

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Wednesday, April 11, 1979.

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.
On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.G. LONG (Cut Knife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and the members of this Assembly 30 students from the Cut Knife High School, their teacher, Mr. Lacy, and their chaperone, Mr. McDonald. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They have travelled some 280 miles from Cut Knife last evening; they visited the Globe Theatre and were fortunate enough to see the Globe Theatre production, *Mark on a Corner*, at Scarth and 11th Avenue. On behalf of the members here, I would welcome them to this Assembly and wish them a good time while in the city of Regina.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly, 53 students from the Ethel Milliken School. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Wollenberg, and their teachers, Brenda Arnold, Nonnie Rieman, and Laura Williams. I will meet with them after the question period.

I trust that you will enjoy your afternoon and I am sure the members on both sides of the House will join me in welcoming you to the Assembly this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C. WHITE (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the House, 26 Grade 4 students from Douglas Park School. Their teacher is Laura Rog and they are accompanied by their chaperone, Mrs. Woods.

I am sure that we all wish them an enjoyable time in the Legislature this afternoon and that they will find the question period informative.

I will be meeting them following the question period for pictures, drinks, and a short discussion.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I too have some visitors to the House who I would like to introduce. They are in the Speaker's gallery, I believe. They are 38 Grade 7 students from W.P. Bates School in Saskatoon Riversdale constituency. Their teacher is Mr. McKenzie and the bus driver is Mr. Tom Siebin. I welcome them to the city of Regina. I hope the weather is not too bad to get back home to Saskatoon. I am sure they are going to have an enjoyable and informative afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Cattle Rustling

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

In light of recent price increases for cattle, is the minister aware that there has been a significant increase in cattle rustling on the prairies?

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there's been a significant increase. I know that there has been some discussion with some people in the farming community about the risk of more rustling this year. I understand that some of the people in the southwest are taking action to try to set up a countervailing, what you might call a posse or whatever to try to prevent that from happening. I understand the police force is prepared to co-operate with them in every way, and certainly our department will be co-operating in every way possible to assure that this doesn't happen.

MR. HAM: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, there has been an increase if you're not aware. But since your government now spends tax money on advertising government programs, do you not agree that advertising the regulations in The Stray Animals Act, branding, the livestock and inspection and transportation acts, would make cattlemen aware of recent changes?

MR. KAEDING: — I think, Mr. Speaker, much of that has already been done. I would take under advisement whether we need to do any more. I think we have already quite adequately stated the new regulations. If it's thought that there was a necessity for more of it we might do it, but I would want to be sure it was going to be effective. I think we have already done what we need to do.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and I would direct it to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). Is the Attorney General prepared to assure the cattlemen of this province who are facing great losses in rustling that he would consider allowing restoring hanging for cattle rustling again?

MR. SPEAKER: — It's not within the jurisdiction of the provincial government.

Uranium Development and Health Care Conflict

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Tchorzewski). Dr. John Bury, clinical co-ordinator of the Saskatoon Community Clinic has written to the Premier. In this letter he states that the government's policy on uranium development is in conflict with your policy on the promotion of health care and delivery of health. Would you agree with Dr. John Bury's comments?

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, no I would not. The government has stated very clearly that in the development of uranium in the province we are following the recommendations of the Bayda Commission very carefully. Every step that is available to us in assuring the health and the safety in the mining of uranium will be implemented and adhered to.

MR. BERNTSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I know how this government is down on community clinics and doesn't like to listen to what they might suggest but, Mr. Speaker, I wonder just in case Dr. John Bury and others are right, will you be brining what influence you have in cabinet to bear to attract more funds from resource revenues towards health care in Saskatchewan?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, unlike what we have seen happening in Manitoba where the amount of health funding has in fact been cut back this year, I want to assure the member for Souris-Cannington, that indeed, the government is increasing the amount of funding for health care this year, very substantially. We are committed to the health care of this province and will continue to do as the need indicates we should.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder, if in relative terms, the minister could indicate to us what the potential risk in Saskatchewan is, as compared to Manitoba, related to nuclear development — the potential health risk?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am not sure what the member wants me to answer in his questions when he asks for that kind of a comparison. I am not in the position to compare the development of uranium in the province of Saskatchewan to that in Manitoba, because I am not aware of any development taking place in Manitoba with their resources there.

Interim Report of IJC.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SPC. On the interim report by IJC (International Joint Commission) of Canada and the United States regarding the Poplar River quality reference and under recommendations that governments withhold approval for the operation of the power facility until they are safeguarded and that adequate mitigation has been provided to meet the objectives, have yet to be set out, I understand they are not going to be introduced until August 31, 1979.

