

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 5, 1980

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to members of this Assembly, 24 grade 8 students from Wymark, Saskatchewan. They're here visiting us today with their teacher, Mr. Knelsen and with their chaperones, Mrs. Wiens and Mr. Koethler. I'm sure member of this Assembly would like to welcome them here and wish them an educational and entertaining stay at the legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and to the members of this assembly, 17 grade 12 students from Sheldon Williams Collegiate, sitting in the Speaker's gallery. These students, Mr. Speaker, are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Robinson. I would like to note that they are students in a law class which is a recent addition to our curriculum in Saskatchewan at the grade 12 level. I commend the students for their interest in this important subject. I now that all members wish these students a most enjoyable and educational visit here. I will be meeting with them at 11:30 for pictures and a discussion.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Travel Arrangements for DNS Employees

MR. ANDREW: — Question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, do you have a statement for the Assembly in view of the various questions raised in the House yesterday?

HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity to review the matter raised yesterday with the deputy minister of the department and can report to the hon. member and to the Assembly as follows. First of all, with regard to travel costs, by travelling Saturday to Saskatoon rather than on Thursday the cost to the government was actually less than had the employees travelled on Thursday, the day originally scheduled for return. The reason for the lower cost is that by travelling on Saturday they were not required to be overnight in Saskatoon before travelling to La Ronge. Dagdick's S-4 indicates that he did not claim travel costs from Saskatoon to La Ronge on Saturday, to which he was entitled approximately \$47. Neither employee claimed any expenses while in Las Vegas.

With regard to the days off, I point out to the hon. member that these are out-of-scope employees, senior employees, and it's common practice for senior management personnel to swap days worked beyond regular working hours for time off during regular hours. These two employees, in particular, are employees who worked a good number of weekends, a good many holidays, and a good number of evenings. In this instance, these employees have substituted Saturday for Thursday. There are no regulatory constraints on this procedure. It's left to the discretion of individual departments.

The case in point was brought to the attention of the deputy minister in September of 1980. The matter was reviewed and an explanation obtained from Mr. Aubichon. No further action was taken and the case was closed. The main issue is that, while Mr. Aubichon claimed a day of annual leave, Dagdick's attendance record for the month of June does not indicate any days off. Dagdick, now no longer employed the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, has been contacted in his new position in the Department of Continuing Education, and admits that was an oversight on his part. He has been asked to submit another attendance statement to rectify the situation. As of this date, Dagdick has accumulated 23 days of annual leave credit, 9 earned days off of the nature I described. Such earned days he would have to take before the end of this month or lose them. He will be unable to take them. So while he had 9 earned days off, he had one day unaccounted for. The government then gets 8 day of work from him which he could have taken off. He has also accumulated 95 days of sick leave. What the S-4 and the entire matter shows is that what is involved here is that one employee took one day off without telling his boss. That's the entire matter.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition can make of that what it wishes. But I suggest that had there been any intention to deceive, the opportunity was there. A deceitful person could easily have falsified an S-4. The S-4 shows clearly that no expenses were claimed for those days. Had there been any intention to deceive, the matter would not have been reviewed with the deputy minister as long ago as September and satisfactory explanations given.

I point out that both of these employees are people of native ancestry, people engaged in a new, very necessary and very broad program.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I'll take the next question. The member for Kindersley.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. If your suggestion, Mr. Minister, is that there was no intention to deceive, why then would it be that both employees, in their request-for-prior-approval form which was tabled yesterday, did not indicate this excursion to Las Vegas? It indicated that their intention was to travel to see the affirmative action program of the Navaho Indians, the place where that was to be done was in New Mexico and the dates were to be June 23 to 27? Now if this were clearly an oversight and this form was filed or approved sometime in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the member have a supplementary? Order, order. I wonder if the member could get to the supplementary right away.

MR. ANDREW: — My question to the minister is: how do you square the request for prior approval with the statement you just gave?

HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, travel to the places mentioned was made. Very shortly after completing the trip, the S-4 which the hon. member tabled yesterday was filled out and submitted by the employees. It showed clearly the stopover from Thursday noon until Saturday noon in Las Vegas. There was no attempt to hid that and the time has been appropriate accounted for. I point out also to he hon. member that, as a result of that trip which he paints as an excursion to Las Vegas, a new program has just been entered into. An agreement has been reached between the construction and general worker's union and Department of Northern Saskatchewan for that union to engage in an affirmative action training program similar to the program operated by the

Navaho nation in Arizona.

MR. ANDREW — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I take it the letter the hon. member speaks of with regard to September was from an Art Gillies, supervisor of training, and the letter reads as follows:

As supervisor of training and development, I was one of the three who assisted in processing the prior approval. However, I have now become aware that one-third (two days) of this education leave was spent on vacation in Las Vegas. I do not believe that a vacation in Las Vegas should be part of the education leave (seven days or less) nor that DNS should be allowed to travel to Las Vegas for a vacation at public expense.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: would you not agree that nothing happens in your department unless the matter is brought to the Chamber and that nothing happens even if senior people complain to the deputy minister? Nothing happens until it is brought into this Chamber.

HON. MR. HAMMERSMITH: — No, Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely false. Yes, a memo was sent from Mr. Gillies to the deputy minister dated September 16. On September 16 the deputy minister took action, as I have already outlined. It was pointed out that no one travelled to Las Vegas at public expense and that no one was paid at public expense for time in Las Vegas. And that was communicated to Mr. Gillies' supervisor by the deputy minister on October 6, and the case was closed.

Appointment of Deputy Provincial Secretary

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Provincial Secretary. I asked the Provincial Secretary if it is true that a Philip Flory, a one-time campaign manager for the present Minister of Finance, has been appointed as acting deputy provincial secretary, effective December 1, 1980. I understand he will receive his permanent appointment for this job on January 1, 1981. Are you making this appointment or am I making it for you?

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Would you like to? Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any appointment or proposed appointment of Mr. Flory as deputy Provincial Secretary.

Premier Declining to Appear at Examination for Discovery

MR. COLLVER: — I address my question to the Premier. The Premier will be aware that court action is under way in which our party contends that you and your government acted in bad faith when you passed Bill 105 earlier this year. I do not wish to question you in any way about the merits or demerits of this case; that is for the courts. But, will you explain to this Assembly why, through your solicitors, you have not agreed to appear in an examination for discovery? After all, you are the leader of your party and your government.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the member is asking for a procedure in the course of a legal action. May I say that the actions taken by me and by other ministers of the Crown are on legal advice and we will continue to follow that legal advice in the course of the legal action.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. . . . (inaudible interjection)

. . . Did you say final, Mr. Speaker? You didn't say final. Good.

Does the Premier not believe that in such an important action, which goes to the very root of our freedoms and our human rights, we are entitled to question the head of the government which we say acted in bad faith, in order to develop the best possible evidence for both sides? I have already agreed to be examined by your solicitors. Is the Premier afraid of what might be disclosed?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier is acting on legal advice and the reasons why he takes the advice or does not take the advice are not matters for appropriate examination in this House.

MR. COLLVER: — Is this the new Premier the people should come to expect? He won't fight Trudeau; he won't stand up for his government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

Ward System for School Board Elections

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, from your recent statements, due to the pressure from this side of the House and the school boards in this province, it appears that you are backing off from your stated position of introducing the ward system in Saskatchewan. It appears that perhaps you are not going to be introducing this method of electing officials for the separate school system. Is that correct? And if you are considering that, will you also consider extending the same privilege to the election of public school board members?

HON. MR. McARTHUR — Mr. Speaker, what I have indicated to the Regina Separate School Board is that at a meeting which they are having with me on December 11, to discuss their apparent point that they wish to see the separate school system exempted from the decision to provide for the ward system of school board elections. I don't think that in any way indicates a backing off. Certainly it is our intent to proceed with the legislation to establish the ward system for school board elections, but I have indicated to the Regina Separate School Board that I certainly will include on the agenda for our meeting the question of whether or not it should apply to the Regina Separate School Board.

MR. TAYLOR: — Obviously if you are going to be discussing it you are perhaps thinking of changing your position. But, Mr. Minister, many other people in this province and I feel this institution of the ward system is a very important decision. I see that we have a standing committee on education consisting of 26 members of this Assembly. Now the report you received from Professor de Vlieger is a biased report and I say to you, will you convene the standing committee on education (which, by the way, hasn't met since March, 1923) to hear these submissions and make an unbiased decision?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate pattern of this opposition is that rather than deal with the issues they attack personalities and public servants. We have seen it in the question period earlier today. We see their continued attacks upon Professor de Vlieger. Professor de Vlieger is a professor of political science at the University of Regina who is highly regarded for his background and knowledge of municipal law and municipal procedures. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, their charge that the report is biased cannot be defended and I would invite the hon. members to come forward and state what portions of that report they consider to be biased.

I consider that report (and I have reviewed it carefully and thoroughly) to be a thorough report which covers the options completely and totally and reviews all aspects of the question including the pros and cons. I say to the hon. members that the legislation will come forward; it will be debated in this House and I invite the hon. members at that time if they can't do so now to bring forward their substantive points to argue against this ward system.

MR. TAYLOR: — A final supplementary. Will that legislation include the separate school boards? And you haven't answered my question: will you institute the standing committee and if not, what is the purpose of the standing committee on education? Answer that for me?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, I don't believe it is my job to answer to this House what the role of the standing committee on education is. That's a question to be dealt with in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I say again that there will be ample and complete opportunity to debate that legislation. I would like to see the hon. member members argue against a system of election that has worked well in rural areas of this province. As the hon. member well knows, it has made provision for quality educational service through its application in rural areas and I believe it can work effectively in the urban areas as well. I invite again the hon. members to debate this point when the legislation comes forward.

Position on Constitution

MR. LANE: — A question to the Premier. We have attempted for a week now to get your constitutional position and one week ago you indicated, on page 12 of *Hansard*, that you would with great ease table the summations you have made to the numbers of constitutional conferences. I asked you for that information yesterday: why was it not tabled as I requested? You said yourself that it was very easy to table the information.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I have a good deal of difficulty understanding the hon. member. Yesterday I understood him to be asking that we table not the matters which we have submitted to constitutional conferences, which I had agreed to do, but the one we are going to submit to the parliamentary committee, which is quite different. The members opposite and the member for Qu'Appelle may not have clearly in their minds the distinction between a constitutional conference and a parliamentary committee, but I am sure there is someone over there who can explain it to them. If the hon. member wishes, we are prepared to table the material which we have used at various conferences. It is all public property now but if the hon. member wants us to collate it, we can. I do suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this hon. House that if members want information the way not to get it is to ask for it in question period, and the way to get it is to put a request for it on the order paper. But if the hon. member wishes us to gather up this matter, we can do it.

