die. Through the intervention of divine providence they are reincarnated. Donald Sutherland now sits as the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) and R.J. Manion in the gallery, both complete with nineteenth century minds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — What reasons did the Tories give for opposing the continued existence of the wheat board? Listen to Donald Sutherland, South Oxford:

. . . one of the effects of the operation of the wheat board during the past year, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, is that the livestock industry . . . received a setback . . .

And again:

Western Ontario has received absolutely no consideration from this board and I, for one, would like to see this business return to ordinary channels and again be governed by the laws of supply and demand. We do not want to have dictators doing things which were done last year and which hampered western Ontario as no other thing has done.

What had happened the preceding year, Mr. Speaker? Well, for one thing under the first wheat board, prairie farmers received the highest prices for their wheat that they would receive until the 1970s.

R.J. Manion had other reasons for opposing the board.

I have received in the last few weeks resolutions from the Port Arthur and Fort William Grain Exchange and the City Council of Fort William, opposing anything in the shape of control . . . unless I thought their resolutions

worthy of consideration. I should not feel it incumbent upon me to support them.

Mr. Speaker, that's what certain Tories had to say about the first Canadian Wheat Board. Easter and B.C. Tories got rid of the board to benefit their own regions or their influential friends. And when Saskatchewan Tories work for the weakening or end of the present board they are certainly not promoting the interests of the prairie farmer. They are kowtowing to special interest groups based in other parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, the Tories and their friends like Palliser and Cargill say to us get rid of the wheat board and sell more wheat. How does that stand up in the light of the past? Not at all. Here's what a member of the House of Commons a year or so after the first wheat board was abolished had to say:

. . . unified buying in Europe continues today. Greece within the last week bought 4 million or 5 million bushels in the United States. Great Britain has purchased all her wheat as a nation since the war and is doing so today. Lord Lee bought 180 million bushels of wheat in the States last June. Why did he not buy here in Canada? Because we had no wheat board to arrange credit with him for the purchase of such a large amount of wheat.

I ask Tories opposite how oil-exporting nations today propose to sell their oil? From government agency to government agency. I ask the members opposite who buys the wheat we export to China, Japan and Russia, some of our major customers? The answer is agencies of government. Can't Tories get two ideas in their minds at the same time? Abolish the wheat board and you can be certain of one thing. Unless certain countries – Russia, China and Japan – can get our wheat at sufficiently reduced prices from private traders to make it worthwhile, they would be asking for a return of the board. Why run from Continental to Cargill unless you can make money? And if money is saved, at whose expense will it be? The Saskatchewan farmer's expense. One of the most remarkable achievements of the first wheat board was the much-reduced cost at which it marketed our wheat internationally. And, Mr. Speaker, there is also the question of arranging government credit for sales to certain countries, whether grain is sold by the wheat board or private parties. But I'll let that pass for the present.

I turn now to the crowrate, Mr. Speaker, and there is not the slightest doubt in my mind where Saskatchewan Tories stand in that respect. They are against it and they always have been.

The performance of members opposite on Friday in this House was really something to see. First the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) and then the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman), accused the Premier of being willing to barter the crowrate. But how revealing. Neither one of them indicated support for the crowrate. Their game is clear for all to see. They know that Saskatchewan people will suffer if crow goes and that politicians supporting abolition will be held in disrepute. They want to transfer if possible some of the notoriety that goes with abolition from themselves and their fellow Tories in Ottawa to members on this side of the House. It's really too bad, Mr. Speaker, that we didn't have TV in this House when NDP (New Democratic Party) members stated and otherwise indicated that the Blakeney government stands foursquare behind crowrate and hence behind the farmers in this province. On such occasions, all members opposite sat on their hands. Not a single one thumped a desk to show support for the crow. Their stand is identical to Tories in the past when the crowrate was suspended, and when friends of the farmers in the House of Commons were fighting to

have it restored. Here's what certain Tories had to say on that occasion, and I want you to note their home provinces; there are a number of them.

John Stewart, Tory, Lanark Ontario: ' . . . in the general interests of Canada it should not be revived.'

L.J. Ladner, Tory, Vancouver: 'I think the course proposed is one which is inimical to the best interests of the country.'

Sir Henry Drayton, Tory, West York Ontario: ' . . . what is wanted in Canada is a reduction . . . in freight rates on basic commodities which have to move in mass and to the extent that special . . . rates are given here . . . you can say goodbye to any reduction in rates.'

After the crowrate had been restored or partially restored, other Tories had this to say:

James Arthur, Perry Sound, Ontario: 'It's a 'bribe to . . . western people . . . at the expense of the whole of Canada.'

H.C. Hockin, Tory, Toronto West: 'Ontario and Quebec had to go without any reduction in order that the West might get the advantage.'

B.M. Baxter, Tory, St. John, N.B.: 'Restoration means 'that the people in other parts of Canada will have to pay more than they otherwise would.'

R.B. Hanson, Tory, York Sunbury, N.B.: 'Reimposition 'struck a blow at the interests of the maritime provinces, because producers there were deprived of a . . . decrease in the freight rates on coal . . .'

H.A. Steward, Tory, Leeds, Ontario: 'Surely the time has come when this agreement . . . should be terminated . . .'

And M.A. Senn, Tory, Haldiman, Ontario: 'The Ontario farmer is suffering very materially from high rates, and I believe great injustice was done him by restoration of the Crow's Nest Pass rates . . . Mr. Beatty, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, made the statement . . . that the chief objection to those rates was the fact that it would prevent the downward revision of rates in Canada generally.'

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted nine Tories who spoke out against the crowrate. Every one of them represented either Manitoba, Ontario or B.C. They all opposed the rate, as did other Tories from those regions on the grounds that reimposition deprived interests they represented of possible economic gain. Their approach was to charge the farmers more so that people in their provinces could pay less. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely clear from the evidence I have presented that when Tories (and that includes the Tories opposite), support elimination of the crowrate they are working to promote the interests of other sections of Canada. They are betraying the interests of the farmers and other people of our province, the very people who elected them to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Now, Mr. Speaker, Tories are prone to tell us that farmers in Saskatchewan will derive major benefits from the elimination of crowrate. Their railway friends, they say, will use the extra money received to purchase rail cars which will

consequently be used to move more grain. Is this true? The hon. member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter) has ably demonstrated it certainly isn't so in the United States. My research leads to similar conclusions. Two years after suspension of the crowrate, here is the situation on a rail line in Alberta, one-third of the way through the crop year. I'll give you the stations, the cars required, and the cars received and it's one third through the crop year:

| STATIONS | CARS REQUIRED | CARS RECEIVED |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Manville | 400 | 32 |
| Minburn | 300 | 24 |
| Innisfree | 300 | 29 |
| Lavoy | 750 | 12 |
| Vegreville | 1000 | 66 |
| Mundare | 600 | 30 |
| Lamont | 600 | 45 |
| Bruderheim | 600 | 17 |
| Fort Saskatchewan | 1000 | 31 |

One third through the crop year! Where railway companies and Tories are concerned, it is not by their words but by their deeds that ye shall know them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Mr. Speaker, I could go on to show how the Great Lakes shipping industry proceeded to gobble up a great deal of the benefit which was supposed to have accrued to farmers when the crowrate was restored after it was suspended. It is a story which makes one ask whenever the phrase crowrate is spoken, benefit from whom? Based on the past you could scarcely expect it to be the farmer. Rather the benefit would wind up in the pockets of special interest groups which finance and support the Tory party — the CPS, Cargill, Exxon and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just let me sum up what I've said. When the first wheat board was abolished, it was Tories from B.C. and Ontario who called for its elimination. They opposed it because they saw elimination as leading to economic gain for their provinces or special interest groups they supported. And when it was abolished, not only did the price of wheat drop, but we lost wheat sales. The same is true of reimposition of the crowrate after it had been suspended. Tories from B.C., Ontario and the Maritimes opposed restoration on the basis that by asking prairie farmers pay higher rates, groups in their provinces could get reductions. They were not seeking what was good for the Saskatchewan farmer. I also pointed out that after two and one-half years of giving the railways more money, there was still a dire shortage of cars for the movement of prairie grain. Finally, I gave evidence to show that there is a need to be suspicious of anything called crow benefit.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat a few words spoken by our Premier Thursday night at the ceremony launching Doug Bocking's book Saskatchewan — A Pictorial History, produced under the auspices of the Saskatchewan Archives Board and the Celebrate Saskatchewan committee, and this is pretty close to what he said: People who do not know or understand their country's history are a people doomed to repeat its errors.

I would urge Saskatchewan Tories to cease betraying the Saskatchewan farmer and

join us in support of the wheat board and the crowrate, before they do irreparable harm to this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — If they cannot do that, I challenge them to refute the statements I have made in this throne speech debate. Mr. Speaker, I'll be voting against the amendment and for the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to address the Assembly as Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — It is therefore appropriate for me to give some of my observations about the department as I have found it and some of my thoughts on its direction for the future.

First of all I would like to extend my personal congratulations to the newest member of the legislature, the member for Regina North-West, John Solomon. During the contest for the nomination I was, of course, an independent bystander. But I did watch with considerable interest as he contested and won that nomination. I am sure that he will quickly make his mark on this Assembly and become a valuable member of our caucus.