Has SPC taken adequate steps to prevent the leaching of the boron into the water flowing into Manitoba?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer to that is yes, as far as we can, until we receive and have the benefit of the final report. The member, as well as other members of this legislature, will be aware of an announcement made by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation quite some time ago, during the early months of winter, that stated we would defer making our final conclusions in regard to Poplar River No. 2 and/or Nipawin hydro until we had the benefit of the information. We hope that sometime this summer we will be able to have that and be in a more credible position to announce which project will be moved ahead.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell this legislature if you are going to follow recommendations made by the IJC already, that we either line the fly ash lagoons or put clay capping on them?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted that IJC is only a body, making note of potential dangers or concerns in making recommendations. By the member's own observation they have not yet concluded their investigations. I think it would be unwise and premature at this time to say with precision what it is the Saskatchewan

Power Corporation will do in response to the latest announcements, I believe a month or six weeks ago of the IJC. SPC and I, as chairman of that corporation, said that we felt we would be able to meet the recommendations that the IJC was enunciating at that time; we would not positively commit ourselves until we had the benefit of the final report. I think that that is only reasonable.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister conveyed this information that you will be able to conform with the No. 1 unit coming on-stream? Have you conveyed this directly to Montana or through IJC? When will number one unit be coming on stream?

MR. MESSER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say that we have not conveyed directly to the state of Montana. He knows what the communication process is. We go through external affairs, external affairs to the Department of State in the United States, Department of State to the state of Montana. Any communication that was made would have been made through that process. We have ongoing discussions with the IJC. I cannot with absolute positiveness articulate what we have been discussing with them in the recent past. I would think that we have been talking about the interim report in regard to the start-up of the first generator. I think that there is still some concern about the start-up date as we have had some problems with equipment and some labor disruptions on site. Also we have had a delay because of the severity of winter and the late coming of spring in constructing some lines to that plant, so that the crucial nature of the start-up is not as relevant as it was before. The member will also be fully informed that we instigated a tie-in line between The Pas and Squaw Rapids in order to give us some safeguards in case we weren't able to begin the generation from the plant at Coronach as anticipated.

New Wildlife Act

MR. J. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Is the minister preparing or thinking about bringing in a new game act for the province of Saskatchewan?

HON. A.S. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, consideration is being given to the introduction of a new wildlife act.

MR. GARNER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, could you tell this Assembly and the very concerned farmers and hunters and ranchers of Saskatchewan whether you will start penalizing the people who are abusing our wildlife populations and game birds?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I got the hon. member's question. If the hunters are obtaining their game birds and game animals in a legal manner, I don't think we'll be penalizing them.

MR. GARNER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister not agree that a monetary fine is not working under the present game act and will he look at suspending licences for a longer period of time?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, I think on that point the hon. member and the members opposite will have an opportunity to discuss it more thoroughly when the legislation is brought forward.

Legislation before the Assembly

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the previous member on this side referred to the abuse of wild fowl. I would like to talk to the Premier just for a minute and question him on the abuse of this Legislative Assembly. Last October 18 he asked for a mandate to govern the people of the province of Saskatchewan. He thought that it was an important matter and he brought it before the people in the fall which was six or eight months ahead of the time when he was normally expected to do so. He would have therefore, large quantities of legislation that he would want to bring to this Assembly. He went to them for a mandate; he got his mandate, yet this is now April 11, and we have been in this Legislative Chamber since February 22, 1979. Not once . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Does the member have a question?

MR. COLLVER: — Yes, I certainly have but I would like to outline . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I wonder if the member could get to the question then?

MR. COLLVER: — All right, Mr. Speaker, I will. When is the Government of Saskatchewan going to bring down the promised legislation that it referred to not only in the last October election but also in the period since then, such as the conflict of interest disclosure legislation, such as the change in the health and education tax legislation, such as the other important pieces of legislation?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, there are now on the order paper some 65 or so pieces of legislation — 70 perhaps. There is lots of work for members to do. I note that a fair number of them are adjourned debates and have been adjourned by members opposite for some weeks so that they will not have had an opportunity presumably, to prepare for the bills that are already there. We certainly expect to bring down in the next short number of days bills dealing with, I think, all of the subjects referred to by the hon. member.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier will be aware, I'm certain, that adjourned debate, so called, over the last few weeks, are necessitated because the Attorney General hasn't brought the bills before the House, the House leader hasn't brought the bills before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order.