MR. LANE: — Yes, I so wish and I'm sure the public and the other provinces of western Canada would like to see it to try to make some reason out of your position. I asked you last week as well for the brief you are going to present to the parliamentary committee and I asked for that again yesterday. At that time you said, "We would be happy to make available copies of the brief to member of the Assembly" and you said that it would be prepared early next week, i.e. early this week. Why are you now refusing to table before

this Assembly your brief to the constitutional committee? It can only lead to the conclusion that you don't really have a position, that you are continuing to await federal government positions, and would you now be prepared to table the brief which should be ready, and would you give the assurance that it is in fact ready?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — No, and no. The brief is not ready and will be tabled when it is submitted to the parliamentary committee and only then. We are in the position that we are going to the parliamentary committee with a brief which we think will be as contemporary as can be. As I have attempted to make clear on a number of occasions, our position is to get changes in the federal resolutions that are before the House of Commons and the Senate. The arguments that are used to get changes vary daily as the submissions by other groups are made. Accordingly, we will wish your brief to be as contemporary as possible. If indeed I had been submitting the brief today, you could have had copies of the brief today, but the brief is not going to be submitted today and the brief, therefore, is not in final form. It will not be in final form until very shortly before it is presented.

MR. LANE: — Would the Premier not admit that his reluctance, fear or refusal to appear before the committee during the time that this legislature is sitting can only lead to one conclusion, that he has a great fear of tabling whatever his lack of position is before this Assembly, and that he has a great fear of having his proposals debated before this Assembly? Will the Premier not reconsider and appear before the Assembly while this legislature is in session?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members will know that I have indicated that I would like to make an appearance before the parliamentary committee. I believe two other premiers have already appeared, the Premier of Prince Edward Island and the Premier of New Brunswick. One of them is a premier who is joining in the court action, and one of them is a premier who is not. So far as I am aware other premiers are not. If I am fearful of appearing at this time, how much more fearful are the premiers who are not appearing at all. That apparently includes the Premier of Manitoba and the Premier of Alberta. I do not for one moment think they are fearful, nor am I fearful. They are not appearing because they think it is tactically unsound to appear; I am appearing because I think it is tactically sound to appear. And I will appear at the time I think it is tactically sound to appear.

If the hon. member opposite is presenting a legal brief, he may well publish it in advance so that his opposing counsel will have it in hand. I would not follow that practice. The member opposite may wish to follow that requirement; if indeed it is required by the court rules, then one would do it.

My point really is that in my judgment it is tactically unsound to do it. I think the member for Qu'Appelle would agree that it is tactically unsound to do it. I think he is attempting to undermine any efforts we are making in this regard. We are attempting to have modest success, and I will follow the tactics which I think are appropriate in that regard.

MR. COLLVER: — My supplementary to the Premier is this. This morning the Attorney General, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, issued a press release stating almost categorically that unless the federal government changed its constitutional package, Saskatchewan and the citizens of Saskatchewan would not accept that constitutional package. This seems to go much further than the statements you have made in this assembly. Is this in fact your position and your government's, that unless these changes are made the people of Saskatchewan won't stand for it?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we have said on a number of occasions — I can't recall the exact words I used in this House but I've used the same words any number of times now — that unless there are significant changes in the package our government will oppose the federal resolution with all the weapons available to us. That seems to me to be the position that I stated in this House. Then I think I went on to say, no, not all weapons and then . . . The only modification I made was that I was not going to have truck or trade with separatism — that's the only one I made.

The member for Nipawin thinks that's a soft line — unless you talk separatism you're being soft. The member for Qu'Appelle believes that unless you talk western separatism you're not standing up for western Canada. I do not share that view.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to participate in this throne speech debate. My colleagues deserve to be complimented on the very capable manner in which they moved and seconded the throne speech debate.

The hon. member for Yorkton, in moving the motion, provided a valuable lesson for all of us. Knowing is background as a teacher, I am not surprised at how well he presented it. I am sure that he never had a more unruly or slower bunch of pupils than those opposite. The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg shined by the high quality of his seconding speech why the people across southern Saskatchewan are now choosing NDP members over all other parties.

I would like to welcome our new southern NDP MLA, the MLA for Estevan, and the other new MLA, the NDP member for The Battlefords, and congratulate them on a job well done in their maiden speeches this week. I also want to extend a welcome to the new member for Kelsey-Tisdale. I am sure that all three of our new members will work hard to try and provide the people of Saskatchewan with the kind of representation that they deserve, and which they received from the former members of those three constituencies.

I am particularly pleased with the success of our new member for Estevan. He has been called Jack the Giant Killer. Although I think that is a somewhat misleading description, the fact is that in the eyes of the people of Estevan the leader of the Conservative Party did not measure up to the stature of their local NDP candidate.

But the reason I single out Estevan constituency is not only because we defeated the leader of the Conservative Party. It is because the people of Saskatchewan repudiated his resource policies and voted in support of the resource policies of the Blakeney government. The people of Saskatchewan can understand, even if the Conservative Party cannot, that it is the resource policies of the NDP government that have provided the base for the program supporting rural Saskatchewan. By investing in potash, for example, we have made after-debt payments of over \$116 million profit in 1979-80 alone, and paid over \$62 million in royalties and taxes — all of this from an initial investment of about \$450 million. Without our resource policy we would not be getting the return we need to fund agriculture programs like FarmStart, SHARP, drought aid, or hopper cars.

I would like to take a few minutes to discuss some of these programs that are so valuable to rural Saskatchewan. This past year, Mr. Speaker, FarmStart funding has been increased from \$1 million to \$2.3 million. The maximum loan available will increase from \$90,000 to \$150,000. These changes will help FarmStart continue to meet its objective of giving farmers access to sufficient resources to develop farms which will provide their families with adequate income.

The value of FarmStart to rural Saskatchewan is dramatically illustrated if we look at one of the characteristics of the clients. The average age of FarmStart clients at the time of application is approximately 27 years. It is obvious there is a need for these young farmers to become established. FarmStart clients are young beginning farmers, 20 per cent of whom are under the age of 25 and 74 per cent of whom are under 35 years of age. These clients will become tomorrow's major producers.

In my constituency of Redberry, Mr. Speaker, 98 farmers have received 151 loans under that program. These farmers have received a total of \$3.28 million under FarmStart, \$362,000 of that in the form of grants.

This is what the Blakeney government is doing for rural Saskatchewan, and it is one of the reasons why today Saskatchewan shares the best provincial record in preserving the family farm in Canada. Without programs like FarmStart and land bank. Saskatchewan farmers could face the 9 per cent reduction in the number of farms that Manitoba farmers have faced over the last three years.

Another program which has benefited farmers in Saskatchewan is SHARP. This program has protected hog producers in Saskatchewan by assuring them of a reasonable return. Our minister of agriculture recently announced a new SHARP which will continue as long as needed or until an adequate federal government program is implemented. Farmers throughout the province recognize that they can no longer survive market fluctuations without such a program.

I strongly support the government's announcement in the throne speech to press the federal government for a national hog and beef stabilization plan. It is only on a national level that such plans can be completely successful.

Mr. Speaker, our provincial drought aid program shows that this government, as on many other occasion, can respond equally well to an unpredictable and short-term program. Many areas of the province recovered because of late rains. In areas where this did not happen farmers found the provincial drought aid programs of valuable assistance.

I have heard a great deal of criticism from the members opposite about this government's agricultural programs. They say we have not been doing enough. They claim they have better policies. Well I have read what their leader thinks about farmers in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. He say 80 per cent of them are inefficient and should not be farming. He advocates that the crowrate should be abolished so that farmers can pay extra to ship their grain to market and increase the profits of the railways. This party supports inland terminals and the consequent abandonment of branch lines. Those are the programs the Conservative Party has planned for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in August of this year I presented a submission in favour of retaining rail service on the Carlton subdivision between Dalmeny and Carlton. I noted with interest the constituency's federal Conservative member, Mr. Hnatyshyn, was also in attendance and also in favour of retaining that rail line. But I couldn't help but wonder,

Mr. Speaker, why he didn't do something about it when he was minister in the federal cabinet.

The NDP have always recognized the value of rail lines to rural Saskatchewan. Some of my colleagues and I recently toured several U.S. states looking at what the Conservatives in Saskatchewan call an efficient system. I was able to present some of that information at that rail line abandonment hearing at Waldheim. On our tour to the United State we found that farmers there are in a far worse situation than here, despite paying up to eight times the freight rate we pay. We found that state governments are seriously concerned about the damage to their highways from commercial trucks. We found that delivery points are closing and many farmers are forced to truck their grain up to 80 miles. Those are actual results of what the opposition calls an efficient grain transportation policy.

In sharp contrast, as the Speech from the Throne notes, the efforts of the NDP government and community groups have resulted in more than 1,000 kilometres of prairie branch line being placed under protective status, making them eligible for upgrading.

But, Mr. Speaker, the policies of the Blakeney government have helped rural Saskatchewan in other ways than agriculture programs. They have greatly benefited our senior citizens. Because 1980 was our Celebrate Saskatchewan year, attention has been focused on the contributions of our senior citizens and pioneers. I am proud that the NDP government has the programs in place to help provide a decent life for our senior citizens and help them retire in the area where they have lived.

This year the Blakeney government has expanded home care. They have increased assistance to residents of nursing homes by over \$10 million. They initiated a tax reduction of up to \$50 for senior citizens in 1980. This tax reduction means the maximum general tax cut for senior citizens increases from \$160 to \$210.

Mr. Speaker, I know these programs have more meaning when translated into specific projects. This year in my constituency I have seen the completion of a new level 3 care facility in Hafford, which the provincial government has funded with a \$90,000 construction grant. I had the pleasure of attending that official opening along with some of my colleagues and the minister. This facility, which has a 15-bed capacity to serve the local area, is providing the care for people from the area. This is not an isolated project. When I look around my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I see new senior citizens' activity centres, such as the one in Blaine Lake. I had the pleasure last week of attending the official opening of that senior citizens' centre which received assistance from our neighbourhood improvement program and through the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, the senior citizens in Blaine Lake are pleased with the policies of the Blakeney government. They are so pleased they asked me, when I was speaking in this debate, to thank those ministers involved. In fact, in the pioneer spirit of Blaine Lake and area, they asked me, Mr. Speaker, to present to the Minister of Social Services, this homemade loaf of bread.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — The pages will deliver this to the minister with the instruction that in a pioneer spirit he eat it with butter and not with margarine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, that is not the only example. There is a new hall in Leask. There is a new community hall, library and senior citizens' complex in Borden; a new curling rink in Meota; tennis courts in Marcelin. Many citizens are having the time of their lives. They should; they have earned it. The policies of the Blakeney government are helping to make it happen.

The rural affairs grants to rural municipalities from another program greatly benefiting rural Saskatchewan. It is another program made possible by the resource policies of this Blakeney government. In my constituency these grants will total \$1.184 million, Mr. Speaker. Revenue sharing grants to all town in my constituency will total \$245,000. The new community capital fund will provide over \$350,000 for the towns in the area over the next five years.

The long list of programs strengthening rural Saskatchewan has not only been made possible by resource revenues. It is the policy of the Blakeney government to return that revenue to the people of the province and to use it to maintain strong rural communities.

This year many people have returned to their home communities to celebrate Saskatchewan. Some of the most common topics of conversation at these gatherings throughout the province have been the paved roads, the improvements to the small towns, the recreation facilities in rural Saskatchewan and the general prosperity which we now enjoy. The only people who do not recognize the strength of the Saskatchewan economy and the relationship between prosperity and the resource policies of the Blakeney government are those members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, they are slow learners. I recall as recently as last March the member for Thunder Creek describing the buying of potash mines as a great tragedy and blunder. I recall the member for Regina South talking about potash. He said, "We should allow others to come and develop it." It is ironic that with such an enterprising philosophy for others they are afraid to rely on the only local source of capital, the government, which is capable of undertaking resource development. It is characteristic of that Conservative Party to stamp Saskatchewan as second class.