As well, Mr. Speaker, in assuming my place in the Assembly as Minister of Social Services, I wish to pay tribute to the voters of my constituency. The credit for my becoming first a member of the Assembly and then being appointed the Minister of Social Services is due in no small part to the people of Quill Lakes. In 1975 I received a solid plurality but in 1978 this support was increased to about 54 per cent of all the votes. A clear majority of the voters of the constituency of Quill Lakes gave me their trust and I intend to prove to them their confidence in me is justified.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the newly elected Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the hon. member at large. I know it must have given him some satisfaction in this achievement, but for a party which claims 40,000 members, it must have been a disappointing event to have only 693 voting delegates at the leadership convention.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne identified three areas in which my department will be concentrating much of its effort over the coming months. These are not the only areas in which special efforts are justified, but they are the ones where special opportunities for progress now exist. Therefore, I would like to discuss these three areas in greater detail.

Employment support. Mr. Speaker, as many know, my department provides income support for Saskatchewan residents in need. What is less well known is the fact that for a number of years we have been placing increasing emphasis on directly helping these people to earn their own income. This employment support program was set up in 1973-74 to help social assistance recipients become more competitive in the labor market. We do this in three main ways.

Job assessment and placement. Through the five major projects around the province, such as the regional employment development committee in Saskatoon. About 300 people in this year are being placed in private sector jobs, 300 people who would otherwise be more or less totally dependent on social assistance.

Secondly short-term job creation. Here we provide funds for municipalities to hire long-term assistance recipients to do community clean-ups, maintenance and beautification. This is, of course a direct supplement to the public works activities of many municipalities. Parks are developed and maintained, curling rinks and hockey rinks are repaired and kept up and buildings are painted. And some of these people on these projects later are hired as employees by the local public works department in these communities. This year about 40 projects will create around 200 jobs.

Thirdly, economic development. In co-operation with the federal government, we participate in about 50 projects a year which create 250 jobs through providing financial assistance and support services to enterprises being operated by disadvantaged and native individuals. The focus here is on creating longer-term and permanent jobs and a recent evaluation indicates that over 80 per cent of those involved in these three types of projects do not return to the social assistance rolls.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the saving in social assistance which we do not have to pay out is substantial. Still there is room for improvement.

So, Mr. Speaker, during the 1980 year, we will be restructuring our employment services program so that it will be tied directly with our regional income security offices. Training needs and other barriers to employment will be identified at the time that the individuals make their initial application for social assistance and a long-term plan will be worked out for the fullest possible development of each individual's employment potential. Thus, the same field offices will be administering both the monthly income support payments and ensuring that the various steps in the plan for the enhancement of individual's employability are being achieved.

In particular, we believe that single parents – most of whom of course are women – can most readily benefit from this approach. In this, we will begin with the assumption that most people applying for social assistance, in fact, want to work to the best of their abilities if given the opportunity. Our job is to help them to reach their goal which we also share, in an orderly and planned manner.

Secondly, I want to address, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis on service which we are providing to senior citizens. A first objective here is the smooth integration of the special-care home program with the rapidly expanding home care network.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that the first home care board was set up in May in the Ituna-Lestock district shortly before I became minister. Since then, this first board has been joined by more. These are Beechy-Eston, Lloydminster, Leader, Canora, Tisdale, Watrous-Davidson, Assiniboia, Outlook, Moosomin, Grenfell, Wynyard, Biggar, Rosetown, Melville, Oxbow, Shellbrook, Lanigan and Carlyle.

Only seven months after the start-up with more than one-third of the 45 boards now in being and in various stages of preparation for the delivery of service, we are confident that the full complement of 45 functioning boards will be in place by our target date of 1981.

The availability of the four primary home care services – nursing, homemaking, meals and home maintenance – throughout the province will be of great benefit to our citizens. These services are already available in many parts of Saskatchewan through about 125 local home care agencies. As part of the new program, a number of these have recently been expanded and new services added. Our expenditure on local home care agencies in 1979-80 will almost double what it was last years and the establishment of local home care boards will bring an even large increase in expenditures. We are doing this, Mr. Speaker, because we believe that when given the option of receiving needed support services at home or going into an institution, most of our elderly people will choose to stay in their own home. Over time this will allow the special-care homes to concentrate increasingly on persons with greater needs. In doing this, Mr. Speaker, we are mindful of the needs to make the transition to the delivery of the boards a smooth one and to avoid creating financial and management problems for the administration of existing home care boards and the special-care homes. To this end there will continue to be consultation with the Saskatchewan Association of Special-care Homes and the Saskatchewan Homemakers Society Association and others.

Members should know that Saskatchewan's special-care beds, per 1,000 senior citizens, already exceeds the average for all provinces in Canada. Further, the Saskatchewan bed population ratio is higher than in British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Newfoundland. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we must address a very tough question: who is special care really for? In short, who should be occupying the 9,000 plus beds? I have just received recently a completed study on health care needs in the Lloydminster area commissioned jointly by the Minister of Health and the Alberta Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In this study, Dr. Graham Clarkson, while focussed on the Lloydminster area, comes to some conclusion which have application elsewhere. The report states:

Clearly while institutional services will be needed for some chronically ill and frail elderly who will require intermittent or continuing care in such facilities, many of the chronically ill and frail elderly should never require to be admitted to these facilities, provided appropriate community services are available in appropriate volume and quality.

It would seem evident that some of the chronically ill, disabled or frail elderly trend not to have been given a choice concerning the services they preferred to receive. It is not unusual for relatives or attending physicians to put an elderly person's name on a waiting list for admission to an institution in case he or she may require that type of service some time in the future.

The report also notes that frequently people who do not want or need to be in a home nevertheless accept placement because if they refuse, as Dr. Clarkson says, their name will go to the bottom of the waiting list, and irrespective of their need in the future, they will have to wait till their name comes to the top again.

Indeed, according to Dr. Clarkson, in one institution that he surveyed, 20 per cent of those residents had apparently been admitted against their will, and of those who did opt to come in, 60 per cent would have preferred to say in their own home.

The report also states:

These assessments come as no surprise, for recent surveys of residents in institutions continue to show that many are misplaced, even in areas which have a smaller supply of institutional services than Lloydminster. One survey pointed out that while some residents could have been adequately maintained in the community, others required active hospital care.

Perhaps the most interesting conclusion of all in the report states:

Society in recent years has taken legislative action to protect the mentally ill from being arbitrarily and unnecessarily banished into mental hospitals. A full specialist assessment, independently carried out, is required before persons can be committed to a mental hospital against their will.

They or their relatives and friends can appeal such committal to appeal boards or the courts. It seems the elderly should be protected from arbitrary actions as well, for only one thing at present seems certain – admission to a chronic care institution is admission for life.

Mr. Speaker, these are the major conclusions which I draw from the Clarkson report and from the other related reports, the Saskatoon geriatric task force report:

1. In the past, too much emphasis has been placed on using institutions to meet the care needs of our aging population;
2. Because of the failure to offer alternatives, people have sometimes been forced into institutions, who did not need this form of care;
3. The process by which decisions are made about who needs special care, in some cases, is inadequate;
4. The special care classification and subsidy systems are in need of change.

I therefore believe, Mr. Speaker, that our major emphasis must be placed, not on building much large numbers of institutional beds, but rather on setting up additional services throughout the province such as home care to provide for our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to go into further detail, but I want to turn to one last subject and that is in respect to child welfare.

The third area of immediate concern is child welfare and day care in particular. As mentioned in the throne speech, I recently announced a review of the provincial day care program.

We wish to find ways of facilitating the community sponsorship of day care and of identifying those specific areas which should receive priority in the further development of day care.

Mr. Speaker, we all speak a great deal on ceremonial occasions about the value of prevention. Child welfare is one of the areas in which the prevention of neglect, abuse, and inadequate development can in fact be the focus of our service. Every child in this province deserves a decent childhood and a sound start in life.

In line with this preventive philosophy, in 1977 my department established a central

provincial registry for keeping track of suspected cases of child neglect and abuse. This registry is also tied in to those kept by other provinces. By this means, possible instances of improper treatment of children can be more quickly detected and accurate verification assisted.

A related part of the program of preventive child abuse is a public education campaign. This involves workshops conducted by social services staff for medical personnel, school teachers, home and school officials and others likely to observe evidence of neglect or abuse. These workshops focus on the detection of abuse and diagnosis of their cause.

On the day care front, Mr. Speaker, we have given increased emphasis to our special needs program. Under this program day care centres receive an additional \$150 per month for children with special needs and can also receive special equipment grants of up to an additional \$50 per month. These cover such things as special teachers for children with speech defects or for those who are mildly or moderately retarded. In 1977-78 there were 13 children in this program. In 1978-79 there were 26 and in 1979-80 the number had increased to 55. I am pleased to say that results to date clearly indicate the great value of early detection and treatment of developmental problems.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the basic nature of any society is revealed by how the old, the disabled, the poor and the unhealthy are treated by the rest of society. Can any society which does not care with warmth and generosity for its dispossessed truly call itself civilized? I think not. We in Saskatchewan have done much to acknowledge our obligations. But I for one must say that I do not feel we can be too self-congratulatory. So long as one child in this province suffers neglect or abuse, or one senior citizen moves toward the end of life in unwanted isolation and fear, or one mentally or physically limited person tries without success to cope with life in a complex and demanding world, I will not be satisfied, nor should you. As J.S. Woodsworth wrote:

What we desire for ourselves we wish for all. To this end may we take our part in the world's work and the world's struggles.