MR. COLLVER: — My supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is very simply this: the Premier has referred to important pieces of legislation. Yet, in this session so far there have been almost no important pieces of legislation — all housecleaning.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order! I'll take a new question.

Government's Intention on Borrowing

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — A question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, if we may. Mr. Minister, in your budget this year, one of the tables which is provided in the budget at the very back indicates that debt service (and that is as a percentage on both the Crown enterprise portion and the government portion) has now risen to almost 9 per cent of total revenue. Mr. Minister, it has been fairly

acknowledged by your department that a very large portion of this dramatic increase to 9 per cent from a year previously when it was only 5.5 per cent, is on account of borrowings in the United States and the very strong currency differential. Would the minister inform this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan precisely what your department and your government's intentions are as far as borrowing this year, specifically as far as the location? In other words, are you planning to float a bond issue in the United States in this fiscal year?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, first of all, the hon. member is not interpreting correctly the money that has to be paid on borrowing in the case of the consolidated fund. It's true that our payments in the case of borrowing are somewhat greater, but it's not at the level of 9 per cent of the consolidated fund. The hon. member has to also look at the incomes and revenues of Crown corporations in order to make the comparison . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You are totally misinterpreting and misreading the information that is provided.

In the case of where we will be borrowing, we will be looking at our traditional markets. First of all, some funds are available to use from the Canada Pension Plan. We will be using that money and our own sources of revenue through the heritage fund and we will be borrowing on the Canadian market and likely on the U.S. market. At this stage, no final decisions have been made. We're watching the market on a regular basis and we will borrow in the markets where it is the best for us to borrow.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Minister, and I must say it is highly unusual for a Minister of Finance to repudiate a chart on page 76 of his own budget. However, since you have indicated that you may very well be borrowing on the American market, would the minister be prepared to tell this Assembly exactly how his department resolved a loan in the United States which expires this year? I'm sure the minister recalls the loan that SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) took out with the Chemical Bank of New York, through its Nassau branch, for some \$44 million. I'm sure the minister is aware that that loan comes due on September 1. Would the minister tell this Assembly, with the currency differential up a trifle (not good, but up a trifle from what it has been) precisely what the intentions of the Department of Finance have been? Since the department had to make a decision two weeks ago, since it had to be either rolled over on April 4, or else paid off, exactly what does your department plan to do?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member is referring to some interim financing that was arranged through the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I'll take the questions as notice.

Proposed Cost-Sharing Agreement

MRS. J. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — A question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. With the tourist season last coming upon us. Mr. Minister, has there been any progress made on the proposed draft agreement between the federal government and your department on the cost sharing for maintenance and upgrading of the Fort Walsh access road?

HON. A.S. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I think that question should be directed to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) who is responsible

MRS. DUNCAN: — In a letter to the Minister of Highways, dated January 29, from Mr. Faulkner, it states that the access road had been transferred to DREE (Department of Regional Economic Expansion) and the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Were you not aware of this?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — We were aware of it. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we've been lobbying, requesting, and we have been on the doorstep of the minister and also his predecessors. A year ago at this time they had tentatively agreed to the point where we actually thought it was definite. We had it in our budget and they then went back on their commitment.

The latest information I have was a telephone conversation with Hugh Faulkner a week ago saying he was going to get back to me almost immediately. I have still to hear from him and the responsibility is flat and completely with the federal government. It is a road to a national historic site that they spend approaching \$2 million on and neglected to even consider building a road so that tourists could get to it. As far as we are concerned we are not going to proceed on building a road to accommodate the federal government until they are prepared to at least do some sharing. We have offered to share very generously on this. The municipality of Fort Walsh is taking the brunt of the cost now and they are the ones who are really suffering.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I should correct the Minister of Highways. There is no such thing as the municipality of Fort Walsh; it's the municipality of Maple Creek No. 111. In a letter to Mr. Weatherall of the municipality dated March 27 of this year, it states that the draft agreement is being reviewed the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. But if you want to take responsibility for it, Mr. Minister, could you perhaps comply with the request of the R.M. that the senior governments quit procrastinating and passing the buck and get on with the job.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, we're not procrastinating. There is only one answer we need, and that is, the commitment by the federal government that they are going to share the road. We're ready. The budget's in place. It's in our program.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, if I might just ask a final supplementary to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, it would seem that you don't seem to have very good control of your department. I would very simply ask this question. How often do you meet with your department officials in order to find out just what direction they are taking so that you can have a grip on the matter?

MR. KRAMER: — Daily.