Mr. Speaker, through this government, the people of Saskatchewan do things for themselves instead of running at the beck and call of the multinational corporations. While the Conservative Party refuses to recognize the success of the NDP government's resource policies, everyone else in Saskatchewan does. The July issue of *Trade and Commerce*, Mr. Speaker, stated:

With agriculture and resources forming the two pillars of the province's wealth and prosperity in a mature and diversified economy, Mr. Tchorzewski could very comfortably and confidentially make the statement that our prospects have never been brighter.

Members opposite have been strangely silent about the statistics reported to this magazine — a magazine which is hardly a friend of the NDP, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take just a few minutes to compare what *Trade and Commerce* says about Saskatchewan's economy with what the PC Party says. Let's look at unemployment:

The vigor of the Saskatchewan economy is reflected in the 15,000 new jobs created in the province last year. This had the effect of reducing Saskatchewan unemployment rate to 4.2 per cent — one of the lowest in Canada.

The PC Party ignores such statistics. Instead their literature says things like, “Saskatchewan was one of three provinces, with P.E.I. and B.C., that experienced a rise in unemployment recently.” Well, no one denies our unemployment rate fluctuates monthly. But let’s not avoid the facts, Mr. Speaker, and the facts are that Saskatchewan’s unemployment rate has been the lowest or the second lowest in the country for the last several years.

Let’s take a look at what the Conservatives say about population growth. The recently defeated Leader of the Conservative Party has been banging his drum, crying “Bring the kids home.” In the legislature, last session and again this session, the members and the member for Regina South said, and I quote:

We have unprecedented population decline under the NDP. Nowhere else in Canada can a province look to the type of population drain that we have experienced.

Now what does *Trade and Commerce*, an independent business publication, say about that, Mr. Speaker? It says, and I quote again:

This year the population of Saskatchewan is expected to reach 967,000, an increase of 10,000, and a total increase of 67,000 since 1974.

Mr. Speaker, that figure has been surpassed, my colleagues tell me. That’s the highest population figure ever in this province, Mr. Speaker.

So let’s go on and look at Saskatchewan taxes, that members opposite seem to relate to the people of Saskatchewan. The Conservatives tell us in their *Cure for Saskatchewan* how bad personal income taxes are under the NDP. Quoting from their Rexall pamphlet they say, and I quote:

Since the NDP has been in power, personal income taxes have risen 34 per cent in 1970 or 53 per cent in 1979, with an additional 10 per cent surtax.

They conveniently, Mr. Speaker, leave out the fact that the 10 per cent surtax only affects those taxpayers whose taxable income exceeds \$31,600. They conveniently leave out that the 53 per cent rate applies only to those in the high income bracket, in other words, those who can afford to pay.

Let’s take a look at what *Trade and Commerce* says about the tax structure in Saskatchewan. The magazine gives us a little fuller treatment of it than the PC Party is willing to do. *Trade and Commerce* writes, and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

With a show of disdain for the federal government’s uninspired, penny-pinching mini-budget, the Saskatchewan government heaped its budgetary bill of fare with a variety of sweetmeats for people and business, including some tax relief.

And I go on to quote:

With a handsome inflow of resource revenues, the province continues to reduce the tax burden on a selective basis. The \$40 per child tax cut is increased to \$50 in 1980. The budget provides a special tax reduction of up to \$50 for senior citizens. These two changes will remove an additional 2,500 taxpayers from provincial tax rolls. Small business gets a tax break. There is 30 per cent funding increases for the interest abatement program.

I am continuing to quote, Mr. Speaker, from this magazine:

Tax relief includes \$26 million in income tax savings from indexing, an \$18 million mortgage interest tax credit, a \$6 million capital gains rebate, expanded sales tax exemptions for farmers. The budget also provides \$180 million in grants and property tax relief for the municipal sector.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue in this way and quote the entire article, exposing the Conservative platform for what it is — the negative approach of a party that is bitter in defeat. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan do not accept a negative approach. Our history shows how time and time again people have banded together to co-operate and overcome the problems they faced. The Speech from the Throne continues in that tradition. It is a tradition of success that we in Saskatchewan can view with pride. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion and voting against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure for me to participate in this throne speech debate. For me it has been an honour and a privilege to represent the citizens of the Maple Creek constituency. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the three new members to this Assembly. I wish them well in their new endeavours and hope they participate well and enjoy the proceedings of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier, in his speech to this Assembly, harkened back to the days of 1962 and went to great lengths to tell us how the Progressive Conservatives at that time were against medicare. For years the present NDP government has deflected close scrutiny of its performance in the health care field by insisting that my party, the Progressive Conservatives would abolish medicare once in power. Every election since 1964 this NDP government has used fear tactics with the elderly, the poor and the sick. Mr. Speaker, during the last election I know of nursing home residents who had to be sedated after a visit from their NDP and why? Because that candidate told them if the Progressive Conservatives won, they would abolish medicare and they would make these elderly people pay for everything.

I speak from first-hand knowledge because that is exactly what went on in my constituency. I would like to say that it is a utter nonsense and it shows that the Premier when it suits him speaks, as the member for Thunder Creek stated the other day, with a deliberate lack of precision as it pertains to the truth. The members opposite may hoot and holler, but the Hall report repudiates both of their charges — charges made not only by this provincial NDP government, but also by Mr. Broadbent and his federal cohorts, charges that some people were against medicare and that PC governments across Canada were diverting federal health funds into different programs. I would like to quote from the Hall report. On page 2, Justice Emmett Hall says unequivocally:

I found no one, not any government or individual, not the medical profession nor any organization, not in favour of medicare. The nation-wide demand for medicare is an accepted fact.

He also puts in his report . . . claims by this NDP government that some other governments across the country were maligning their federal resources. On page 11 Emmett Hall concludes:

I conclude therefore that the first part of the allegations, namely that federal health dollars are being diverted is not (and I repeat not) established.

Mr. Speaker, I can say with conviction that medicare would be improved and not abolished under a Progressive Conservative government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — Progressive Conservative feel that the medical and social needs of the citizens of Saskatchewan cannot and should not be equated with such priorities as the acquisition of farmland or the development of uranium mines within the province. Today, health and social programs in Saskatchewan are in competition with expenditures for these mines, for these land acquisitions and other sundry business ventures of the NDP. Decision about such programs are being made on purely financial and political grounds. In this time of rampant inflation, health costs are forecasted to increase 50 to 60 per cent over the next four years. This government will have to redefine and reinforce its priorities, both fiscal and political, in the health and social service area. Mr. Speaker, it is time that this NDP government stopped using health as a political football to be tossed around at will.

The field of health services illustrates, perhaps better than any other, the paradox of our ages, which is the enormous gap between our scientific knowledge and skills on one hand, and our organizational and financial ability to apply them to the needs of our citizens on the other. In 1963, Justice Emmett Hall recommended to the government in Ottawa that this gap be closed. He recommended that, as a nation, we take the necessary legislative steps to make all the fruits of the health sciences available to everyone without hindrance of any kind. He also stated, Mr. Speaker, and I quote: "There can be no greater challenge to a free society of free men."

Certainly, times and conditions have changed since 1963. Public expectations in the health field have continued to rise. Modern technology, such as CAT (computerized axial tomography) scanners, to mention one innovation has added enormously to hospital costs. The health industry, which is heavily labor intensive, has achieved substantial increases. Surgical procedures, such as kidney transplants, require added personnel and added resources. The list is almost endless. Drugs, medical and surgical supplies, food, and labor costs have, in consequence, risen proportionately. The health economics resource section of Statistics Canada said that in 1971 health costs in Canada consumed 7.3 per cent of its GNP (gross national produce). In 1975, they dropped to 6.9 per cent in Saskatchewan, the spending on health has been 5.5 per cent of our gross domestic product while the Canadian average runs around 7 per cent. Today hospitals and hospital care personnel, in general, are being made the whipping boys, taking the blame for the uncontrolled expenditures of government at all levels, while government segment after government segment receives increases, percentage-wise, much greater than those attributed to the health industry.

Mr. Speaker, recently Justice Hall made public the findings of his most recent survey of the Canadian health scene. Two of the dominant issues of this report centre on extra billing and on the scale of fees paid to physicians. Justice Hall concluded that extra billing denies access by the poorer elements of society to medicare and this violated the essential principle of accessibility for all. He also concluded that the real point of the issue is the right of the physicians to be adequately compensated for their services.

Here, perhaps, is where the dilemma begins. It begins by defining the word "adequate." Adequate by whose standards? Yours? Or mine? Or the governments? The provincial government sets fees in conjunction with the establishment of a budget for medical care expenses. This means that doctors' fees are partly determined by the amount used for highways, for schools, for land purchases, for mineral development. Michael Walker, director of the Fraser Institute, believes that, rather than regarding extra billing as a problem, we should see it as *prima facie* evidence that the cumbersome process of government pricing has erred in the area of physicians' fees as it has erred elsewhere in the health and social field.

The scope of Justice Hall's report is far-reaching. He calls it a commitment for renewal and aptly so, Mr. Speaker, It has to be our commitment as we go into the 1980s. It is time that this NDP government shed its very partisan stance. As elected MLAs we are here not only to serve our constituents, but also to serve each and every citizen in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see established a select standing committee on health and social services, a committee that would be non-partisan, which would review and make recommendations to the government. Is that not what we are here for? Is it not the desire of each elected MLA to work together to make Saskatchewan a better place to live in? As we go into the 1980s, the problems and solutions we seek don't just affect NDP citizens or Progressive Conservative or Liberal citizens. The problems and solutions we seek affect each and every citizen of this province.

In the field of health, as competition for tax dollars becomes keener, we must develop a comprehensive array of health services not only in urban but also in rural areas. Better communications must be established between the health and social services departments. There must be a consolidation in areas such as small hospitals, special-care homes and home care services. Perhaps these could be administered by one department. As legislators, we must re-evaluate the function of our smaller hospitals to maximize the use of beds. As more and more technology becomes centralized in large urban areas such as Regina and Saskatoon, plans must be developed for the transportation and housing of rural residents when they are referred to these centres. The list goes on and on, and I look forward to putting more suggestions to the Minister of Health during health estimates in the spring.

Another area we must look at seriously is the whole scope of gerontology, and geriatrics. There is an urgent need today to review and upgrade our psychiatric services. Once we were the trend setters, but today we have fallen dangerously behind. We must look seriously at the area of trying to develop a comprehensive health and educational system for our citizens of native ancestry. I believe this is already started and I hope we will go ahead with many more plans.

Another area we must look into is the area of child abuse and children's rights. It would

appear to me that it is essential at this time to develop a strong family court system where we are able to deal with the youthful offender. There is an urgent need for expanded day care services. We need to dispel the myth that these centres are simply baby-sitting services. If day care centres are properly staff with trained people, they become child development centres. Day care centres are no longer a luxury; they are an absolute necessity in today's society.