We see in this province great promise of future prosperity. But I sometimes worry, Mr. Speaker, that we will be dazzled by this great light and in the drive for development forget our creative purpose. This purpose has been and must remain equal opportunity for each person in Saskatchewan to achieve personal growth and to fully participate in the burdens and benefits of society. We have done much as a party and a government, Mr. Speaker, and we should be proud of those achievements. I believe that much more remains to be done and I want to say that I am eager, Mr. Speaker, to meet the challenge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to speak in this throne speech debate for several reasons which I will outline in a few moments. First of all, I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of what, I think, was a tremendous job of moving and seconding the speech from the throne. I want to congratulate John Solomon, our new colleague, as well, for winning the constituency of Regina North-West. He already has a record to his credit; he has, for the second time, defeated the Leader of the Liberal Party and he has, for the second time, defeated the Tory candidate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: – I am sure, Mr. Speaker, by this time both the Liberal leader and the other Tory candidate will feel that their chances of getting into this House are very slim.

A short while ago, the political scene of Saskatchewan saw yet another change. This, of course, was the recent election of Stan Hovdebo in the federal riding of Prince Albert.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: – The by-election in Prince Albert took on a added meaning because it was a Tory stronghold for 26 years and more than that, it showed that the people of Saskatchewan wanted to send Joe Clark a message that his policies and programs were not acceptable. Mr. Speaker, the people of Prince Albert clearly sent a message. They sent a message to Joe Clark that they wanted positive government action in those matters which presently plague this country. They sent a message asking for action similar to that which they receive in Saskatchewan. I'm proud to say that at least 50 per cent of my riding falls within the boundary of Prince Albert federal constituency. I look forward with great anticipation to working closely with Stan Hovdebo to serve the people both here in Saskatchewan and through Stan, in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: – Mr. Speaker, today I want to speak about two areas – one being co-operatives, other one being Crown corporations.

In the area of Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, Sask Tel plays a very vital role in the day-to-day communication service in this province. In the past three years, Sask Tel has voluntarily assimilated 560 rural telephone companies and given service to more than 41,000 additional subscribers. During that time, we have buried about 26,000 kilometres of wire and cable. In 1980 we will once again bury a further 10,000 kilometres of cable and wire which is a record in Canada for burying of cable and wire in any four-year period.

Mr. Speaker, this has meant many jobs and many man-hours of work to contractors in our province. Sask Tel represents a positive public action in providing a vital service to the people of Saskatchewan – a service that the private sector could not perform, let alone duplicate, at the cost charged by Sask Tel today. For example, Mr. Speaker, I just happen to have handy some of the phone rates in other provinces for basic service . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Let me quote them for the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck). In Tory Toronto, it costs \$8.55 for a telephone; in Halifax, \$9.95; in Vancouver, \$9.25. And, Mr. Speaker, in Regina – yes, good old socialist Saskatchewan – it costs only \$6.20.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: – This, Mr. Speaker, is what can be done by a Crown corporation. Now, let's look at what the so-called free-enterprise governments do for their small business community. The opposition always says we do nothing for small business. Let us show you what we really do. In Vancouver, a business rate costs \$27.75; in Halifax, \$28.85 and in Toronto, \$27.35. Get this one. It will really hit the opposition hard – Edmonton,

\$17.80. Once again, it is very interesting to note that in Edmonton, it's nearly \$10 less than in Vancouver and Toronto and Halifax, but of course, Edmonton's is not a free enterprise organization. Edmonton has a public utility and that goes to show you that private enterprise does not do the job as well as does a public utility. Of course, once again, we have to come back to sunny old Saskatchewan and the businessmen in Saskatchewan don't pay \$27.85 or \$29.95. No, Mr. Speaker, businessmen pay \$14.85 in Regina and Saskatoon.

But what about the rural subscribers in Saskatchewan? How does this stack up, Mr. Speaker? Well, in St. Louis in my riding, it costs \$4.30 for a residential telephone. Comparable places in British Columbia – \$5.25; in Tory Ontario – \$4.95; in Nova Scotia – \$8.35. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in spite of its being a Crown corporation in Alberta, they are above Saskatchewan at \$5.05.

That, Mr. Speaker, illustrates the benefit of public ownership of an essential service and just to prove is efficiency, it returned some \$19 million in dividends to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of this money is ploughed back into new and improved services such as a 40-line dial extension at Carievale (now where's Carievale, Mr. Member? I guess he's the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) now) or touch-tone equipment at Lampman or rural service improvement at Unity. Mr. Speaker, this is only a portion of a list of about 300 projects that Sask Tel has undertaken in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, I want to warn the people of Saskatchewan that there are storm clouds on the horizon – storm clouds that are not the making of Sask Tel or the people of Saskatchewan, but decisions made in eastern Canada by the Canadian Radio Television and Telecommunications Commission. In 1979, the CRTC made a decision to allow interconnection between CNCP and Bell Canada. This automatically means that rural subscribers in Saskatchewan will pay more. They will pay more because some of the revenues which are in the Trans-Canada Telecommunications pool will be siphoned off and given directly to CNCP and their organizations.

Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba fought this case with all our power. However, the CRTC saw fit to allow this interconnect in spite of the fact it would cost many millions of dollars in western Canada. We also asked that the new Tory government in Ottawa intervene on behalf of all communications carriers to stop the CRTC decision. We thought with the new government, one that said they wanted to have consultation, wanted provinces to ask them to do things for them, that it would be a good idea to try them. But what did they do? It was barely a week after we asked them to intervene, Mr. Speaker, that the federal cabinet confirmed that the CNCP decision would be allowed and the interconnect would be allowed with Bell Canada. That's what the federal Tories did for us! That's the kind of consultation we can expect from Joe Clark! That's the kind of consultation we got and we can expect in decisions from Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport). I didn't ever believe it would happen. This, Mr. Speaker, automatically means that they will interconnect with B.C. Tel and they have already asked us and Sask Tel to interconnect. If B.C. Tel has interconnection it will even be worse in so far as cost to Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba are concerned.

I'm not here today to tell you how many dollars it will cost each subscriber but I will estimate it will cost over \$100 million in a short period of time, and that will mean a lot of money to the people of rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in knowing where the opposition in Saskatchewan stands on this issue. I would like to know if the opposition in Saskatchewan are behind the rural subscribers or if they condone the actions of the federal cabinet, the Tory federal cabinet and their friends in the CPR.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to turn to another Crown corporation, a very small Crown corporation and that is the Saskatchewan Transportation Company. This small Crown corporation serves roughly 380 communities, approximately 85 per cent of all towns, villages and hamlets in Saskatchewan. In some cases, it is the only regular means of access for passengers and freight in this province. This system uses for its ticket sales and freight handling, small businessmen in Saskatchewan so that they can be a part of a transportation system which is being recognized throughout Canada as a leader in the bus industry. Mr. Speaker, STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company) has a record of high efficiency, quality service and sound progressive management. If only our counterparts in the transportation business, such as the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railways) would just do a portion of what STC does, we would have a tremendous performance by other areas of transportation as well.

STC at the present time is participating in three intermodel studies with VIA Rail to upgrade our facilities at Moose Jaw, Melville and Regina. It is hoped that whatever the outcome STC will be able to move ahead in these three centres.

The corporations of course has another trait which makes it stand out and that of course is its employees. Mr. Speaker, the employees of STC are as loyal and courteous as those providing any other service in Saskatchewan, if not in Canada. A number of the drivers have put in many years of service and each in his own way contributes in a manner which no amount of money could buy, let alone measure.

In recognition of our 75th birthday, STC has launched a new program called Sask Pass. This program permits a person to travel anywhere on STC lines for a period of seven days at a greatly reduced price. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the company continues to do as it always has and that's to offer discounts on all our buses to our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, STC is another Crown corporation that is proving its worth to Saskatchewan and another important reason why rural Saskatchewan continues to survive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: – Mr. Speaker, you can look at Crown corporation after Crown corporation and find a success story in Saskatchewan.

Look at the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. It has returned to Saskatchewan's people in the last few years over \$60 million. This is a corporation, Mr. Speaker, which the opposition said would be dead in several years if it were turned into a Crown corporation. This is an industry where the opposition said if we did not stop taxing the private enterprise mines they would leave the province. Mr. Speaker, at the same time they are here; they are healthy and they are wealthier than ever. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has done its part in providing jobs and economic activity in this province.

Mr. Speaker, you can look at SaskOil, a Crown corporation which was set up several

years ago and has now returned to the people of Saskatchewan something over \$7 million. This Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker, like Petro-Can, is doing a job that the private sector would not do. It is doing the job of developing our resources, finding new resources and, at the same time, giving you and me, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and Canada a good return as well as an understanding of what is going on in this vital industry.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in reading the Hansard the other day when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) spoke in this House. Let me quote:

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan is fundamentally opposed to the government's course of acquisition of our resource industries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we had not been in potash and oil and sodium sulphate, we would not have the \$515 million that we have, that we received this year alone through our resource policy. Mr. Speaker, it goes further than this. We would not have an airport in Cudworth where I had the opportunity to participate in the official opening in July. We would not have the many senior citizen centres in places like Weldon, St. Benedict, Pilger, Middle Lake and other throughout the province. Mr. Speaker, we would not have housing projects in places like St. Louis and Wakaw, Kinistino and Yellow Creek. We would not have a health care system like we do in Saskatchewan. We would not have a hearing aid program or a dental program for our children. Towns and cities, villages and hamlets would not have received massive sums of money for projects ranging from skating rinks to water and sewer to gravelling their streets.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, believe in small communities. The Progressive Conservative Party does not. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) would have this all taken away on you. We believe that our resource policy is oriented for people of Saskatchewan both now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to a very important sector of our economy and what this government is doing to assist and nurture its continual growth. I am of course talking about the hundreds of co-operatives which are a trademark of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the other day in this House the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) stood before us and condemned the government for honoring the co-operative movement by holding a special week in its honor. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that a member who professes to know so much about Saskatchewan, who professes to be able to cure all the ills in the province would stand before this House and tell the government it should ignore a movement to which over 50 per cent of the population belongs – ignore them completely. He said they shouldn't have a day of recognition. That's what he said, and if you can read, you can read Hansard yourself. Yes sir, Mr. Speaker, it said it should ignore a movement which provides service when free enterprise friends like theirs leave or refuse to provide service to many small communities in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I am a politician and until the other day I thought the members opposite were too, but in one divine speech they have condemned themselves to the permanent opposition status. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, it is a role they are well suited for. After all, if the world is changing around you and all you can do at best is bury your head in the sands of Arizona and spout the rhetoric of the eighteenth century economists, then it is quite easy to understand that they will be in opposition for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I plan on making it my business to tell every co-operative person in Saskatchewan that the Tory opposition stands against the week of recognition. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Tory opposition stands against a week of recognition for a movement which started over 50 years ago and whose members have played such a vital role in the development of this province. Mr. Speaker, I will be asking the president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, I will be asking the president of Federated Co-operatives and I will be asking the president of Credit Union Central and many small co-operatives, what they think. I want to find out if they believe that a week of recognition is asking too much from their government.