Highway Signs No. 11 Highway

MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Highways. On Highway No. 11 between Regina and Saskatoon as you are familiar. Mr. Minister, the signs have been well put up between Regina and Craik. But they opened up No. 11 Highway, the double highway last fall, and where are the signs between Craik and Saskatoon that are missing? They have been missing all winter and people are

April 11, 1979

complaining about it. Where are these signs?

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of signs being missing. For the information of the member for Arm River I would like to tell him that Saskatoon is directly north and west of Craik.

Department of Highways Budget

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, the current fiscal year will mark the fourth straight year that your department has lost out in Treasury fights with other ministers. It is the fourth straight year that that expenditures in your department as a percentage of the total budget have declined. Would the minister tell this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan approximately when we can expect highways to get its fair share out of the budget? Do we have to wait to get a new minister before this will happen? Mr. Minister, can you bring in some superior help to advise you in this area?

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the public is generally satisfied, as indicated in the October 18 election. If we would have had more budget, we would have wiped them out!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question to the Minister of Highways. Would the minister be prepared to say, as he earlier stated to this Assembly, that he is not concerned about safety from Craik to Saskatoon and that the only thing that is important to people in terms of highway safety on Highway No. 11 is the directional sign to Saskatoon. Is that what this minister is trying to have this Assembly believe?

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, that question isn't worthy of an answer.

Fort Walsh Road

MRS. J. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Highways.

You stated just a little while ago that your department is all ready to just go right ahead on that Fort Walsh road and you are waiting for the federal government. It seems to me it is a monkey see, monkey do attitude that your department has. Why can't you advance your share, or at least part of your share, to the municipality at this point? They need the money now. They can't wait and go through another year of repairing the road.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, when it comes to seeing monkeys, I can see 17 of them right now. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest if the lady member for Maple Creek is suggesting that we should, again, take the monkey off the federal government's back. I say we are not going to do it. It is their responsibility and we are, as I say, prepared with our budget to build that road when they get off their fanny and supply the rest of the cash.

Replacement of Aged School Signs

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways and I hope we can get an answer

Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us when his department intends to replace the aged school warning signs that are too small and too aged at this point to read on most highways in Saskatchewan?

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, if the member for Swift Current would be kind enough to identify the areas, I am sure our people would be glad to look at them because safety is top billing in our department continually.

MR. HAM: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would be glad to identify the signs in Saskatchewan. If the minister would spend more time driving and less time flying, perhaps he would see these signs. They are on every highway in Saskatchewan.

Noxious Weed Problem

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — A question to the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Minister, since you made light of the fact that every year your percentage of the gross provincial budget declines, might I ask the minister, if for the first time in recent years the minister could perhaps, scrounge enough money out of his highway budget to at least look after the noxious weeds, such as leafy spurge where it perpetually grows in the ditches of highways as prominent as even the Trans-Canada Highway?

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, the member for Thunder Creek does not seem to be able to understand that our efficiency has improved year by year so that we need less dollars to do the same job year after year. This is efficiency, Mr. Speaker, and I would like these people across the way to take note of that.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think we have hit the bottom line.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — MINERAL RESOURCES — VOTE 23

ITEM 1 (cont'd)

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Chairman, members of this Assembly will no doubt recall the debate which took place last Monday evening when we started estimates reviewing the Department of Mineral Resources. At that time, I think, we were making some considerable progress with the resource critic, the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter). Then we had the benefit of a sermon from the mount (so to speak) from the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) who felt that it was his responsibility to talk the clock out until 10 p.m. that evening. Not only was it a very, very lengthy review of resource development in the province of Saskatchewan, it, I guess, centred on uranium development.

I know that the member does have some very strong feelings about not only resource development in the province of Saskatchewan, but I think in particular the development of uranium and its related spinoff activities. I think that it's only proper for him to voice those concerns and to take advantage of the Legislative Assembly to convey the concerns that he has and/or people that he represents. But I do believe, Mr. Chairman, he was most misleading in some areas, and I think it is important that we correct the misleading comments he made to this Legislative Assembly Monday evening. I want to, Mr. Chairman, be reasonable as possible in response to some of those statements the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) made.

Let me begin, Mr. Chairman, by responding to the observations of the member for

April 11, 1979

Rosthern that we will put dollars before health and safety. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that nothing as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, could be further from the truth. Mr. Chairman, there are a few catcalls from the members to your left, but they know full well that this province under a New Democratic government has been a leader in North American as far as occupational health and safety is concerned. And we're very proud of that record, Mr. Chairman. We have displayed time after time that we will put the concerns of the worker and the working place before the profits that may be generated from that working place. In fact, Mr. Chairman, let me review.