We must also look at the teen-agers. The Premier took credit for having one of the lowest rates of divorce and alcoholism as compared to the province of Alberta. Some how he hinted it was because of the benevolence of the NDP government that we could be proud the divorce rate in Saskatchewan is very low. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he is prepared to take the credit for the statistic that Saskatchewan has the highest rate of teen-age pregnancies. What about drug abuse and what about teen-age suicide? It is not a laughing matter. The members opposite may laugh but this is a very critical area. Today we have children raising children, with no help . . . You should be proud of your Premier.

Mr. Speaker, it will be incumbent on us all, as legislators, to expand the programs for the physically and mentally handicapped. We have made a good start in this area, but let us forge ahead with new programs to once again become the trend setter in the country.

Mr. Speaker, and members of the Assembly, perhaps the greatest challenge we face in the 1980s is to work together in the health and social field, to help society overcome its fear and its prejudice, to help society recognize its responsibility to the physically and mentally handicapped, to our minority groups, and to recognize the responsibility of being a willing citizen in this great province.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that my time is up. I would therefore at this time move, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, that the amendment be amended by adding thereto:

These problems must be addressed with a view to having a strong Saskatchewan in a strengthened western Canada in a strong and united Canada, and that this Assembly rejects separatism as a solution to these problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate continues concurrently on the subamendment, the amendment and the main motion.

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, on rising in this debate, I want to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion, the member for Yorkton, and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

In extending congratulations to them I want also to extend congratulations to all of the members who have spoken in this legislature. The member for Redberry, this morning, and the member for Maple Creek are two examples of the efforts that members of this Assembly put into their remarks in his throne speech debate. I congratulate everyone who has been involved.

I extend, Mr. Speaker, best wishes to the members who have retired from the legislature in recent months. I wish them well in their new endeavours.

I welcome too, Mr. Speaker, the new members to the Assembly. I say to them that they are fortunate to have been chosen to do what is probably the most important job they will ever do in their lives, and I say that with sincerity. The serving of the people of Saskatchewan and the serving of the people of their constituencies is, I think, the most important job that they can do. I know they were filled with the importance of that task today, and I hope and pray that they will have that feeling a year or two years from now, or as long as they remain members of this Assembly.

It has been a great year for Saskatchewan — a remarkable recovery in the farm sector — but I think 1980 will go down in history because of the celebrations, the reunions, the suppers, the breakfasts, the dinners, the dances — I even milked a cow, Mr. Speaker! You never forget how to milk a cow, and the old cow didn't forget how to give me the old seat in the face with her tail either. I put some sheaves into a threshing machine. But I think the best parts of Celebrate Saskatchewan were the heritage nights, the family farm awards, the pioneer women awards. A lot of members of this Assembly participated in that little program of the Department of Agriculture, and I thank them for being involved and helping us out in a very important aspect of our celebrations.

It's an important year for agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Never has there been so great an opportunity to be seized in Saskatchewan agriculture, but never has there been a time when so much might be lost. I say the first challenge of the '80's is the transportation system. I remind the members of the Assembly of the words in the throne speech?

We have witnessed this past year the continuation of the attack begun several years ago on western agriculture's deal with confederation — the crowrate.

My government believes that there are constructive ways to cover the legitimate costs of the railways while still preserving the crowrate for western farmers. We will continue to put forward proposals which can accomplish both objectives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where do the three political parties stand on transportation and the crowrate? Where do the New Democrats stand? Well, I quote our Premier as he spoke in the Assembly on Tuesday:

The assault (of the crowrate) is led by the CPR and its allies in the Conservative Party. . . . The Conservative Party and the CPR started out life together in each other's pockets. It was hard to tell the difference between the Conservative Party and the CPR in the 1870s and the 1880s and it's hard to tell the difference between the Conservative Party and the CPR in the 1970s and the 1980s.

It's clear that western farmers have a hard, tough fight on their hands. . . . We know and the farmers know where the New Democratic Party stands . . . We stand for a grain handling and transportation system which has the needed rail capacity to move prairie grain to ocean ports, which has a strong system of branch lines, which preserves and protects the Canadian Wheat Board as a marketing agency for Canadian grain and which preserves for farmers the statutory grain rate, the crowrate.

Mr. Speaker, where do the Liberals stand? I listened to the Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board, Senator Argue. Take this from the *Leader-Post*, November 15 and 17.

He opposed the idea (he, meaning Argue) of paying the compensatory rate, to compensate the railways for their losses under the subsidized crowrate, to farmers who would then pay higher freight rates.

He went on to say, concerning an absolute guarantee to western farmers of the benefit of the crowrate. "These are my personal views, but we've got to leave this matter to the minister in charge of resolving the crowrate issue."

Now a word about where the Conservatives stand. I listened carefully to the hon. member from Rosetown-Elrose Wednesday. This is the policy that the Conservative government in Ottawa put forward during its short term in office: there was some need for change but the western farmers should retain the crow benefit.

What is the policy? Well, I think the policy of the Conservatives is that there should be some type of negotiation which would perhaps change the crowrate, but retain the crowrate benefit for western farmers.

The minister in charge of resolving the crowrate tells us, from the *Leader-Post* of November 21:

. . . the time is ripe economically and politically to change the crow. Implementing the changes will take a number of years and should be done with a stable government, like the federal Liberals, is early in its term.

"Early in its term," he say. Mr. Speaker, everything is set to go, but there are four issues unresolved — so say the minister in charge of resolving the crowrate. Again I quote from the *Leader-Post*:

. . . whether the compensatory rate will be paid directly to farmers or directly to the railways.

Now the federal government can't decide whether to pay the crow benefit to the farmers or whether to pay it to the railways. They can't decide whether to join the Conservative policy or to pay the railways, because they can't decide which will be worse to live with when the compensation ends. I say that the compensation indeed will end, because the minister in charge of resolving the crowrate told the people of Saskatchewan that the compensation will come out of the \$4 billion western development fund. I quote from the federal budget of October 28:

We have allocated \$4 billion to a western development fund of which we expect to spend \$2 billion over the next three years.

Let's say we give them two more years to spend the other \$2 billion, and that fits, or maybe give them another year, and another year would make three years. The other \$2 billion gone. I predict, Mr. Speaker, six years and it will be all over for compensation.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, where is that \$4 billion coming from? I have a very interesting book called *The Budget in Brief*, and it comes from the Department of

Finance, Government of Canada. It is dated October 28. Page of that document says:

The budget proposes a new federal tax on natural gas and gas liquids beginning November 1 for domestic sales and next February 1 for export sales, increasing over the next three years. Also, a new tax of 8 per cent effective January 1, 1981 will apply to net revenue from production of oil and gas in Canada.

The document goes on to say:

The two new taxes will yield some \$11.7 billion over the next three years to the end of the fiscal year 1983-84, with the new revenues financing major spending initiatives in energy and a new western development fund.

The second issue according to the minister in charge of resolving the crowrate is how future inflationary increases are to be dealt with. Now western farmers must realize what the minister said. He said, "Neither the federal government nor the railways have unlimited funds." The poor old federal government, which just put two new taxes on western Canada which will yield \$11.7 billion in three years. Mr. Speaker, the poor old railways. The poor old CP, which in the first nine months of 1980 showed profits of \$423 million, up 15 per cent from \$368 million in the first nine months of last year. The poor old CN rail division, which in the first nine months of this year showed profits of \$171.9 million with higher revenue coming from, as they say, "greater coal, greater sulphur and greater grain movements."

The third issue the minister says is how to guarantee the performance of the railways. Well, they have already decided how to guarantee the performance of the railways, Mr. Speaker, because in Saskatchewan last week he said, "You've got to have faith, you've got to have trust; you've got to have courage. You have to trust the railways. You have to trust someone." say the minister responsible for resolving the crowrate.

The fourth issue according to the minister in charge of resolving the crowrate is the question of variable rates versus the distance-related rates. Now I know what variable rates are: the right for the railways to charge different rates from different delivery points or from different lines. Distance-related rates — I don't know what they are. If they are equal rates for equal distance, which is a fundamental principle of the crow, why did he not say so?

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize. The Premier:

We stand for a grain handling and transportation system which has the needed rail capacity to move prairie grain to ocean ports, which has a strong system of branch lines, which preserves and protects the Canadian Wheat Board as the marketing agency for Canadian grain, and which preserves for farmers the statutory rate, the crowrate.

The Senator: "I've got personal views."

The Conservatives:

Some type of negotiation which would perhaps change the crow, but retain the crowrate benefit for western f

The minister responsible for resolving the crowrate: Well, he and the senators from western Canada and the ministers from central and eastern Conservative are out to “modernize” the crowrate. I look at the issues they are struggling with in this modernization and I look at the minister’s words and he says:

Producers might reasonably be asked to bear some future increases since neither the railway nor the federal government have unlimited resources.

“Modernize” the crowrate? What western Canada needs is a minister of transportation, a minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and a minister of agriculture who would open their eyes to what is going on.

What is going on, Mr. Speaker? What is going on is, as the chief commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board reminds us at every opportunity:

World markets continue to expand faster than we had predicted. World trade has already reached the levels that, three years ago, we predicted for 1985. Over the past 10 years wheat trade is up 70 per cent; coarse-grain trade is up 156 per cent; oil seeds are up 81 per cent. Altogether, last year’s world grain trade was 245 million tonnes — more than double what it was 10 years ago.

Everything you pick up talks about the need for grain in the world: “Grain reserves decline.” World grain reserves could hit record low, “Grain shortages predicted.” “Grain shortage main topic.”

Mr. Speaker, we had a good year last year in exports. We exported 22 million to 23 million tonnes. Rumours from Ottawa are that when we express concerns about our buyers going to the United States instead of to us, we are told to go home and get our own house in order and then they will come to talk to us. “Get that grain to export position and then we will talk to you.” And that’s the issue, Mr. Speaker, The crowrate is not the issue.

I suggest to the minister in charge of resolving the crowrate, the senators from western Canada and the minister from eastern and central Canada should start putting their minds to building the transportation system which is needed to meet the opportunities of the 1980s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Now they say the moved a record volume of grain last year — 22 million to 23 million tonnes. It was an easy winter; there was an early opening at Thunder Bay; there was confidence and there was investment. That’s how it was done. Investment — the solution to the system is to invest. I say in this Assembly, the solution of investment is to use public money. You say, because we have bought hopper cars and the federal government has bought hopper cars, and Alberta has bought hopper cars and producers have bought hopper cars, “Aren’t the taxpayers of Canada, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, doing the railways should be doing?” We are. Equipping the system is the railway’s job. But the minister in charge of resolving the crowrate say you have to have faith and you have to have courage. I say in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I do not trust the railways to build and operate the branch lines, to provide the diesels, to provide the hopper cars to move grain in the 1980s.

CN has not brought a new car in for grain since 1946; CP since 1950. It is true they've ordered locomotives, and it's true CN has ordered 1,000 hopper cars, but not one of those locomotives and not one of those hopper cars has yet to be designed for the movement of western grain.

Hall offered the railways a rate, and if you use Snavely figures, a rate which could cover their operating plus a return on capital for CP of 20 per cent and for CN of 13 per cent. Why didn't they support Hall? We offered the crowrate guarantee plan to take care of livestock and processed products. They didn't say, "We love you, Saskatchewan." The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan pays full compensatory rate for movement of potash. They've already bought 1,700 cars. They've already on order for 280 cars — to bring their total to 2,000. They need them to move the potash.