Mr. Speaker, in June of this year the credit union system crossed a magic milestone and now represents over 50 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan with assets over \$2 billion. Mr. Speaker, in many of our communities the established banks have long gone and now credit unions are springing up. I look at places like Briercrest with a population of around 130 people. This community southwest of Regina lost its bank many years ago and a while ago it lost its only grocery store. The people of this community have in the last five years, established both a credit union and a co-operative food store. This community now continues to survive because of the co-operative way of life. This one example, Mr. Speaker, is typical of many communities in rural Saskatchewan. Through the co-operative way, rural Saskatchewan is staying alive.

My department plays a very vital role in two ways. Firstly, it provides a development role, giving advice, lending management and organizational expertise to people wishing to fill a void through a co-operative effort. To date there have been over 1,300 co-operatives formed ranging from seed cleaning plants to community halls, skating rinks and day care centres.

The second role the department plays is one of regulation, regulating the operations of all existing co-operatives registered in the province. This regulating consists of ensuring that audits and annual returns are done, providing advice in manpower in some cases, to help overcome particular problems and finally, to channel the needs of the co-operatives back through the government so that any legislative changes required are made.

In the last year my department, in co-operation with Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, embarked on a new program, called the house-building co-operative. This program, in just six months is directly responsible for over 200 homes being built, some of which are already complete. These homes are spread throughout the province in places like Grenfell, Lloydminster, Saskatoon, Estevan and Regina. This, Mr. Speaker, is further proof of what government action can do through co-operatives.

Mr. Speaker, the department has also launched another program, this time in the field of education. Mr. Speaker, for many years the co-operative sector has felt neglected and it's just now that they are having co-operative education in the schools. Let me tell you, it's a sad and sorry day when you see the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) stand in this House and say that the co-operatives should not be brought into the schools, that we shouldn't have co-operative education in schools. He really believes you shouldn't be sharing, you shouldn't teach children how to share, you shouldn't teach children how to get along with one another. And that's what co-operation is all about. I think it's time that we gave the opposition a course on what co-operatives really are. They are not merely a credit union, or a wheat pool or a co-op store. They are a matter of sharing with each other, living with each other, learning how

to get along with each other, and that is something that I think Tories all over this country could certainly stand a lesson in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: – They are certainly not very acquainted with getting along with each other. Mr. Speaker, there are many, many things a person could talk about. I think the throne speech has been a good one. I think it has been one of the finest documents that we could see in years when there has to be restraints and yet when there's progress. I think that this government has done a good job and I believe that the people in my constituency, the constituency of Kinistino, would want time to do just exactly what I'm going to do. I'm going to vote for the motion, and I'll certainly vote against the Conservative amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): – Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to extend to the member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) and to the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long), the mover and the seconder of the motion, my congratulations for the way they carried out their tasks which I believe are important tasks in this Assembly: that of the moving and the seconding of the throne speech. The member for Regina North-West seemed to speak, as a new member, with ability, some perception and indeed, even some grace. He had, I would suggest, a most difficult function in trying to defend this government's drift towards mediocrity. I listened to the throne speech debate with attentiveness. At the best it seemed to demonstrate sorely the insignificance that this government tends to put on the institution of the throne speech. At the worst it reflects, I suppose, a government starting to grow tired, to be bankrupt of innovation and bankrupt of ideas. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, that all comes at a time when we in the province of Saskatchewan are literally on the edge of a new frontier, at the dawning of a new decade. Before I say more about that subject I'm sure the Assembly will afford me a few partisan words with regard to our new leader of our party, Mr. Grant Devine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: – I believe that he is indeed a new, bright, young political face on the horizon of Canadian politics. Born and raised in the new West, educated here and in the East, a young man, a strong mind, a new vitality and clearly a man for the future.

This government has touted in their throne speech that we're going to see a new initiative in the field of the environment. Most would, I think, agree that it is indeed a field sorely disregarded as of late, not only by this government but by many other governments. We are told that there will be a new environment act coming down that will require environmental impact studies. To date we have seen nothing of that promise, even though some seven months have passed since the Assembly last sat. But traditionally, when the government is bringing in a new initiative, the Premier in his address in reply makes reference and further expands upon that concept of the environment. What did the Premier say here in the address in reply? Precisely nothing. Reference was made in a self-congratulatory fashion to the Squaw Rapids project – an environmental impact study that I suppose is most noteworthy in the fact it has not been followed. As well, he devoted two or three lines to uranium – the great problem of uranium which will be a debate of the 1980s. Two lines were spent there – and again

the same words as if the government has done in the past a marvellous job – and I say that is not enough.

But not one word about the future in the environment field. Not one word. And what does that tell us? What does that tell us, Mr. Speaker? All is well? That we can expect very little in the way of new direction in this most important field? Where do we go from here? Are we to leave each problem to the various departments in the way they see fit to handle it? It strikes me the significant areas in the environment which we are going to face in the 1980s (and if we leave them to the various department heads I think we're going to be in trouble) are mineral resources, SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation), SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation), SaskOil – all the responsibility of the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer), the person who de facto makes the decisions. His performance has fallen far short of what I believe is appropriate action. Witness Squaw Rapids – a department under his control. Witness Key Lake – a department under his control completely disregarding government regulations. Witness Coronach. It was the minister who thumbed his nose at the IJC (International Joint Commission) over the delicate area of acid rain.

Mr. Speaker, to allow the environment to be under the care of Jack Messer is like entrusting a bountiful young maiden to the arms of a debaucher.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: – We have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to future generations in this province and on this planet. We must always guard against simply reaping the momentary advantages but must continually look a little ahead when it comes to the environment.

I wish also to say a few words about the field of agriculture. As has always been the case in this province, I suppose agriculture has taken a back seat when it comes to government initiative. There's nothing, I suppose, very glamorous about picking rocks or ploughing fields or hauling hay bales. Successive governments have sought instead to develop uranium, to build a pulp mill, to build a brick factory – but always we have come back to the most important industry, agriculture. And in this throne speech, what about agriculture? Six thousand fewer farmers since land bank; lowest farm income of all prairie provinces; farm cost price squeeze. This government's approach to agriculture has been dominated by ideology and dogma. Every program or idea is met with the same comment. We just heard the member say, you're out to destroy the co-ops; you're out to destroy the wheat board; you're out to destroy the crowrate; you're against orderly marketing. Every program meets the same song – the same song from the members opposite. I say, Mr. Speaker, the NDP did not provide the farmers of Saskatchewan with the Canadian Wheat Board. The NDP did not provide the farmers of Saskatchewan with the statutory crowrates. They have always been in the area of federal jurisdiction and they've been there for five decades or ten decades and successive governments have come and gone and the crowrate has stayed and the wheat board has stayed and the NDP has not been in power one time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: – The future of those two programs will not depend on the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a very fertile region of the world, in a world which we see (to our horror very often on television) starving. What does our government and the budget do

about increased production? Nothing. Does the throne speech refer to increased productivity? No. Does the throne speech give any new initiative in the field of finding new markets? Not a chance. Our Premier, in the name of humanity, rather than providing food to those people, seeks to sell the uranium.

The farmers of Saskatchewan are no longer prepared to simply live and accept the dogmas of yesterday when it comes to agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I would further like to make a few comments about the freedom of information. Changes are required in our institutions if we are to keep pace with the changing winds of time. That applies to the institution of this legislature, Mr. Speaker. The most urgent and basic reform is to stop the secrecy which denies public access to public information. This legislature cannot do what it does not know. This is not a narrow legal question; it is basic power politics. What we are talking about here is real power in the hands of those who have the facts. In a democracy that power must be shared by all in the province; today, it is not. It is to that degree we no longer have a democracy in any sense of the word. There is excessive power in the hands of those who hid public information from the people and from the legislature. To obtain information in any politically sensitive area in this province is indeed difficult at best, and simply impossible most of the time. If you simply try to get that information one gets the feeling you are knocking on the door to an empty room.

For example, what about the studies of uranium markets? Why should the people of the province not have that information? If we are to make the decisions as to whether or not we spend hundreds of millions of dollar, surely the people and surely the legislature of this province can have that information so we can make a valid decision and make valid comments on that decision. What about the contracts relating to the details of joint venture agreements. Why should the legislature not have that? How can that in any way, shape or form seriously affect the operation of government?

What about the details of our environmental problems and environmental spills? Why should the opposition and why should the people not have that information? How can it possibly hurt anyone except the government opposite?