Mr. Chairman, I sat here for an hour and a half listening to the diatribe of the member for Rosthern. I would appreciate it if he would benefit me with the same kind of courtesy. If he wants to take notes by all means do. He's likely to forget if he doesn't.

Mr. Chairman, let me remind these members, the Conservative opposition of this legislature, that this province, the New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan was the first jurisdiction in Canada to pass a comprehensive occupational health and safety act in 1972. It happened here in Saskatchewan, not in any other province in Canada but first here in this province. Now, since then, Mr. Chairman, there's been some action by other provinces. In fact Conservative Alberta heeded the significance and the rewards of such occupational health and safety legislation and introduced similar legislation. Manitoba also followed. Ontario followed. Newfoundland followed. New Brunswick has followed. All of them since we introduced that comprehensive legislation under some controversy have introduced similar legislation. In each instance, Mr. Chairman, none of it is as exhaustive or as complete as is the Saskatchewan legislation. I make that point because we do that purposefully. We put health and safety before the dollars that may be generated in the working places of those people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the real test of any legislation is what the response is from the group that it affects the most. In the case of occupational health and safety, what is the response or the acceptance of the workers who find themselves subjected to this? What do they say in Saskatchewan? Well, in Saskatchewan, they praise this legislation, and they're not bashful about praising it. In fact, unions across Canada, and workers across Canada, continue to use this as the model. Contrary, organized workings, or organized workers, or labour institutions criticize the shortcomings of the legislation that is currently on the books in other provinces. We are still considered to be a leader as far as occupational health and safety is concerned. It's recognized as a model for all of the rest of the Canadian legislation that's now on the statute books.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — What that means, Mr. Chairman, is that the Saskatchewan government will apply fully the weight of this legislation as it pertains to uranium mines, in particular uranium mines. And I remind the member that our legislation, and our regulations are much higher than federal government standards. I thin the member and some others opposite will likely also be aware that uranium is, in fact, under a federal jurisdiction, subject to clause 92-10C of The British North American Act, and is really their responsibility. Here in Saskatchewan, because we believe their standards are not stringent enough, they don't meet our requirements, we have imposed provincial regulations that are more stringent, far more stringent, at a much higher standard than any other province in Canada. And yet the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) say that this government will sacrifice health and safety for money. That's absolute nonsense,

because there isn't one example in the rest of Canada that would substantiate that. None, Mr. Chairman.

Let me tell the member, Gulf and Eldorado have, as a condition of their federal licence to operate in the province of Saskatchewan, that they abide not by federal regulations but by provincial regulations. Let me convey to the member for Rosthern that Amok, as a condition of their provincial surface lease, shall abide by, not federal regulations, but provincial occupational health, safety and environmental laws. Now, Mr. Chairman, what that means is that I can say with the fullest confidence that the law which applies in the province of Saskatchewan is superior to any other jurisdiction in Canada. That applies to uranium mining and its related activities as well; we make no apologies for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, moving on. The member made some reference to his visitation to Port Hope, and I understand that after he makes the statements, then he makes the phone calls to Port Hope to find out whether he was right or not. I hope the member has the courage, when he cares to speak again on this subject, to stand up and apologize for the misleading statements that he made because Monday last, he said to this Legislative Assembly as positively as he could possibly say it, that the by-product of the enrichment of U-308, if it was shipped out of Canada, had to be shipped back to Canada for storage. That is not correct! The member know that we don't have in Saskatchewan an enrichment facility and therefore, where enrichment is required the product is sent out. At Port Hope, they are in effect, doing that. The member said that the new regulations under the federal government compel those countries who were reprocessing uranium or enriching uranium to send that back for storage here in Canada. On contacting the Port Hope authorities and other officials who should be knowledgeable about that, it was conveyed to us as clearly as possible, that that is not, Mr. Chairman, the case. And I hope that the member will take note of that and extend at least an apology or attempt to correct the misleading statement that he left with us.