We do not trust the railways. The president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Ted Turner, this week told pool members in Southey of a visit of CN and CP presidents to the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee. The wheat board advisory committee said, "How much do you really need? Two times crow? Four times crow?" The railway president said, "Yes, six times crow, or seven times crow would be fine."

What we really need is rate structure. Now, I ask the member of this Assembly, if the railways had rate structure, would they rehabilitate the lines: The Porcupine line? The Kirkella line? Or the line running down to Holdfast?

We have to invest in the system with public investment. If we have a control mechanism over the investment, what's wrong with owning hopper cars, branch lines, and diesels, as a means of covering legitimate costs of the railways? We've got to have a system. There is only one way to guarantee that system. Only through public ownership will we ensure that the additional 10,000 hopper car are actually bought, the additional 200 diesel locomotives are actually bought, and the branch lines are rehabilitated. We've taken some steps already, through the purchase of hopper cars.

Once we have a system in place, then and only then should a national government look at any further direct compensation to the railways, and then and only then in relationship to railway profits.

Mr. Speaker, we can't get the grain to the port if we do not have a transportation system. We can't get the grain to the port unless we have a marketing system for the '80s. Right now we have two systems — two systems with two different objectives. One system's job is to bring the greatest return to the producers, to get the grain to the market on the basis of honesty and quality and integrity. The other system's job is profit, to line the pockets of the speculation in the private grain trade. Those two systems are hitting head on.

The Moose Jaw terminal is full of off-board rapeseed and flax. There are terminals and railcars tied up with off-board grains, playing the futures market.

Every time this government comes out in support of the Canadian Wheat Board we hear criticism of the board. Peter Perkins of the Herald Grain Company in Winnipeg, formerly an employee of the Government of Alberta, speaking at Weyburn, said, "The Canadian grain industry has become slothful and lazy and stupid."

I thought the member for Thunder Cree had written that speech. But he went even beyond, by saying, "Greed is a good thing, equity is a bad thing. Why create equity for

those who are not equal?"

Peter Perkins Blasts the Wheat Board is the headline. When I read that, I think about criticism. But what I read from the United Grain Growers annual convention said that they will oppose deliberate tampering with the operations of feed grain marketing and criticized the producer-elected wheat board advisory committee, suggesting that those farmers should stay out of farm policy matters. I say in this Assembly it's time to move the Canadian Wheat Board to the city of Regina where there is support for orderly marketing and where we have the world's largest and most respected grain handling co-operative. I wish the people of Regina would wake up to the fact that the city is becoming the agricultural capital of western Canada. For anyone who doubts that, look at the machinery dealership head offices moving to Regina. Look at the wheat pool and at the people from 20 countries visiting Agribition. Agribition has sales this year which will exceed \$2 million and over 100,000 people will go through the gates. Look at the Farm Progress Show and at the spring bull sale. It's time to round it out by moving the wheat board head office to Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, if we have a transportation and a marketing system, we can then turn our minds to growing the 36 million metric tonnes and the 43 million metric tonnes needed in the 1980s. We are told that the main increase in production will have to come from Saskatchewan which already produces 65 per cent of export grain. But in the last five years the average in Saskatchewan has only been 18 million tonnes total production. The Canadian Wheat Board conference in Saskatoon identified the areas that need to be addressed:

1. Genetics. Dr. Al Slinkard of the crop development centre says that we have increased 1 per cent in the last 10 years in production because of genetics without even working at it. What could we do if we worked at it?
2. New land coming into production through a reasonable system of clearing.
3. Extended rotations, continuous cropping, minimum till, increased use of fertilizer, chemical uses, snow and water management.

Mr. Speaker, I report to the members of this Assembly we've been meeting over the last year with farmers, university and federal research scientists and they've come up with about the same kind of list as the Canadian Wheat Board. We need this list. We will need to establish committees throughout the province to decide the priorities for testing within a particular area. But before we can ask producers to embark on a production effort, before we can ask the University of Saskatchewan and Canada Agriculture Research Farms to embark on a production effort, before we can commit ourselves money for that effort, we must have our transportation and marketing system in place. Otherwise, what's the point?

Mr. Speaker, increased productivity just automatically leads to an expanded livestock industry. It is simply not possible to move from a half-and-half summer fallow basis in many of our areas of the province to one with rotations involving grass and oil seeds, and pulse crops and oats and barley. If we do that, we will destroy the land. If we are going to have an increased livestock industry, it's not good enough, as the opposition members indicate, to continue to be in love with the free marketing for beef. That love

affair with free market is going to destroy the beef industry in Saskatchewan when we have an opportunity to increase it. If they'd only wake up to the fact that we need orderly marketing for beef as we have established with hogs, that we need stabilization for beef as we have established if for hogs and grain, then we can seize the opportunity for beef marketing and beef production in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, a great opportunity lies before us in agricultural development in Saskatchewan in the 1980s.

There's transportation, marketing, production, and the opportunity for processing. Plains Poultry, Prairie Malt, Pool Fertilizer, CSP Foods, co-ops in oil, as I call it, are a start.

But I say to members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that it is an opportunity not only for the co-operative movement, the Canadian Wheat Board, the supporters of orderly marketing, the Government of Saskatchewan and the producers of Saskatchewan, it's an opportunity for the private grain trade the Liberals and Pioneer, CPR and the Conservatives, the multinationals and their integrated programs for agriculture.

You see, it boils down to their way and it boils down to our way, Mr. Speaker. And there is a difference. Their way it is money and profit; our way is people and the producers of Saskatchewan. I will be supporting the main motion, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to be speaking in this debate. I am pleased to be following the Minister of Agriculture, my colleague, even though it's a tough assignment. I want to say how proud and pleased I am that he, at least, represents this side of the House with respect to the agricultural policy which in fact will make Saskatchewan a much greater province in which we can live.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BOWERMAN: — I want, Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with my remarks to commend and express my compliments to my colleagues for Yorkton and Assiniboia-Gravelbourg for their excellent contribution in moving and seconding the motion.

Mr. Speaker, it is also my pleasure at this time to congratulate the new members of the House. They have indeed been congratulated a number of times. I think that is worthy. I congratulate the member for Estevan for his tremendous victory in that constituency, the member for The Battlefords, and the member for Kelsey-Tisdale. I want to welcome them warmly to this Assembly. I have to express some regrets that my personal efforts with respect to my own activities in the by-election in Hudson Bay weren't as fruitful as I had hoped them to be.

Well, it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that with welcoming the new members we have lost from our roster of colleagues three very able members. We acknowledge, with a great deal of appreciation, the contribution of those members, both in this House and of two of them in the Executive Council of government. We not only extend them our thanks and our appreciation for their years of service, we want to wish them success in their new ventures or retirement, whatever might be their choice of endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, as well I want to express my personal pleasure in seeing before this legislature the final recommendations of the boundaries commission with respect to the renaming of my constituency. They have, in following our submission to them, acknowledged the dual historic nature of the new boundaries established in 1975. Both Shellbrook, and the name Torch-River are constituency designations which have early and historic recognition in this Chamber. I am pleased, and I know that the people of my constituency are pleased, particularly those who live in the eastern end of my constituency (those places like Choiceland, Smeaton, Snowden, Meath Park, Weirdale, and a number of others) that they will not be better recognized for their contribution to the new constituency, Shellbrook-Torch River.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a throne speech reflecting the optimism and the vision of future which always characterized the Blakeney government since 1971. The people of Shellbrook-Torch River and of Saskatchewan as a whole are encouraged by the vision of this nation and its future presented so clearly by the Premier of Saskatchewan the other day in this debate. This view of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and of Saskatchewan's fight for change in confederation is deeply contrasted by the lack of national and provincial perspective coming from across this House.

I believe the people of Saskatchewan are pleased, as they are encouraged, to see the continued vigour with which our resource development programs will be pursued. They are pleased because an ever-increasing share of the benefits will accrue to them instead of vanishing across our borders to the bulging coffers of foreign-owned companies or internationally powerful cartels or corporations. This also stands in contrast to the negative attitude of members opposite, who express the belief that the people of this province cannot do the job. Just as citizens of the province approve and support the vision of Canada outlined in the Speech from the Throne, they also appreciate and support the vision of the future of Saskatchewan outlined in the speech. New initiatives and new confidence in the economy, in agriculture, rural affairs in the North, in health and social services, and I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. All are welcome announcements.

We are also pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech this government's continued commitment to environment protection. In a moment I will say a few words about our continued efforts to find short and long-term solutions to hazardous waste disposal problems in western Canada, as well as our increasing efforts to monitor and evaluate the effects of chemicals used here. But first I would like to touch on a few other areas of interest where Saskatchewan environment is involved in the ongoing effort to keep Saskatchewan a safe and beautiful place in which to live. We will be putting programs in place based on and legislation which were begun in the last session. The Department of the Environment has been preparing for the proclamation in the new year of The Drainage Control Act — water management if you will, spoken of earlier by my colleague. This involves the preparing of regulations, the development of procedures for implementing surface water drainage control, and the development of a public information program. It will require a drainage appeal board, and that must be established early in the new year.

This will require though and planning regarding the setting up of drainage basin commissions and the financing of those commission, as we move into the full adoption of the legislation which we passed last years. Under The Ecological Reserves Act which was passed in the last session, we have begun the process of evaluation and prioritization of candidate areas to be designed for preservation. Mr. Speaker, I should

have the list (I will be happy to provide it to you and other members of the House) of those areas which are being considered in ecological reserves. They are interesting. They are an exciting group of unique natural phenomena in our province which not many people recognize as being part of our heritage. In a very important area of land-use policy development, input has been sought and received from the broadest possible number of people and after more regional meetings a report is expected in the new year.

Also an area of importance, Mr. Speaker, is the long-term implementation of many of the recommendations of the water management study which is virtually complete. In fact the report is now on my desk and will be made available to the members.

Another matter on the horizon involves our role in the future regional water supply problems. A four-year water demand study will be proceeding to investigate water use in the Saskatchewan Nelson River basin, which covers most of the settled portion of the three prairie provinces, and we look forward to the findings of this report.

Turning to resources development as a potential source of future environmental damage, this government will continue its efforts through our environment impact assessment legislation to minimize the harm, while at the same time, taking into account the social and economic implications of developments in that area.

Although oil and potash account for nearly 60 per cent of the value of Saskatchewan mineral shipments, the province also has rich deposits of uranium and coal. Sales of uranium expected to increase dramatically and approach \$1 billion by 1990. Coal, which now provides 9 per cent of Canada's domestic primary energy supply, could go up to 12 per cent by the years 2000. If coal utilization and conversion technologies are applied along with pollution control measures, that could increase up to 18 per cent according to a study paper recently released by the federal government.

In the area of uranium development, our new mines pollution control branch has drafted pollution control regulations. Members of the public have been reviewing them and sending them in with their comments and their proposals.

In the environmental impact assessment process, the Key Lake Board of Inquiry is expected to submit its final report in the near future as well. Concerning problems which were created before the environmental legislation, such as coal overburdened strips, other mine mill tailings, Saskatchewan Environment along with other government departments in industry is formulating guidelines for increasing the amount and the quality of land reclamation programs.