What about demographic studies, or studies of gas and oil reserves? Why can we not have that? The list goes on and on and on – all treated the same – different answers, but always the same. It is better that than remain secret!

I find the idea that government is separated from the people, that it is somehow superior to the people, that indeed it is the master and not the servant, to be reprehensible in a democracy. Yet government positions and documents are infused with that idea. We must bring those documents to the light of day, they are public documents, paid for by the public purse and intended and legitimate only if they serve the public interest. They should not be hidden away from the public that they are supposed to serve.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: – I have, in that sense, today served notice of an intention to introduce an act respecting the right of the public to govern information – a bill modelled (and not to my credit) after that presented by G. Baldwin and worked on and fought for by G. Baldwin, MP from Alberta for some ten years and a recognized civil libertarian in this province and this country. Like that bill, it sets out five important requirements of

any freedom of information act:

- (1) There must be a declaration of the right to all documents held by government; that these be available to people unless specifically exempted; free speech is of little use without the facts.
- (2) Exemptions must be precisely and carefully set out; to be restricted in these areas you must demonstrate that it is in the public interest to conceal them, as opposed to disclosure.
- (3) There must be an indexing system so that people know what type of information is there, what type of information they can come and find;
- (4) There must be a simple, inexpensive method to obtain the information within a reasonable time limit;
- (5) There must be an appeal process or an appeal mechanism to ensure the independence of a body.

I would as well like to say a few words at this point in time with regard to the procedure of the House, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary government in this province and in this country has become government by cabinet – government by the executive – and the checks and balances are eroding. Changes are needed. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, to obtain those changes I think we are going to have to have a change of government – and I say that from an historical point of view. Parliamentary reform has only come about when there has in fact been a change of the governing party.

Freedom of information is one example. Private members, the private members of this Assembly, on both sides of the House, should have a right to make a contribution and they don't under our present system. In that way I have also presented a motion to this House calling for the select standing committee on the environment. I really believe if we as legislators are genuinely interested in the full question of the environment, not in a partisan political way or for partisan political advantage, that we will vote for this. Members of the back rows and the back benches of the government side, surely you can make that input. Surely you, as well as the members of this side, and go out and find solutions to those environmental problems that are not, I repeat, not necessarily always of a political nature.

I would also refer to the public accounts committee of this province. We are the only jurisdiction of the Commonwealth that has our public accounts behind closed doors. And that I suppose is in keeping with the secrecy in all types of things that this government tends to profess.

I would like to close, Mr. Speaker, with a reference to the Meewasin Valley Authority in Saskatoon . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right. It has often been described, I suppose, to the member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) as a monument to Roy Romanow. Roy Romanow has been described by the Premier of this province as Saskatchewan's answer to Bobby Kennedy. How nice.

I want to make it very clear with regard to Meewasin Valley Authority, that no one disagrees with the central concept of Meewasin Valley. The right to protect the river is like motherhood and apple pie and I have heard of no comments that go against that concept. But having said that, why should there be – why should we in developing that

type of an act, have to have legislation that, in effect, affects the right of a person to his land without compensation? Why do we have to have a river edge authority running 15 miles beyond the river? The opponents have been boisterous against this program. Wally Ham from Saskatoon led the charge of that group. I think that we should be encouraged by citizen action groups, regardless of what position they take and what position they do this way. They take a position and well they should take a position. But they support the protection of the river every bit as much as anybody in this Assembly does.

What about the mortgage lenders in Saskatoon? You say the mortgage lenders say, no, we're not going to, we are concerned about this legislation. I'm not sure we want to lend any money. So the easy answer, of course, comes back from the Attorney General, oh, looking after your big fellows that want to produce a high-rise apartment. What about the people who want to buy a house in the Meewasin Valley Authority that is all good and encouraging? What about those people who want to have a mortgage on their house?

I also take note of the comments of Professor Doug Schmeiser, former dean of the college of law, hardly an unrealistic red neck, a person well recognized in the field of civil liberties in this country. What does Doug Schmeiser say? I think as member of this legislature we perhaps did not pay the care that we should have last spring. I am the first person to admit that. What does Doug Schmeiser say? It is very, very repressive legislation. So the members opposite talk about whether or not we should repeal the legislation. I say to the members opposite, what is the difference. I don't care about the words you use. We want to protect the river edge every bit as much as you do but we want to do it in a way that is not taking away the rights and the civil rights of the individual. I am perfectly in favor (I'm on record at this point) of legislation which amends the present act. I ask you, is it any different if you want to bring in a new act which protects the river? Go ahead. Fine and dandy. All I say is, don't take away the individual's rights.

I would make one further comment before I sit down and it relates to the field of education. The prior speaker made mention of the fact that the Tories are simply against the amendment to the new act because it refers to co-operatives. I have no objection to the schools teaching the co-operative program to the people provided that they balance it. Any education system, Mr. Speaker, must teach all sides of the story. That clearly is the whole concept of learning. What we are concerned about on this side of the House is if you can show us through your legislation and through your curriculum that indeed you are simply trying to promote learning, fine and dandy. But what scares us, Mr. Speaker, is when you are sitting on the NDP convention in Saskatoon this fall and Tommy Douglas comes out and says, hey, we're starting to slip here with the younger people. We have to get back to the basics of teach these young people about socialism. The second thing we see is the new Minister of Education (Mr. McArthur) indeed starting to follow that program in the name of co-operatives. The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) is so apt at always saying as soon as we start to bump against his edges, ah, you're against the co-operatives. What you are going to be doing with this legislation is teaching and promoting socialism and that is wrong. That is wrong. The school is the wrong place to promote your political philosophy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: – There are many other speakers who wish to get into this debate and the debate is in fact running on. I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that I do intend to vote for

the amendment and against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. MR. J.A. HAMMERSMITH (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): – Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise and participate in this throne speech debate. Before moving into the main text of my remarks, I can't help but comment on the latest demonstration of fence sitting put forward by the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew). You know it is often said and it has just been well demonstrated that a Tory is someone who sits on the fence with both ears to the ground. And I remind the hon. member that those who spend that much time sitting on the fence are in great danger of receiving a fence post in the sensitive part of the anatomy. I would just like to refer to a couple of statements he made, Mr. Speaker.

First of all he says that although we voted to a person for the act to establish Meewasin Valley Authority, although we voted to a person to establish that authority and although we are in favor of the authority we don't think it should have any authority. That is the kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, that got Joe Clark into trouble with the Israeli Embassy. That's the kind of thinking the members opposite would foist upon the people of Saskatchewan. He follows that in his pleading way with a plea, asking all to believe in the great support that Tories offer to the co-operative movement. Great support, but don't tell anybody about it. Don't teach anybody about it. We support it; we just don't like anybody to know about it. That's Tory thinking. That's the kind of thinking that prevails in Ottawa today and that's what passes for thinking on the opposite side of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to John Solomon on his election to this legislature for the constituency of Regina North-West. My association with the newest member of this House dates back years and during that time, Mr. Speaker, I have come to know the member for Regina North-West as a person of considerable ability and dedication. Obviously the people of Regina North-West felt the same way. I believe their perception and wisdom were clearly evidenced by the manner in which he so ably moved the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, a similar proficiency was exhibited by the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long) when he so competently seconded the motion. He has demonstrated in the 14 months he has served as a member that, both in his constituency and in this House, he is a person of exceptional ability and dedication.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: – It is apparent that the people of those two constituencies will continue to enjoy the outstanding representation they've come to expect over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate also the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) and the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) on their recent promotions. The member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) is also deserving of congratulations in attaining the presidency of his party. I wish to also congratulate Grant Devine on winning the leadership of his party and on assuming one of the safest seats in this House. He has demonstrated great caution and great wisdom in assuming the seat that he has. Because, Mr. Speaker, while the member for Qu'Appelle may have designs on the leadership of that party, he has yet to exhibit an inclination to challenge

his current leader's rightful place in the gallery. Having observed the performance of the members opposite, I can understand why their new leader would wish to maintain some distance from them and at the same time, be able to keep an eye on them.

We on this side, Mr. Speaker, are proud to sit with our leader in this Chamber and we are proud that he is not afraid to join in the cut and thrust of debate. We are proud that unlike the Tory leader, Allan Blakeney has been tested under fire and he has been judged by people of all political persuasions to be the outstanding leader in Canada. Mr. Speaker, as part of the New Democratic Party government, I'm certain that the member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) and the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long) share the same feeling of optimism and confidence in the future of this province under the leadership of Allan Blakeney that I hold. The throne speech was indicative of that optimism and confidence.

Despite the fact that the economic outlook for Canada continues to be a bleak one, Saskatchewan's economic prospects are bright. The change to a Conservative government in Ottawa has only created a worsening situation with rapidly escalating costs brought on by the soaring interest rates and other misdirected economic policies of the federal Tories. One wonders how a newly elected government such as the one in Ottawa can so effectively create such a terrible mess, in such a very short period of time. But one need not wonder long when one recognizes that the government in Ottawa is filled with members with the ability like that exhibited currently by the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck). It's not quite so surprising after having made that observation. One wonders also how any government could so quickly break faith with the people who elected them.

Fortunately, but not surprisingly, the voters in my area recognized the misguided efforts of the federal Conservatives in the recent Prince Albert by-election. Hopefully Prime Minister Clark got the message when the electors in Prince Albert sent another New Democrat, Stan Hovdebo to Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: – The voters clearly pointed out that they see no reason why we shouldn't have federal representation that can take the Saskatchewan message to Ottawa. Tomorrow, when the Tories bring down their expected 1929 budget in Ottawa, we will see whether they are capable of listening to the electorate.