The member also said, Mr. Chairman, by his standards (and I don't know what his standards may be, but assuming they're credible) Port Hope was not operating in a manner that would give him any kind of confidence. There was negligence and there was not the strict control that one might accept for such an operation as Port Hope. And that may or may not be the case. I accept in this instance, the member's word. I remind him that the operation is not in the province of Saskatchewan, that's in Tory Ontario. If that operation was picked up and placed anywhere in Saskatchewan, by our regulations and by our legislation and by our law, it would be shut down immediately. That's the kind of standards that we have here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the member did go on to make some other comments. I'm not going to elaborate as extensively on them. But he talked about having to be 100 per cent positive before any activity could be undertaken in regard to uranium mining and related activities. The member knows that is absolute nonsense; you can't be 100 per cent positive about anything. There are dangers in everything we do — driving your car, the member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) says getting on your bicycle, flying an airplane, whatever. There are those problems. A day or two ago, I listened to the new and read in the paper of a train derailment somewhere in Florida where there was a massive spill of chlorine gas that could have brought about significant death. Maybe we should have stricter controls there. I suspect that we should. The point I want to make is that you can only be as positive as technology and science will allow you to be at any given point in time and that's where we are with uranium in Saskatchewan. We're

April 11, 1979

miles ahead of anyone else in regard to incorporating a recognition and a need to protect the environment and a recognition and a need to provide adequate safety and health considerations in those projects.

The member also made reference to renewable resources; I think in an attempt to allude that this government has no concern about renewable resources or the conservation of energy. Here again nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Chairman. We have a very active conservation program. We started a Warm Up Saskatchewan program in SPC last year and it's very successful. We advance money to those who will try to conserve energy on an interest-free basis pay back, attached to their power bills on a monthly basis or whatever their circumstances may be.

We have an energy conservation house right here in the city of Regina that is talked about by all of North America, showing that even with the severe winters we have in Saskatchewan, we can heat that house without a solar collector for something in the neighborhood of \$50 to \$80 a year — somewhere in the neighborhood of \$50 to \$80 a year with supplemental electric heat without a solar collector. That's the kind of effort we are putting into conservation to make the general public aware of what can be achieved through conservation.

We have a variety of other renewable resource projects under way; a wind operation in southwestern Saskatchewan, Swift Current; we've got a gasifier in Hudson Bay which is utilizing the by-product of the wood industry there. I could name others. We are doing everything that we think is reasonable in order to utilize economically and efficiently renewable resources and at the same time trying to educate the people of Saskatchewan about the need to conserve energy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the member also made some comment about the Warman refinery. He can check the debates and proceedings of Hansard. He said that I, as a former Minister of Industry and Commerce, and this government were out trying to buy land and he used it several times, for a refinery in Warman and he knows, Mr. Chairman, that that is not true. Not true! I would like the member to also apologize or correct the remarks he made here Monday last in regard to this government buying land at Warman because we did not attempt to buy any not have we bought any. He knows what was done was an option, the exercising of an option so that the land was there and then when the environmental and hearing process went into place, people could clearly identify that that land had been acquired under an option. And subject to all of the terms and conditions of the development policy of the province and the final decision of the government, it may or may not be put there. It is deliberately, deliberately, Mr. Chairman, misleading to say this government was attempting to buy and that I, as a former Minister of Industry and Commerce, in fact went out and attempted to purchase that land in the Warman area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the member I think, in total, was attempting to convey to this House that we were prepared (this government was prepared) to put, as I think he put it, 'holy dollar before the health and safety environmental considerations of uranium mining and related activities.'

I missed, during that whole hour or whatever it was, sermon that he gave to us (we should give him a pulpit instead of a desk) any basic logic or fact, or one scrap of evidence which would show that we are prepared to sacrifice health and safety and environment in order to obtain significant financial rewards. If anything, Mr. Chairman,, he could lay his mind to evidence which shoed the contrary in the province of

Saskatchewan. Surely this member isn't now saying that this government will buckle under to corporate free enterprise and multinational business in order to make a buck because if he is that is a new turn for him and the Conservative opposition of this Legislative Assembly.

Up to this date — up to this point in time . . . we will get around to that. The member for Thunder Creek says, tell me about the shares and the like of that. I am more interested in hearing about his holdings than I am about mine. That time will come and that is a matter for another debate at another time. I am sure that it is going to be most interesting.

Mr. Chairman, the point that has to be made here is that this government is clearly on record of forfeiting the revenues in order to develop the province in the way that we think is most proper. We do so more than any other province in Canada and that is clearly it. If I recall debates made by members opposite, they were all criticizing us for that. The same with chasing the oil industry out, chasing the gas industry out, chasing the potash industry out, and chasing the uranium industry out.

The fact of the matter is that we have got something that is better than anywhere else in Canada and we have got a higher level of activity than have most other regions of Canada. So that the member fails to put forward any kind of credible argument. It is on that point, Mr. Chairman, that I want to close my remarks to the member for Rosthern (Mr. R. Katzman) and the members opposite.