Some people will no doubt say, Mr. Speaker, that what has been done is not enough. But I am confident that if more is going to be done anywhere in Canada, it will come from the Blakeney government. Saskatchewan people have again shown their agreement and their support with this approach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BOWERMAN: — At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to focus our attention more closely on the question of development as it relates to the health of the people of Saskatchewan. We have led the way in Canada with programs such as medicare, occupational health and safety legislation, dental care, public insurance and a number that have been repeatedly broached in this Assembly. In addition to these measures, we

have established a wide array of environmental legislation to ensure that this province will continue to be the beautiful and healthful place that it now is, not only for those of us who are here today, but also for the generations that are to come.

With our growing enthusiasm for oil, for potash, for uranium, and for other resource developments, it is understandable, although at times regrettable, that in some circles we have a tendency to overlook our largest industry, which is also our largest growth industry, namely that which my colleague heads, the Department of Agriculture or the agricultural industry. Let me emphasize that this government views agriculture as our most important industry, not only in the present but increasingly so in the future. Farm cash receipts have quadrupled between 1970 and 1979. Comprehensive stabilization programs have been developed to protect the farming community from the disasters which can result from the fluctuations in weather and in world markets. The land bank program provides a land base for new farmers and the FarmStart program provides low interest credit to producers.

Because agriculture is of such paramount importance in Saskatchewan, as minister in charge of Saskatchewan Environment and as a member of the farming community, I would like to spend a few minutes concentrating on farm chemicals which have become a matter of serious concern to the farming community and to the general public as well.

Pesticide use in North America has doubled in the past decade. It has grown twelvefold since the introduction of major synthetic organic pesticides in the 1940s. Saskatchewan is one of the heaviest users of pesticides in Canada. We use mostly herbicides for weed control. We use nearly as much chemical as Alberta, Manitoba, and British Columbia combined. Over 8.3 million pounds of herbicides are sold for use in our province annually. Nearly 65 per cent of this is 2,4-D and 15 per cent is MCPA. The other three provinces' combined use is just over 8.7 million pounds.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of increasing concern for four main reasons:

1. Insects can acquire resistance to a particular insecticide or class of insecticides necessitating progressively greater applications of the chemical in order to effect their control.
2. Many pesticides produce broad spectrum effects damaging various forms of insect, animal and plant life other than the intended target.
3. Many classes of pesticides, particularly organochlorines, are highly stable; they resist degradation and they accumulate in the food chain at levels other than one millionfold in excess of those found in the environment.
4. Finally Mr. Speaker, many pesticides have been found to induce a wide range of toxic effect in experimental animals, including birth defects, sterility and cancer, thus posing grave health hazards, especially in view of the widespread environment dissemination and persistence.

Mr. Speaker, there is general agreement that some of the major causes of the dreaded disease, cancer, and other of the less dreaded diseases of equal importance are environmental.

Our concerns have been intensified by the infamous IBT (Industrial Biotest Laboratories) affair and the growing evidence of public use that a variety of human

health side effects seem to be associated with the extensive, sometimes indiscriminate and careless use of chemicals.

Most of us will be aware that the Industrial Biotest Laboratories, based in Illinois, was used by major multinational chemical companies to test their chemicals for registration requirements in the United States as well as in Canada. American government agencies doing audits on the company in 1976 began to notice discrepancies in test data. Since then a scandalous story of large-scale fraud and ineptitude in thousand of IBT tests have unfolded, throwing open to question the safety of many food additives, drugs, pesticides and herbicides. Among other IBT chemicals relevant to Canada, there were over 100 agricultural chemicals.

Since March of 1980 I have been pressing the Minister of National Health and Welfare to identify the chemicals involved and give us the reasons why they are suspect and judged to be of concern. I have sought assurances that they are without health hazard to our people as a whole (or farmers in particular) and to the overall environment of our province. However, Mr. Speaker, after repeated requests we have received no information beyond the mere list of chemicals without any documentation on the defects or the potential effects of each chemical. We are continuing to press for release of data necessary to making a satisfactory assessment for ourselves of the possible dangers involved.

Saskatchewan Environment takes a responsible chemical position. In the past surveillance of both the federal and provincial levels has been lacking, poorly co-ordinated where such co-ordination existed and we are attempting to achieve improvements in this area.

We have moved in Saskatchewan to use provincial authority to prohibit two hazardous agricultural chemicals, namely 2,4,5-T and TOK, known as niclofen. Neither of these was considered a major chemical in Saskatchewan agriculture and satisfactory alternatives were available to replace them. Therefore they were banned. We believe this action has averted a serious potential danger of birth defects, cancerous reactions and genetic damage in humans, wildlife and in domestic livestock. My officials are continuing to monitor 2,4-D which is an agricultural chemical of great importance to our province. Mr. Speaker, 5.5 million pounds are used annually here, compared with 8 million pounds used in the remainder of Canada. It is contained in over 1,588 products registered by the American Environmental Protection Agency for use not only in agriculture but also in a wide range of products including some for use in our homes. 2,4-D was on the EPA's list of IBT chemicals in 1977. National health and welfare, which was involved in the registration process for sale of this and other chemicals in Canada, has recently acted in response to pressure and they have begun their own study on this particular chemical.

There has been increased concern since the October 23 news release by the Hon. Eugene Whelan that Agriculture Canada has found dioxin contaminates in some 2,4-D samples. These are some of the most toxic chemicals known to man. He has promised a decision on how these findings will affect the permitted use of 2,4-D for the 1981 growing season.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention one more chemical at this time which is of serious concern in Saskatchewan, the insecticide lindane. Although it is not on the IBT list, it is known to cause cancer, to create birth defects and reproductive disorders in test animals. In humans it has been linked with blood disorders and damage to the central

nervous system. Other concerns about lindane are the health and safety of its users and the widespread distribution of the chemical in surface waters. Although federal authorities do not intend to make any immediate changes concerning its use, Saskatchewan will continue its examination of the insecticide and will take appropriate action if and when that actions is considered to be required.

It is incumbent upon all of us, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that these chemicals are used only where absolutely necessary and with positive care. It is also necessary to intensify our efforts in the area of sound research — if not doing it, it is our responsibility to see that it is done and done properly.

Mr. Speaker, while I am speaking on environmental issues related to agriculture, I would like briefly to refer to the problem of acid rain which has a potential in the future to damage our northern lakes and our soils, perhaps even the productivity of our agricultural soils. My department, with joint funding from the Alberta Department of the Environment and Environment Canada, has commissioned a study of acid rain to be carried out by the Saskatchewan Research Council at Saskatoon. This project will review and summarize existing studies of air quality and ecosystem effects. It will provide an inventory of industrial atmospheric emissions and estimates of future emissions. It will identify areas where the aquatic environment, soils or vegetation may be susceptible to acid rain or snow. It will recommend further studies to help identify potential impacts on water, soil, fish and wildlife. It will further recommend a monitoring system which will help show changes in precipitation, chemistry, air quality and ecosystems. It is believed that this will be basic and the basis upon which we can begin to establish emissions and total quantum standards.

Although acid rain is not yet a problem in Saskatchewan, particularly in the more southerly part, my department is concerned that the growing developments in the tar sands and Cold Lake areas of Alberta could cause problems in the future. In an effort to mitigate the increasing damage from sulphur dioxide, which is one of the main components of acid rain, an intervention prepared by the Saskatchewan Department of the Environment was sent to the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board. As a result, the board is considering an application for Esso Resources Canada Ltd. to use natural gas as the make-up fuel instead of coal, which will reduce hazardous emissions to some considerable extent.

The department believes that special consideration should be made to reduce environment impacts, particularly in a region where other similar projects are expected in the near future, and where the environment is highly sensitive to sulphur dioxide.

Let me turn for a moment to a slightly different topic, although still in the area of chemicals. The Department of the Environment, along with counterparts in three other western provinces and Environment Canada, is involved in working out a co-ordinated waste management strategy for northern and western Canada. This report is expected early in 1981. In western Canada approximately 250,000 tonnes per year of hazardous waste materials are being generated, not including contaminated soils, drilling muds and wastes treated on site. Saskatchewan generates approximately 45,000 tonnes, according to the federal-provincial study, including 12,500 tonnes of waste oil and grease, and 12,800 tonnes of organic waste from meat processing and tanning operations. Although some of the wastes generated in western Canada are destroyed in special incinerators, or through recover processes, most if it is disposed of in municipal landfill sites according to the report. This is of concern to our

environment, and it is requiring of the department more and better monitoring techniques to ensure that if dangerous substances appear, their source can be speedily traced and contained.

These items and many more which time won't allow me to mention are evidence of this government's commitment to protect our environment. It is our intention to increase our level of technical expertise, not only to implement our own environmental programs, but also to be able to supply such technical expertise to other departments as well as to agricultural industry and the public at large.

For these and many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech that is now before us is clear evidence that the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan is with the Blakeney government in many of its proposals for progress. At the same time we offer the good life to our citizens. As many others on this side of the House have indicated their support for the throne speech and their opposition to both the amendment and subamendment, I too will be supporting the Speech from the Throne and opposing the amendments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to rise in this House on behalf of the residents of the Saskatoon-Sutherland constituency to speak in support of this throne speech. Before I begin my remarks I want to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion we have before us. I think all members will share my view that they have done a fine job on behalf of their constituents and on behalf of the government side of the House.

I also want to extend my congratulations to the new members of the Legislative Assembly who have been elected in the by-elections and to wish the former members of the Assembly for Kelsey-Tisdale and Estevan and The Battlefords the very best in their future endeavours.

In speaking in support of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, I want to also state that there are many additional initiatives which our government needs to pursue over and above the ones outlined in the current throne speech, and I want to comment on what I believe some of these should be.

As a government much of our time has been occupied over the past year with constitutional negotiations. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe our Premier and our Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs have done a fine job of negotiating benefits for the people of Saskatchewan. I fully support the position we have taken in both opposing unilateral patriation and, at the same time, seeking changed to the proposed constitutional legislation in the event that it does become the constitution of Canada.

In seeking these changes our provincial government has concentrated on guaranteeing provincial ownership and control of resources, changing the amending formula and attaining a clear commitment for equalization payments in the constitution rather than the current constitutional proposal which simply establishes as a broad principle the concept of equalizing opportunities for all Canadians.

I believe, however, that a fourth condition should be added to the current changes the Government of Saskatchewan is insisting on. Our government should press for a change in the constitution which will guarantee the treaty rights of native people and

will also guarantee the rights of native people to negotiate land claims.

At the present time the federal policy that consideration may be given to negotiating a specific land claim when one is brought forward provides native people with no guarantees of protection at all. The federal government could choose not to negotiate if it wanted and some future federal government could change the policy entirely and give no consideration at all to Indian and Metis land claims. Recognition of land claims and native people's rights to negotiate those claims can only be assured by way of a provision in the constitution.

Protection of treaty rights is also essential in any new constitutional proposal, Mr. Speaker,. Given the history of the federal government's attempts to erode treaty rights, a provision in the constitution that these rights be recognized and protected is absolutely imperative.

I therefore believe that our Saskatchewan government, representing the largest group of Indian and Metis people of any province in Canada, should insist on the inclusion of rights for native people as a central part of our constitutional position.