Another factor, of course, Mr. Speaker, in the Prince Albert by-election was the absence of John Diefenbaker. It should be obvious to the Conservatives that Prince Albert voted for the past 26 years, not the ineptness of the Tories, and not for that empty vessel known as Tory policy, but rather for the unquestionable personal ability and personal popularity of Mr. Diefenbaker.

I would like to digress for a brief moment and express my respect for Mr. Diefenbaker as a man of integrity and concern for people. I was just a teen-ager becoming interested in politics when John Diefenbaker first became prime minister and although many of us disagreed with him on many fundamental issues, all of us recognized the early fires of Canadian nationalism, western pride and the vision of the North which he sparked. Unlike the members opposite and unlike what passes for the Government of Canada these days, he stirred in me and in many of my generation (even though we disagreed with his politics), a pride in being Canadian and a belief that the political process,

particularly the parliamentary process, could bring about positive change to the benefit of all Canadians. There are very few persons anywhere who have become a legend in their own time. Mr. Diefenbaker was a legend and he will be missed by all Canadians but most particularly by his constituents in Prince Albert.

Unfortunately, those personal attributes of Mr. Diefenbaker were not transferred to either the Conservatives who have formed the government in Ottawa, or those Tories who form the opposition in this House. Neither group has ever been able to grasp or share the vision of John Diefenbaker. Their vision is narrow, short-sighted and petty. One does not have to dig very deeply to find a long list of the sorrowful accomplishments of the Clark government, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I have such a list right here.

Undoubtedly the burden placed on the Canadian people through the Conservatives' imposition of unbelievable high interest rates leads the list. But there are numerous other example of Conservative bungling: the Petro-Can issue; the on again, off again move of the embassy to Jerusalem; the all-out attack on the crowrate, the wheat board and orderly marketing; the failure to negotiate a price for oil; the failure to get the Premier of Alberta to tell them what their national energy policy will be in time for the new budget; the promise of severe cutbacks in the civil service threatened by that happy hacker, Sinclair Stevens. And these are only a few examples of the Conservatives' inability to deal with the problems facing this country. In fact, one of the few governments in the world that manages to appear more inept and confused than the current government in Iran is the Tory government in Ottawa.

Even the one promise that they are prepared to keep – one promise – that of a mortgage rebate, is of questionable benefit to many Canadians, particularly those in greatest need of relief from the rapidly rising cost of living brought on by the Tories. Mortgage rebates are mainly advantageous to upper income families with large mortgages. They will be of absolutely no benefit to the thousands of Canadian who cannot afford their own homes because of the high interest rates implemented by the Clark government – high interest rates, by the way, opposed by John Diefenbaker and by a member of parliament who was a member of the Diefenbaker government, Alvin Hamilton. In fact, those same interest rates have wiped out any real benefit the home-owner might have gained from a mortgage rebate. It didn't take the voters in Prince Albert long to realize that the federal Conservative government was not going to provide the kind of leadership those voters have come to expect through their relationship with the New Democratic Party government in Saskatchewan.

Indeed the contrast between the bright future for this province under the premiership of Allan Blakeney, and the bleak prospects for Canada under the guidance of Joe Clark, was startling. And you know, the Tories made two major blunders in the Prince Albert by-election. First, they brought Joe Clark to town. Secondly, they sealed their fate by bringing their newly-elected provincial leader, the member from the spectators' gallery, in to finish the job. I want to thank the members opposite, as well as their federal counterparts, for exhibiting such a high profile in that by-election. Unfortunately for the Tory candidate, who is a very fine person, it was your credibility and the credibility of the federal Tories that the voters judged on November 19. He was very much a victim of his association with the Saskatchewan and Ottawa Progressive Conservatives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: – Provincially, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservatives

faced with the impossible task on one hand, attempting to defend the federal Tories, and the impossible task on the other hand, of attacking with any credibility the efficiency of the Government of Saskatchewan, have been forced to sink to their now familiar policy source – the bottom of the barrel – to find an issue. They have found one in Regina North-West and it was obvious in that by-election when Conservative Party workers unsuccessfully attempted to create a racial backlash in that constituency. And as usual, the Tories underestimated and insulted the intelligence of the Saskatchewan electorate. They failed to realize that knowledge of that kind of campaign conducted in Regina North-West would travel to Prince Albert. The people of Regina North-West responded to the Tory campaign by placing them firmly in last place.

It is significant and it is encouraging, Mr. Speaker, that it was the non-Indian voters of Regina North-West who rejected the low and base campaign of the Tories. The Tories should have known that the people of this province will not respond to phony issues suggesting bigotry and racism. They had the previous experience of attempting to exploit that kind of issue in the Pelly by-election of 1977 and it didn't work there. The people of Pelly responded by sending Norm Lusney to this House with a resounding majority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: – It didn't work in Pelly and it didn't work in Regina North-West and it will not work in this province. The people in my own constituency, both Indian and whites, reject completely that low level of political activity carried out by the Conservative Party opposite. The people I have the honor to serve through the Department of Northern Saskatchewan are aware of those demeaning Conservative tactics and they reject them. Those northern constituents can respond most emphatically because they know what effective government programs can do for people who have previously been denied opportunities open to other citizens in this province. They responded to those programs with a resounding yes in the last provincial election when they re-elected Fred Thompson and Norm MacAuley with record majorities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: – They knew that in 1971, for most of the people of northern Saskatchewan, welfare was the number one source of income and that there were few prospects for a brighter future. Seven years after the New Democratic Party government created the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, that outlook has changed dramatically. The people of northern Saskatchewan know that Fred Thompson and Norm MacAuley and Neil Byers and Tom Bowerman worked long and hard with the support of all other members on this side . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: – . . . to bring about those dramatic changes. The people of northern Saskatchewan are also aware of what happened to similar progressive programs in northern Manitoba after a Tory government with the same philosophy as the members opposite took over and began its cutbacks. And I want to give one example of Tory efficiency – a shopping centre in Manitoba, in The Pas, owned by The Pas Indian band and situated on The Pas reserve. The Department of Northern Affairs in Manitoba had leased 23,000 square feet of office space in that shopping centre, leased it from The Past Indian band. Shortly after the Tory government assumed office,

the people were moved out of that office space. The lease wasn't cancelled. They're still paying and will be paying for another three years for empty office space, but they don't want their civil servants to be near the Indians. They've moved them into downtown Pas and that's Tory efficiency.

The people of northern Saskatchewan can look back upon the past seven years, Mr. Speaker, with considerable pride on what has been accomplished. The most visible improvements are of course, the physical ones. Over 800 public housing units have been built in northern Saskatchewan and that compares to a total of 68 built in the four years prior to the establishment of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Today, most of those homes are being built by local housing groups. Sewer and water services have been provided for 10 of the larger communities with plans to extend those services to several other settlements each year. All northern communities, with the possible exception of one or two very small, isolated ones, are now provided with electricity. Telephone and television service, almost non-existent in northern Saskatchewan in 1971 is now available throughout the North. Health services have been extended and upgraded through an increase in the number of doctors, dentists and nurses working in those communities. New hospitals and nursing stations have been built. School construction has totalled more than \$15 million since 1971. Every community in northern Saskatchewan has been involved in either the construction of a new facility or an addition to the existing school facility.

Both the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and the Department of Highways have been involved in building new roads or upgrading old ones in northern Saskatchewan. Over 400 miles of new roads have been constructed and 120 miles upgraded by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. At the same time over 1500 miles of road has been built by the Department of Highways.

Airfield construction is equally impressive – eight new airstrips and three which have been upgraded. The North will soon boast two of the finest airfields in this province – the one already completed at La Ronge and the one soon to be completed at Buffalo Narrows. As well, the department has been involved in constructing municipal facilities. Five fire halls, six community halls and four municipal buildings have been built during the past few years. All of these physical facilities have led to an improvement in the standard of living enjoyed by northern people but more importantly has been the change in the government's attitude toward the people of the North.

Seven years ago, northern Saskatchewan represented a classic case of colonial development. Virtually all organized elements of society – government, education, commerce, communications – were controlled and dominated by offices, organizations, companies and people from outside the northern administration district. As a result, the future appeared bleak. Widespread apathy was common. All that has changed and continues to change.

Today northern people are actively involved in government at all levels. The number of people employed has increased dramatically and the number of people on welfare has been reduced just as dramatically. Elected school boards oversee the operation of all northern schools under provincial jurisdiction. Northern people are being trained and employed as teachers, teacher-aides, health workers, social workers, carpenters, heavy equipment operators, mechanics, truck drivers, administrators, and the like. Through individual and co-operative ownership, northern residents are now operating everything from sawmills to grocery stores. I want to point out that in those seven years, Mr. Speaker, over 400 new businesses owned by northern people have been

established. The total number of people employed in the forestry industry has increased from 176 people in 1972 to a little over 1200 this year.

In the traditional occupations, the revenue from trapping has doubled in seven years. Gross income for commercial fisherman has increased from \$1,300 in 1972 to \$4,000 last year. The number of outfitting camps has increased from 141 in 1972 to 209 last year and the story goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

Grants to schools in 1972 amounted to \$2 million, and last year amounted to over \$10 million. Grants to local governments in 1972 amounted to \$32,000 and in the current year amounts to over \$2 million.

Today, northerners are producing radio programs, operating day care centres, supervising construction projects, providing alcohol rehabilitation services and actively participating in all aspects of society. Today, there is reason to be optimistic. The future is not so bleak and apathy has given way to enthusiasm. As planned, even-paced, sensible northern development takes place, the opportunities for northerners to assume their rightful place in Saskatchewan society will increase.