It is on the word credibility. What is their credibility? I listened to the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) say that we would have none of these worries if we had free enterprise activity, exclusively free enterprise activity, in the development of uranium in northern Saskatchewan.

I listened to the member for Rosthern and he says because we are involved, we are sacrificing environmental health and safety concerns. You can't have it both ways. They either apply to one or the other or to both, and we say that they apply and our record shows that they, in effect, apply. For the member for Rosthern to say simply because we joint venture with them, we forfeit that is absolute nonsense. We could have a commitment to the, as he put it, holy dollar through taxing and royalties and whatever, and forfeit in order to attain that — the health and safety and environmental concerns. There is no real difference. If we are after the dollar, we will forfeit those, or the government will forfeit those. The evidence here has clearly been with consistency and without exception, one that looks first to those measures of safety and then the rewards after and it is with that in mind we move forward on uranium mining and related activities in Saskatchewan.

So that I, this government, and this legislature, Mr. Chairman, can clear up what appears to be a difference of thought and a difference of position to the members opposite, because I assumed on some occasions listening to some members that they're for development of uranium. On other occasions when the member for Rosthern retired I think that it was proper to conclude that he was not for this kind of development. So, Mr. Chairman, I would like those members to indicate to this Legislative Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan where they really stand. And it's keeping that in mind that I would like to move the following motion, seconded by Mr. Kramer, the member for The Battlefords:

That this committee support the continued mining of uranium in the

April 11, 1979

province, an industry with a twenty-five year tradition in Saskatchewan provided that the necessary environmental and occupational health and safety controls are in place and there is appropriate involvement of northerners.

I will appreciate the remarks of the members opposite, and I will be more appreciative of their stand when this is put to a vote.

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon Sutherland): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise to speak against this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Could I have order in committee, please. I recognize the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble).

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to open my comments on this motion which the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) has put forward by addressing myself to some of the comments that opposition members made yesterday. Opposition members have, first of all, suggested that governments should not be involved in this industry, this should be a matter of private enterprise. That was what was suggested by Mr. Larter. Then we had the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) outlining some of the concerns he had about the industry, and it sounded like he might be opposing it. The reason I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that this motion has been put forward is that it will require all members of the House and the PC Party to state where they are on this issue . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PREBBLE: — . . . because the kinds of comments they have been making over the last two or three days have suggested they may be against uranium development, but some of the comments simply suggest they would like to leave this industry to private enterprise.

Now we are going to have it very clear, Mr. Chairman, to say that if uranium development does proceed it makes a lot of sense for the public sector to be involved. We've seen the cost very, very clearly of foreign domination in the mining industry and in all kinds of other economic activities in this province. Public involvement would very clearly help to offset that and make sure if we do make profits in this industry, the profits go to the people of Saskatchewan. Public involvement is also an opportunity to make sure that we can exercise very careful environmental control in the industry. There is no better way of undertaking that than being directly involved in it.

That's not the fundamental issue. The issue in the motion is whether uranium development should proceed, should continue further, or whether it shouldn't.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Remember PCBs there, Peter!

MR. PREBBLE: — That's right — that's what I am going to address myself to at this point.

I think we should put this debate in context. I remind members that this is the International Year of the Child. I don't think that any question that we address in this legislature this year will have more implications for children in the future than the question of whether we should continue mining uranium or whether we should not.

I also want to put this question in the context of events that are now taking place in the world, because we have seen a very significant change in the last couple of years in terms of the world picture.

In the United States we have seen orders for nuclear reactors drop from something like 40 in 1973 to only one or two last year. In Austria we have seen a referendum in which the people of Austria, despite the fact that they had already built a \$750 million nuclear reactor, decided that it would not open because the hazards associated with nuclear power were too great. They voted it down in a referendum 51 per cent to 49 per cent.

In Switzerland we have also seen this issue go to a referendum, again very close. By a 51 per cent to 49 per cent margin, again, the people of Switzerland voted in favor of nuclear power.

We can turn to Sweden where the debate has been very hot over the last couple of years, where several municipalities have decided that they would keep uranium in the ground because they didn't believe that the uses to which uranium was being put justified mining. We have seen the leader of the government in Sweden trying to gain support.

AN HON. MEMBER: — A good Conservative.

MR. PREBBLE: — A good Conservative, that is right. We have seen a socialist government in Sweden defeated on the uranium issue and the nuclear issue. We have seen a Conservative leader try to rally support from other parties on the right to proceed with a halt on uranium development and nuclear power. We have seen that he was unable to get that support, and therefore, had to give up his position as head of the government.