I want to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the question of energy policy, a matter that is of special importance to our province. In my view, energy conservation and the efficient use of energy should be seen as the most fundamental part of any government's energy policy. I am encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by the initiatives that our provincial government has begun to take over the past year in the conservation field. The interest-free loan program implemented by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the construction of 14 energy-efficient demonstration homes in Saskatoon, the Saskatchewan Minerals plan to manufacture heat storage trays and the signing of an \$18 million agreement with the federal government to encourage conservation and technological advancement in the area of renewable energy, are all positive steps forward.

However, Mr. Speaker, conservation is still not the priority it should be in our government's energy policy. Our province must formulate a comprehensive energy conservation program and implement it as quickly as possible. This program should be designed with three primary objectives in mind. First, our province should aim for an energy growth rate of one per cent a year or less. Second, we should give priority to conservation policies which stimulate the development of an energy conservation industry here in Saskatchewan, creating new jobs for Saskatchewan people. Third, we should pursue policies which reduce the long-term energy costs Saskatchewan consumers will have to pay.

I would like to propose a 10-point energy conservation program which I believe the Government of Saskatchewan should implement as quickly as possible.

First, our government should stimulate the establishment of an energy conservation industry in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan people are developing many new inventions in the conservation field, such as insulated curtains, new air-to-air heat exchangers, attic hatches, thermal window shutters and windows that have an insulation value better than most walls. Our provincial government should give special support to the manufacture and distribution of these inventions within Saskatchewan. Additional research in the development of conservation technology should be funded. The establishment of a conservation industry in the province could be an important source of new employment opportunities and could be the type of industry that would establish in smaller urban centres, thus decentralizing benefits around the province.

Secondly, funding for energy conservation should be very substantially expanded to recognize the fact that it is cheaper to invest in conserving oil and gas than it is to invest in producing it. This fact has now been clearly demonstrated by numerous other studies, including the Harvard Business School's study called *Energy Futures*, research by the Canadian Office of Energy Conservation, and a major research project by the U.S. advisory committee to the President on matters of environmental quality, which reviewed 44 technical studies and concluded that savings of 30 to 40 per cent in energy consumption were possible without major lifestyle changes.

In light of this, the Saskatchewan government should designed at least 50 per cent of the energy security fund budget for conservation investments. Home-owner assistance programs to encourage home insulation should be expanded. An insulation grant should be established to supplement the \$500 federal grant, which only provides assistance to home-owners whose houses were constructed prior to 1961. A provincial program could extend the \$500 insulation grant to all houses built between 1961 and the present date. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that a large number of more recently constructed homes have also been built with poor levels of insulation, and owners of these houses should be assisted in improving the insulation value of the houses.

The \$1,000 limit on interest-free loans should also be extended to allow home-owners to undertake large retrofit projects.

Thirdly, the provincial government should introduce an incentive program to encourage the construction of new homes that are highly energy-efficient. Through building into a house such features as improved insulation, double wall construction, a well-sealed vapour barrier, double or triple glazed windows and primarily south facing windows, heating costs can be reduced to under \$100 a year. The extra cost of these energy conserving features is usually \$3,000 to \$5,000. As energy prices increase, this extra investment will quickly pay for itself. However, home-owners may have difficulty meeting the higher mortgage costs that will result during the first years of home ownership. Therefore the Government of Saskatchewan should either provide a three-year interest free loan of up to \$4,000 to remove interest payments on the cost of the extra conservation features, or should establish a home-owner grant program, based on income, which would help offset the extra costs involved. I believe that such a program would pay for itself by reducing the natural gas purchases needed from Alberta and in the case of electricity, by reducing the demand for and cost of new electrical generating facilities.

Fourth, the province should work in co-operating with the municipalities to remove obstacles in the taxation system which discourage conservation. Consideration should be given to making capital investments on energy conservation items exempt from property taxes. At the present time, home-owners and businessmen are being taxed when conservation investments result in higher property assessments.

Fifth, the Government of Saskatchewan should reverse the Saskatchewan Power Corporation rate structure for electricity and natural gas purchases, at least within each category of user. The current policy, under which each of us pays less for energy as we use more of it, is an outdated policy which actually provides a disincentive to conserve. Instead a policy should be adopted in which consumers would pay a lower base rate and be charged more for energy as extra amounts are used. Such a policy

would encourage conservation and reduce the rates for those who attempt to be energy conserving.

Sixth, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation should introduce a pricing system for electricity based on time-of-day metering. This pricing system would recognize the fact that electrical generating capacity must be installed to meet periods of peak demand during the busiest periods of the day, expensive new capital projects can be avoided and price increases for consumers can thus be kept down. Under a time-of-day metering system higher prices would be charged for electricity used during the busiest times of the day. Consumers would pay a lower rate during off-peak periods. In this way a financial incentive would exist for businesses and residential consumers to switch, where possible, their use of electricity to times of the day when the rate is cheaper. Significant shifts in use could avoid the need to construct new generating facilities.

Seventh, our provincial government should implement an insulation code as part of the Saskatchewan building code. Unfortunately quite a number of houses are still being built with low levels of insulation. As energy prices increase these houses will become a greater burden on the home-owner. If an addition were made to the building code so that provision existed for insulation standards, we could ensure that all new houses would be built so that they have at least reasonable levels of insulation. On a similar principle, the provincial government should consider establishing energy efficiency standards for office buildings and larger commercial and industrial operations. Many office buildings are still constructed that are very energy inefficient.

Eighth, the Government of Saskatchewan should work actively with municipalities to encourage the construction of energy conserving subdivisions. Model subdivision designs should be implemented in which the large majority of houses are south facing, so as to take maximum advantage of passive solar energy. Savings of 5 per cent to 10 per cent per household would result. Brampton, Ontario has already successfully implemented such a plan and private developers have adapted to the new guidelines within a few months. New subdivision plans should include regulations for the protection of solar rights. These regulations would prevent someone else from building in such a way that their building blocks the sun from shining on the south-facing side of new housing.

Ninth, the Department of Agriculture in co-operation with SPC and industry and commerce should encourage the use of waste heat in the production of vegetables in Saskatchewan.

Successful experimental work conducted by University of Saskatchewan professors George Green and Ed Maginnes has clearly demonstrated the feasibility of such an initiative. Professors Green and Maginnes have established a greenhouse operation next to an SPC compressor station and have utilized the waste heat in growing what I consider to be the best tomatoes one can purchase in Saskatoon during the winter months. With support from our government I am confident that waste heat sources such as potash mines, thermal generating stations, compressor stations and factories could be utilized for the production of vegetables. Our government should encourage the establishment of greenhouses near all these sources and should assist greenhouse operators in assuring a place for their produce in Saskatchewan supermarkets.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our government should significantly expand the investment we are currently making in urban transit. Such an investment should be seen both as

providing an essential urban service and as a vehicle for promoting energy conservation. I am pleased with the reference in the throne speech indicating that the government will consider additional ways to encourage the use of urban transportation systems.

What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is an increase in the 3 cent per passenger subsidy currently contributed by the province plus an incentive program that would provide support to municipalities wishing to upgrade the frequency of service. The provision of service to the outskirts of a city is particularly expensive and thus service is often infrequent. In many parts of my constituency bus service is only provided every half hour. Such infrequent service clearly means that the bus is no alternative at all to the automobile. Bus service must be improved in the suburbs of urban centres such as Saskatoon and the province should give support to municipalities which wish to improve urban transit service in these particular areas of the city.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to a consideration of several labor and social issues that are of special concern to me. Since the 1978 election our government has taken important steps toward improving pension legislation and in strengthening The Labor Standards Act. The recent changes in The Labor Standards Act provide for improved notice in the event of job layoff, for better maternity and paternity leave provisions and for two consecutive days off for many groups of employees in our province. I want to most sincerely congratulate the Minister of Labor for these initiatives, Mr. Speaker.

My hope now is that during our government's current term in office several more initiatives will be undertaken on behalf of working people. With respect to further changes in The Labor Standards Act, I want to urge the government to adopt at least three major new thrusts.

First, I believe that new amendments are needed that would ensure that all employees in the province are provided with sick leave benefits in the event of suffering ill health. It seems extremely reasonable to me that an employee, after having worked for an employer for a given period of time (shall we say six months), should be eligible for sick leave benefits of some sort. Yet at the present time there is no provincial legislation protecting employees from loss of salary in the event the employee becomes ill. Workers only protection at this point is through a union agreement.

I am also very anxious to see further strengthening of The Labor Standards Act provision with respect to written notice in the event of layoff. Layoffs are often of a very temporary nature, Mr. Speaker, Right now firms are frequently choosing to lay employees off for a period of two or three days in the course of a week and often the employee only receives a day's or few hours notice of such a layoff. Under present legislation, no notice is required, if a layoff is less than a week in length. Yet such layoffs can be a major disruption to an employee. They upset a person's budgetary planning for the month. They upset his scheduling of time and they provide uncertainty and insecurity about the future. I think that all employees have a right to at least a few days notice in the event of a temporary layoff and I want to urge the government to introduce legislation that would require such notice in the event of temporary layoffs taking place.

The third area, one that is of special concern to me, Mr. Speaker, is the current lack of protection that is provided for part-time workers in Canada and in our own province. In my view the most serious discrepancy that currently exists between benefits received

by part-time workers and by full-time workers is in the area of pension benefits. One can pick out a great many retail and department stores in Saskatoon and Regina where full-time employees receive pension benefits and part-time employees in the same store receive no pension benefits at all. This discrepancy is a grossly unfair to the part-time worker, Mr. Speaker.

A similar type of injustice exists for part-time workers with respect to other types of benefits. For instance, about half the department stores in Saskatchewan provide no sick leave for part-time workers. Disability plans and seniority rights are frequently unavailable to part-time workers when they are available to full-time workers in the same establishment.

The lack of benefits for part-time workers, and the difficulties this poses for them, are compounded by the fact that wages for most part-time workers in Saskatchewan are low. Only 12 per cent of part-time workers earn more than \$5 per hour. Since the number of part-time workers in Saskatchewan is growing, and since the large majority — over 71 per cent — are women, who for the most part are working out of financial necessity, it is clear that the lack of protection for part-time workers is adding to their financial pressure, pressure that is most likely to be felt by single women and that will hit especially hard when these persons retire without pension benefits. I thus urge our government, which has implemented the best set of labor legislation for working people in North America, to go a step further and introduce legislation that will protect the rights of part-time workers. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if people need to work part-time or wish to work part-time their contribution should be recognized in the same way the work of full-time employees is recognized, and they should accordingly be assured benefits at a similar rate.

One of the most important announcements made in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, is the proposed improvement to The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. I know that the increased promised in third-party liability and weekly income benefits will be well received by my constituents. Beyond these initiatives it is my hope that our government will go further and introduce a program of universal sickness and accident insurance. Our province now offers protection through an improved workers' compensation program to those who become hurt on the job, or who can demonstrate their illness is work-related. The Automobile Accident Insurance Act provides income protection to those who are injured in auto accidents. But many suffer illness or injury off the job and off the highway. If these persons do not have private insurance they usually have no protection from loss of income, except social assistance. This is surely a situation that must be corrected. The labor movement and many other organizations have called for a system of universal sickness and accident insurance that would provide income protection for all in the event of sickness, in the event of injury, or any combination of the two regardless of cause. Existing government income protection programs would be integrated into such a universal program, and many private insurance programs would become unnecessary. Additional cost to finance such a program would need to be met either through the application of increased resource revenues to the program, or by way of a tax increase. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a program of universal sickness and accident insurance would be one of the most important sources of income security our government could offer to people in our province, and particularly to those who are low-income. And I urge the Government of Saskatchewan to attempt to introduce such a program within the decade of the '80s.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to raise one of the issues of greatest concern to me with respect to the future of Saskatchewan. One of the reasons it worries me is that it is

getting so very little discussion in Saskatchewan, not just in government circles but by the populations as a whole. That is the issue of technological change and what its impact will be in Saskatchewan over the next 15 to 20 years.