Certainly much remains to be done but with the continued support of this government, with the continued co-operation of government and elected northern representatives, the people of the North can face the future with confidence and hope.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: – A prime example of sound, planned northern development is exhibited in the terms of the Amok surface lease agreement which will provide for stringent environmental health and safety controls as well as for the involvement of northern people in all phases of the development. Amok has already signed and will be signing in the near future major construction contracts with new, northern companies – companies supported by the economic development program of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. These contracts will ensure that the majority of workers involved in these projects will be of Indian ancestry.

As well, the funding of industrial parks like the one recently announced at Creighton (which I might point out is the most northerly industrial park in Canada) provides much needed assistance to progressive northern communities.

Similarly, proposed amendments to The Northern Economic Development Act will allow the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to be even more responsive to the needs of northern people as they continue to expand their role in the contracting construction, retail and service sectors of the northern economy. The involvement of northern people will be further enhanced as the Department of Northern Saskatchewan continues the implementation of the major recommendations of the Bayda report.

This government has recognized the need for quality education by continuing to increase the amount of money being spent on educational programming in the North. Such increases are the result of a recognition of the need to tie education in the North more closely to resource development.

Capital construction will continue at a strong pace in order to provide the same type and quality of facilities for the use of northerners as are found in the South.

Mr. Speaker, the story of this government's efforts in northern Saskatchewan can indeed be termed a record of success and great promise for the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: – I want, in the few moments that are left, to shift my emphasis to point out that not only in the North does one see effective government programs being implemented, but also in my own constituency.

The community capital fund assisted Prince Albert, MacDowall and Duck Lake to build some of the finest physical facilities in communities of that size anywhere in this country. A downtown revitalization proposal initiated by and committed to by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Smishek) is now being received most enthusiastically by the citizens of Prince Albert. Both the Prince Albert Chamber of Commerce and the city council have expressed their appreciation for and support of this provincially-initiated proposal. This project will ensure the continued vitality of the Prince Albert downtown area. It has the potential of adding dramatically to the downtown revitalization process begun by the construction of a provincial office building with an associated downtown mall and parkade. It is a proposal which can effectively meet the needs brought about by the changing conditions of the 1980s. It is a proposal of foresight and vision.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear the members opposite attack efforts to expand, enhance and diversify the Saskatchewan economy. It is interesting to hear their claims that nothing is happening and then, against that, to pick up the Star-Phoenix of December 8, 1979 and on page B-4 read the headline "Mall Construction Booming in Saskatchewan Towns" – Melfort, Kindersley, Humboldt, Tisdale, Nipawin, Meadow Lake, Swift Current, Prince Albert, all with major mall developments under way or proposed.

It is a strange kind of convoluted logic, Mr. Speaker, which says on the one hand with this kind of activity in the tertiary sectors of the economy that nothing is happening in the primary and secondary sectors, because those two things just don't hold together.

It will be interesting to note as the session goes on the reactions of the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew), the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) and the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) and the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) because I note in Nipawin the proposed developer is Roda Developments from Red Deer, Alberta, outside the province. In Kindersley the proposed developer is Alma Brothers group from Surrey, B.C. and Gelmon Corporation of Calgary, outside the province. I am confident that those members will be attacking the developments in Kindersley and Nipawin with the same kind of vigor they are attacking Chartwood in Regina.

Public housing programs, Mr. Speaker, have made homes available for people in Prince Albert and other Saskatchewan communities who would not otherwise be able to afford them.

As I travelled through communities during the Prince Albert by-election I noticed considerable evidence of the success of our housing programs. Senior citizens are now being adequately housed in buildings constructed under a provincially initiated program. A similar program is to be implemented by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan for senior citizens in the northern half of this province.

It is also obvious that the people of Duck Lake, Beardy's reserve and MacDowall are making good use of facilities made possible with the assistance of our recreational facilities grants programs and built by the communities themselves. Other provincially supported developments in Prince Albert such as the new SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) office, the new mines pollution control branch, improvements to Highway No. 302, and grants to the Duck Lake historical museum have been a source of considerable satisfaction to the Prince Albert-Duck Lake constituency. That satisfaction is increased by the positive tone set by the throne speech. The constituents of Prince Albert-Duck Lake know that life enhancing programs being implemented by this government are going to continue and that many will be expanded. They are pleased with the fact that they live in a province where the economic outlook is bright. They know that that is largely the result of the excellent leadership provided by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: – Farmers are pleased that this government has moved to purchase a thousand hopper cars. They are also pleased the government continues its strong support of the wheat board, of the orderly marketing of their products and continues to defend the crowrate. They are grateful that this government, unlike the PC Party opposite, does not believe that four out of five farmers are inefficient. They point with pride to concrete examples of this government's belief in the family farm and the rural way of life as viable options.

Since a large number of my constituents are of Indian ancestry, they are encouraged by the steps being proposed by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Smishek) to enhance the quality and quantity of services available to them. People of Indian ancestry are optimistic about this government's continuing commitment to assist their efforts at enhancing their place in Saskatchewan society. While much remains to be done, the Indian and Metis people know that no other provincial government in Canada and certainly not the Tory party opposite, is as attuned to their needs and aspirations as is the Blakeney government in Saskatchewan. There are many, many, many, many more things I could say, Mr. Speaker, that reflect the praise of this government conveyed to me by the people in my constituency. I want to conclude by saying that I'm in the fortunate position of not having to defend the kind of inept bungling exhibited by the current government in Ottawa or that would be exhibited if members opposite were ever to form a government. I believe the throne speech clearly indicates that sound government planning and programs can be looked forward to in the 1980s and I'm proud to say that I will be supporting the motion and voting against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS – 14

| | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|
| Berntson | Rousseau | Muirhead |
| Birkbeck | Ham | Katzman |
| Larter | Swan | Duncan |
| Lane | Pickering | Andrew |

Taylor

Garner

NAYS – 30

Blakeney

Mostoway

Koskie

Pepper

Kaeding

Matsalla

Allen

Hammersmith

Lusney

Smishek

Kowalchuk

Long

Snyder

Dyck

Johnson

Kramer

Feschuk

Nelson

Baker

Byers

Thompson

Skoberg

Vickar

Engel

McArthur

Tchorzewski

White

Shillington

Cody

Solomon

Debate continues on the motion.

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): – Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the throne speech debate, I do so with a sense of optimism and pride. My optimism stems from the fact that on the weekend of November 8, 9 and 10, the Progressive Conservative Party had the largest and most successful political convention ever held in the province of Saskatchewan. People from all walks of life gathered in Saskatchewan. There was a sense of new hope, new directions, new policies to replace the arrogance and the lack of compassion, the bureaucratic attitudes of a tired and unconcerned NDP government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – A new revival is taking place in this province, Mr. Speaker, that we, as an alternative, can and will do more for Saskatchewan as we enter the 1980s. As a Progressive Conservative member of this Assembly I am optimistic that the future is an exciting one, and that is why I also have a sense of pride in participating in this debate. I belong to a team that offers fresh, new, positive policies as opposed to lacklustre, tired policies of Premier Geritol Allan Blakeney and his Sleepy Hollow colleagues. Maybe they might wake up soon and find out times are changing in Saskatchewan, but somehow I doubt it. You know, Mr. Speaker, as a member for Bengough-Milestone I have, during the past year since my election, had many concerns brought to my attention by way of letters, telephone calls and personal contacts. I can appreciate the late John Diefenbaker's words that there's nothing more rewarding than public life. To my knowledge, I have dealt with each and every concern. It gives one a feeling of satisfaction to be of service to one's constituents.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on the Saskatchewan economy. In the Speech from the Throne this government says Saskatchewan's economic prospects are bright. Of course, any government would hope the economic prospects are bright, but I say to them, Mr. Speaker, the proof is in the pudding. I, too, hope Saskatchewan's economic prospects are good because in 1978 the net farm income declined in Saskatchewan but rose substantially in our neighboring provinces of Manitoba and Alberta.

AN HON. MEMBER: – First rate farms in Saskatchewan.

MR. PICKERING: – Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the personal income in 1977 and 1978 was well below the national average. I can see why the NDP government hopes Saskatchewan's economic prospects are bright – hope springs eternal. And if the Sleepy Hollow government ever wakes up they will discover that our personal income tax ranks the third highest for a province in the whole of the Dominion of Canada. They will also see through their sleepy eyes that farmers are being taxed to the hilt, E & H tax on steel grain bins plus many other articles essential in the operation of a farm. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln once said: 'You can fool some of the people all the time, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – I contend as we approach 1980 the people of this province are going to reject more and more the tired doctrinaire, socialistic rhetoric of the 1940s, and opt for the Progressive Conservative programs of the 1980s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – Mr. Speaker, if Saskatchewan is to be a good place to live in the 1980s, then our environment must be given special attention. The people on the other side of this House seem to think their environment is a place where you sleep and do as you please. For a government which spouts how modern it is, I have to remind them that this province has the most inefficient and ineffective Department of the Environment in Canada, bar none.

In question period last week I asked the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) what action, if any, his department was taking as it relates to the many illegal ditching and diking projects taking place throughout Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister woke up for a few minutes and indicated that it has been under way for some time, a public review of floods and drainage control. I would like to refer at this time, Mr. Speaker, to a resolution passed in 1976 at the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) convention, that The Water Rights Act be amended so that there is control over illegal ditching and diking in order that there be other recourse than one individual suing another. The SARM has requested the government to set up a group study of all interested parties to look into the whole area of illegal ditching, diking and flooding. It seems likely the government will initiate such a study.