We have already witnessed several significant cases of automation and technological change being introduced into the province. These changes have often meant the loss of jobs for lower income people who, I am sure, found it difficult to obtain another job.

For instance, we have witnessed the increase in self-serve gas stations operated largely by terminal pumps. I am sure that many hundreds of gas station attendant jobs have been eliminated by this change. We have seen the introduction of electronic check-out terminals into supermarkets in major centres such as Saskatoon. Word processors are beginning to be considered for offices in Saskatchewan. The use of larger machinery on the farms has displaced many farm labor positions.

Some of the changes and new applications of technology are undoubtedly in the public interest. In many cases, however, the benefits are less clear and the impact, in terms of displacing whole categories of jobs, may be completely unacceptable.

I believe our government has a responsibility to be taking much more initiative in assessing the potential impact of upcoming technological change in Saskatchewan, and giving consideration to the establishment of guidelines as to how much change is to take place and to what extent it will be permitted to impact on the job market.

My view, Mr. Speaker, is that there is an urgent need to protect workers from the negative impacts of technological change. I am very anxious to see legislation introduced into this House which would require the introduction of technological change to be a part of collective bargaining discussions in our province.

In most job categories and areas of the economy — and of course secretaries are a very obvious one — I would also like to see legislation which would require a company that eliminates certain job positions due to technological change to hire the persons displaced in new job positions with that company. That should clearly apply to most job categories and areas of the economy.

Most importantly at this point, however, is that Saskatchewan immediately needs to begin assessing the potential impact of technological change and studying with care the impacts that have already taken place and the numbers of jobs that have been displaced. It is especially important that we do this since in our current state of economic growth we may be less likely to notice the negative effects of technological change than we would at a time of more moderate economic growth.

However, it is unquestionable that the technological revolution centred on the silicon chip, which is already having a substantial impact on many areas of the world, will before long be very much felt in Saskatchewan.

In Ontario and in the United States we see automobile assembly lines that are now, in part, made up of robots. In many parts of the world, terminals with microcomputers are quickly replacing cash registers and have the means to check the validity of credit cards, record sales, and reorder automatically. There are already automatic warehouses operating that only require one or two persons running an entire warehouse.

Newspapers are rapidly moving their means of publication to computer. Even Saskatchewan newspapers are using computers in some stages of their advertising preparations and more substantial change are sure to come.

In offices in many parts of the world, machines are being used to replace files. All the accounts of a bank, or the salary cheques of all employees in a firm can be placed on a computerized disc with a single cashier simply reading the tape. Word processors, and the potential future development of voice writers, could very well make hundreds of secretarial jobs in the province obsolete. Even high-level professional positions could be significantly threatened by this new round of automation. For instance, in the medical field computer development has now reached the point where computers are capable of being programmed to diagnose patients to a level of competency much greater than a medical specialist can achieve.

While some of these technological changes have obvious benefits for our society which should be taken advantage of, I believe the impact on our workforce will be unacceptable in many areas unless work begins now to lay down guidelines for technological change in these areas. Above all, Mr. Speaker, the rights of people to jobs and to a humane work place must be protected. I believe this should receive the highest priority of our government in this regard, many new initiatives and experiments should also be considered by our government with respect to improving working environments, particularly in companies which are wholly or partly owned by the government. I hope this opportunity will receive increased attention by our government in the 1980s. Operations such as meat packing plants and assembly line situations deserve special attention by our government with respect to attempting to improve the work environment.

The issue of the need to give increased attention to assessing the long-term impact of changes in Saskatchewan also applies to policy objectives which have now been set by our government. For instance, we have established as an objective a 50 per cent increase in production by the mid 1980s. It is not at all clear to me that this can be accomplished without placing increasing pressure on our soils and our environment. What will the impact be? Will the decline in humus levels in the soil continue into the 1980s under such a policy? Will increased production result in a further decline in wildlife habitat, hedgerows, sloughs and other natural habitat? Will the production targets which have been set encourage large farmers to acquire even more land, being assured of a market for their grain? While such a trend would not increase net production, there is little question that the easiest way for an individual farmer to increase production is to increase his landholding. Finally . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. It is incumbent upon me at this time to put all the questions on amendments and subamendments which are before the Assembly. In keeping with that rule 13(3) we have before us the original motion, the amendment and the subamendment. Yes, the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of clarification. I note that the Speaker has ruled the subamendment in order. I also note under the rules relating to address in reply to His Honor's speech, section 2, reads as follows:

On the fourth of the said days if a subamendment be under consideration at thirty minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, Mr. Speaker will interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put the question on the subamendment.

The fourth day has now passed. We are in the fifth day. Could I have some clarification on your ruling as it relates to the approval of the subamendment or putting it in order and as it relates to the clause in the *Rules and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly*?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I think I can clarify the point which the Minister of Agriculture is raising with regard to rule 13(3) Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, the section entitled Amendments to the Address, and specifically 353 states:

Any member may introduce an amendment up until the moment when the final vote has been taken.

this means the final vote on the amendments to the address. So I find that the amendment is in order at this time. The member will note that when I rose a moment ago, I cited rule 13(3):

On the fifth of the said days, if any amendment be under consideration at thirty minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, Mr. Speaker shall forthwith put the question on any amendment or amendments then before the Assembly.

I think the understanding of the rule is quite clear. It clears off any amendments of the motion which is before the House to allow any other points of view to be brought forward in that interval before the final vote.

I will now put the vote on the subamendment which is before the House.

Subamendment agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 45

Blakeney	Pepper	Allen
Kaeding	Snyder	Smishek
Bowerman	Baker	Skoberg
McArthur	Rolfes	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Vickar
Kowalchuk	Thompson	MacAuley
Engel	Feschuk	Byers
Cody	Shillington	Lusney
Poniatowski	Prebble	Johnson
Nelson	Long	White
Solomon	Chapman	Miner
Birkbeck	Duncan	Lane
Taylor	Rousseau	Swan
Pickering	Muirhead	Katzman
Garner	Andrew	McLeod

NAYS — 1

Collver

Amendment negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 12

Birkbeck	Duncan	Lane
Taylor	Rousseau	Swan
Pickering	Muirhead	Katzman
Garner	Andrew	McLeod

NAYS — 36

Blakeney	Pepper	Allen
Kaeding	Snyder	Smishek
Bowerman	Robbins	Baker
Skoberg	McArthur	Rolfes
MacMurchy	Mostoway	Banda
Vickar	Hammersmith	Kowalchuk
Thompson	MacAuley	Engel
Feschuk	Byers	Cody
Shillington	Lusney	Poniatowski
Prebble	Johnson	Nelson
Long	White	Solomon
Chapman	Miner	Collver

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I see the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland rising to his feet. Did he intend to continue debating? Then I will read a ruling with regard to the member from Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms* Fifth Edition, page 124, citation 354:

At the hour appointed for the interruption of proceedings, when the Speaker puts the question, a Member who is speaking at that time is considered as concluding his speech even though he has not spoken for his full allotted time. He may, however, speak on any subsequent amendment or subamendment.

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, I have many things I'd like to say to the hon. members across the way, but I don't think I can get it in in the next two or three minutes. For that reason I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Boundaries Commission

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask leave of the Assembly to drop the resolution that is before us and replace it with another resolution. I ask that that be

considered and approved of. Before asking leave and making the motion, perhaps I could just make a few comments on the resolution which is before us and on the reasons for the introduction of an amended or a different resolution.

This resolution is about the final report of the constituency boundaries commission. The Constituency Boundaries Commission Act states that if the House, by resolution approves the commission's final report (with or without alterations), a bill to establish new constituencies must be presented in the same session. So therefore I think it is important to move this resolution along.

It is our intention to present a bill to establish new constituencies in this session — in fact to present a bill next week. I will give notice today if the resolution passes.

The resolution before the House proposes that this House adopt the final report of the constituency boundaries commission with two alterations. In its report the commission said, and I quote:

The commission would not regard it as departure from this report if the legislature deemed it advisable to change and did change the designated names of any constituency or constituencies.

The resolution before the Assembly, which I asked be dropped, indicates that there should be alteration for three constituencies. The resolution I will introduce provides for two, the reason being there is some dispute about what the new name should be and in order to resolve the dispute we are proposing that we go back to the name put forward by the boundaries commission. That relates to Regina Argyle. The boundaries commission recommended Regina North. We are going back to Regina North.

The second alteration is in the descriptions of the boundaries of constituencies. These changes are all technical and in nature and in substance do not change the boundaries or the populations of any of the constituencies. All these proposed changes result from the discrepancies in survey description and are outlined in two letters from the secretary of the constituency boundaries commission I will file with the Clerk for members' information.

We have provided for the change in the new motion by saying, "which schedule incorporates the changes in the boundaries contained in two letters from the secretary of the constituency boundaries commission."

I think all of the members have had an opportunity to make representation and consider the constituency boundaries commission report. I think it is a good report and I ask that the resolution which I put forward now be adopted with the final alterations as provided.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, by leave of the Assembly, that the resolution before the Assembly be dropped and that a new resolution be introduced, which reads as follows:

That the final report of the constituency boundaries commission established pursuant to The Constituency Boundaries Commission Act, laid before this Assembly by the Hon. Mr. Speaker recommending that the area of the province: (i) lying south of the dividing line as defined in section 14 of the said act, be divided into 62 constituencies; and (ii) lying north of the dividing line as defined in section 14 of the said act be divided into 2 constituencies,

be hereby approved and adopted by this Assembly.

That the descriptions of each of the constituencies as recommended by the said final report, except the names of the constituencies of Saskatoon Buena Vista and Saskatoon West and the description of the boundaries of the constituencies of Arm River, Canora, Kinistino, Redberry, Regina North, Regina North-West, Rosetown-Elrose, Shaunavon, Thunder Creek and Turtleford be approved and adopted by this Assembly; and

That the final report of the Commission be altered by: (i) deleting the constituency name “Saskatoon Buena Vista” and substituting therefor “Saskatoon South”; (ii) deleting the constituency name “Saskatoon West” and substituting therefor “Saskatoon Fairview”; and (iii) deleting the descriptions of the boundaries of the constituencies of Arm River, Canora, Kinistino, Redberry, Regina North, Regina North-West, Rosetown-Elrose, Shaunavon, Thunder Creek and Turtleford and substituting therefor the descriptions of the boundaries set out in this schedule, tabled in this House today and attached to this resolution, which schedule incorporates the changes in the boundaries contained in two letters from the secretary of the constituency boundaries commission. And, that the final report of the constituency boundaries commission as so altered by this resolution be approved and adopted by this Assembly.

MR. LANE: — We will have some comments to make on the motion. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:53 p.m.