Now, going from 1976 to 1979, resolution number 81.

Whereas there is a great deal of unauthorized ditching being done by farmers to increase their arable land;

Whereas this may be a larger problem than the Government of Saskatchewan anticipated and the conservation and development branch is behind by about five years (and I repeat, about five years) in dealing with the applications for the conservation areas:

Therefore be it resolved (this is another resolution passed in 1979, March) that the Department of Environment take the appropriate action to stop this unauthorized ditching until such time as the Saskatchewan Agriculture, Conservation and Land Improvement Branch has dealt with the application

for conservation areas.

To show this House what a tired and unresponsive government we are saddled with, perhaps a good shot of Geritol might put a little pep into their actions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – When speaking of environment, Mr. Speaker, I must express very serious concern over the lax environment legislation we have in this province. It took two serious spills of hazardous solutions to prod this NDP government into even thinking about clean-up legislation. But what really shocks me is that the Saskatchewan Department of the Environment has no preventive legislation to help prevent environment damage. These self-righteous people over there, Mr. Speaker, pretend to be concerned, but here is a case where the pay lip-service to environmental problems but take no action, another example of the uncaring, lax ways of the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – Let us continue to inspect the record of the government, Mr. Speaker. I look to agriculture where the NDP continues to stress, let's save the family farm – another case of lip service. They must be really proud of losing 6,000 family farms since the beginning of the land bank. This government is obviously losing in its attempts to save family farms.

You know, Mr. Speaker, what is even more shocking is the shameless attitude of this government in that affiliations to certain political parties continue to prevail in land bank allocation. Many examples have been brought to my attention in the past year. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I service notice to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that he had better wake up from the hibernation and have his homework done before this spring session.

Now I will turn, Mr. Speaker, to highways. Mr. Speaker, there are numerous grain elevator closures taking place throughout our province. I am concerned with such happenings on the east side of the Bengough-Milestone constituency. Colgate has already closed its doors and Goodwater is being shut down at the end of the current year. Farmers in such areas are forced to deliver their grain to alternate points of their choice that involve further distances and higher costs. I would suggest, to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer), if in fact we still have one . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – . . . that priority be given in such cases to upgrade all highways in the affected areas. Mr. Speaker, once again this year, thousands of dollars have been spent to repair the potholes on secondary Highway 334 from Corinne to Avonlea. I wonder how many more years I will have to bring that up.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Premier wailed the other day on the great happenings within our province. The Premier said if you live in a province governed by Conservatives you can expect reduced services and higher costs. Mr. Speaker, he said in Conservative Ontario, the average family pays \$450 a year in health premiums and in wealthy Alberta, with their cheap gas, they pay \$180 per family. He failed to inform the Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan that medicare costs \$380 million in Saskatchewan which amounts to well over \$400 for every man, women and child.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – Where does the money come from? This money is raised through channels of hidden tax which, of course, comes out of the taxpayers' pockets. Mr. Speaker, the NDP governs like a sewer line. We, the people, dribble out hard-earned dollars into one pocket and they flush it out of the other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – Mr. Speaker, in 1980 the province of Saskatchewan will celebrate its 75th year since joining confederation. This province was founded by hard-working pioneers who believed in the dignity of the individual and not give-away programs as is the philosophy of the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – I am optimistic, the people of this province, you're in for a return to the good virtues of the pioneer spirit. In speaking about 1980, Mr. Speaker, I contend that if Celebrate Saskatchewan events were all held on one day and say, for example, that all of the young people who have left the province return, at that instance our population would be well over one million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: – But, Mr. Speaker, the sad thing is the next day they would all leave and we would all know why – because the government offers no hope and no incentives to return to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I will cite two more examples of uncaring and unresponsive attitudes of this tired and worn-out government before concluding my remarks. The other day I received a . . . (inaudible) . . . from a young man in Saskatoon about cutbacks at the University of Saskatchewan. While this government literally wastes all sorts of tax dollars they cut back on the educational needs of our young people. Are they afraid that the new generation is wise to the old socialist song and dance of the 1940s, that they are looking for inspiration and leadership and find it lacking in the NDP. The young people want to come home to Saskatchewan but not under the NDP. I say we need to invest in their future because they are the future of Saskatchewan.

My final example, Mr. Speaker, is how the NDP has declared war on the small businessman, the single family business owner who helped build Saskatchewan through ever increasing taxation. This government is causing the virtual end of free enterprise in Saskatchewan. At every opportunity these people go out of their way to put up hindrances to personal initiative and investment and their goal is a socialist Saskatchewan with 1940 solutions. And we all know, Mr. Speaker, that this reckless journey must stop soon.

Mr. Speaker, in closing this afternoon I would like to say that out of the tragic and negative deeds of this government, I sense that most people in Saskatchewan want something better. I have a deeply rooted love and commitment to this province and a vision that we can do better – a vision that the Progressive Conservative Party is prepared for the challenge – the challenge to make a better Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. B.M. DYCK (Saskatoon Mayfair): – The member for Bengough-Milestone talks about declaring war on the small businessmen of Saskatchewan. I am going to have something to say about that later on but I do want to suggest that the people who are declaring war on the small businessmen of Saskatchewan and all across Canada are the Conservative party and the large multinationals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: – I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to participate in this, the 10th consecutive throne speech debate from the government side of the House. My pleasure in speaking from this side of the House, Mr. Speaker
...

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order. I am having trouble hearing the member for Saskatoon Mayfair and I know all members will want to hear what he has to say, as I am sure other members of the Assembly want to be heard when they are speaking in the House. I am sure we will all join in silence while we listen to the member for Saskatoon Mayfair.

MR. DYCK: – As I was saying, my pleasure is certainly enhanced when I consider the performances and the empty words which emanate from the other side of the House. If those performances continue from the members opposite it is my view that they will be staying on that side of the House for a good long time to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: – While at the same time I am confident members on this side of the House, if they continue to carry on their responsibilities as they have in the past, the while they will be on this side of the House could turn out to be a very, very long while, Mr. Speaker.

In rising in my place, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that once again the Saskatchewan economy remains very buoyant. It is buoyant and it is growing, growing by every economic indicator.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: – The labor force is increasing; the gross provincial product is increasing; the population is increasing; net incomes are increasing; mineral production and manufacturing are increasing. The future in fact, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Saskatchewan looks very bright.

Turning from quantity to quality, Mr. Speaker, it is my view that the quality of life in Saskatchewan, while there is room for improvement, is certainly superior to that in other parts of Canada. In large part this is due to the many social programs developed by this government since 1971.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to a topic of some real importance to me. I know that a good deal of study has been given to the matters of problems associated with the urban Indian and Metis problem, in the cities particularly. As I mentioned last year and as members will know, the problems of our urban Indian today are very serious. The problems are basically well-known by all. There are problems of unemployment, lack of education and training, poor housing, and discrimination.

In my speech last year, Mr. Speaker, I demonstrated our own obligations and responsibilities to assist the native people in seeking solutions to these problems. I want to say that I am hopeful and I am optimistic that our next budget will reflect some programs which assist the Indian and the Metis people to address some of the areas to which I have just referred. Perhaps one of the most immediate and critical problems is one of unemployment. While I say this, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add that as a prerequisite in the long term to good employment, good jobs with opportunities for advancement, there must be a comprehensive, full training and a good education program available.

I have recently had some discussions with native people in the city of Saskatoon on this topic and I have attended a conference where this matter was given some considerable discussion. While the problems of unemployment and underemployment are many faceted and complex and will not be solved overnight a start should be made. When a solution is found and I'm optimistic it will be found, Mr. Speaker, the solution will probably be multifaceted as well.

In the matter of unemployment I would like to make a suggestion that I believe has some merit and is worthy in my view of some study. I would like to see the Indian and Metis people in our urban areas set up their own employment and counselling centre – an employment and counselling centre operated and managed by Indian people themselves. I make the suggestion for a number of valid reasons. Federal government bureaucracy, while eventually may be part of the solution, is certainly at the moment part of the problem. For example, it is my belief that for a number of reasons Canada Manpower which has a program called Outreach has had very limited success in placing native people of native ancestry into suitable job positions. Manpower does not have sufficiently close communication with the native community. There is not a sufficient understanding of native people. The native people understand native people. White people frequently do not understand native people. Returning to my point, this native employment centre would not only act as a placement office, i.e. a place where people could register for employment and then be located in a suitable job position, it would have other functions. It should, for example, be the responsibility of the employment centre to provide follow-up services with the person placed in a job position. Perhaps the employee will require counselling to assist him or her to adjust to his or her new position. He or she might require advice and guidance. This could, in my view, be best accomplished by such a centre. Frequently, the employee will require additional training in order to advance and progress to more responsible duties at his place of employment. This could again, in my view, be accomplished by such an employment centre. In many instances, there may be housing problems or family difficulties and again, such an organization should be in a position to provide very necessary support services. It would work actively and directly with the private sector and government employers to find job opportunities and to develop on-the-job training. It could work actively and directly to assist in the development of affirmative action programs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have touched on only one small aspect of the difficulties confronting the native Indian. We know there are many problems – problems of housing, unemployment, discrimination – but I want to say in closing this topic that we have a responsibility to act and as I have said before, we have a responsibility to act in this legislature. If we do not act now, the situation can only worsen, and all society, Mr. Speaker, will suffer. Indian and Metis people do not want handouts. They do not want welfare. They want to take their place in society. They want to once again (as they did

before the white man came to this country) hold their heads high. They want their dignity. They want their self-respect.

Mr. Speaker, I have other things to say on this topic, and I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:02 p.m.