We have seen the Danes make a conscience decision not to go ahead with nuclear power because of the hazards associated with the nuclear reactors as was exhibited by Harrisburg a couple of weeks ago. We have seen massive demonstrations in France — 50,000 to 60,000 people turning out to oppose nuclear reactors at any one demonstration.

In 1977 we saw in the Basque area of Spain, a demonstration of 250,000 people against nuclear power plants. The Spaniards were concerned about the fact that the emissions from nuclear power plants would damage the orange groves in Spain that are so famous.

We have seen demonstrations of 7,000 to 8,000 people in Italy on evidence that plants in Italy may be located on earthquake zones. We have seen, very clearly, tremendous opposition along the Rhine River where people occupied a nuclear reactor for months, finally forcing the German government to declare a moratorium on nuclear power. We've seen 60,000 people hold that site for several days. Those are not intellectuals; they're workers, farmers, fishermen, students, people of the local community and people coming from miles around to occupy that site.

We've seen increasing opposition in Japan, the nuclear reactor program is a red herring. Five of the nuclear reactors in Japan are operating at less than 40 per cent efficiency which means that they're all uneconomic and they're a burden on the Japanese taxpayer. And we've seen farmers and fishermen in Japan strongly oppose

April 11, 1979

nuclear power because people in the cities would not buy food and fish from areas close to a nuclear reactor and were damaging the sales of the local farmers and fishermen in those areas.

So, we've seen people from all around the world strongly opposing nuclear power. From the industrialized world, the countries to which Saskatchewan is going to be exporting most of its uranium, we've seen those people not only say that they're against nuclear power but that they don't want Canada, the United States and other countries to export uranium to their homeland. They have said this despite the fact that their governments were agreeing to develop nuclear power programs and were agreeing to those exports of uranium.

So the first question we have to address is the moral question of whether it is right to be exporting uranium to countries where, despite the fact that the government in power agrees to those uranium exports, there are massive demonstrations, and massive divisions within the populace as to whether those uranium exports are to their best interest or not. I say that it is wrong to be exporting uranium when there are those kinds of divisions within the countries to which we are exporting — the main buyers of our uranium. When there are calls again and again, as we saw a 35,000 person demonstration in Germany just last week against the waste disposal site.

The hon. member says that we can't solve their problems. The hon. member seems to have his morality very limited. He seems to be only concerned about Saskatchewan. He doesn't seem to be able to get a global view of this issue. I say that's what has been always wrong with the PC party. That's your problem. Why don't you broaden your horizons a little!

Mr. Chairman, I return to the issue at hand and say that first of all, I would like to remind members of the implications of the Harrisburg accident a couple of weeks ago and the implications that this has for Saskatchewan. The first issue, as I say, is the fact that I don't think it's right for us to be exporting uranium to industrialized countries when there is such massive opposition against uranium development and nuclear power within those countries. That opposition is being displayed more and more every day.

The second issue is the issue of safety. I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should not continue to be mining and exporting uranium from Saskatchewan when it's very clear that uranium only has two purposes. One is for use as a nuclear fuel in nuclear power plants, and the other is for bombs. Those are the only two purposes that are significant. All other purposes are so minor and so irrelevant in terms of the amount of uranium they require that they're simply not significant. The main purpose for uranium clearly at this point will be nuclear power and the operation of nuclear power plants for electricity. I say to members opposite and to members on this side that the Harrisburg incident very clearly illustrates the fact that we are unable to predict the consequences of regular operation in nuclear power plants. We are unable to handle accidents properly when they occur. We are unable to assure that the safeguards which need to come into operation when accidents occur at nuclear reactors will come into operation. We are unable to assure any of those things. The hon. member opposite says this was dumb. He doesn't seem to recognize the significance of debating an issue that is as . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I recognize the member for Saskatoon Sutherland.

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Chairman, first of all I think that what Harrisburg has shown us is

the problem that's associated with nuclear safety of human error. We are unable to be sure that nuclear power plants will be safe and that a catastrophic accident will not occur because the people who are operating the plants are only human. The nuclear industry depends upon 100 per cent perfection in terms of performance. When that's not achieved we're faced with very, very serious problems. First of all I'd like to point out there were at least three human errors associated with the accident at Harrisburg. Three separate human errors contributed significantly to an accident at the Three Mile Island plant. At least one of those errors was in violation of federal nuclear regulatory regulations in the United States.

The basic problem associated with the operation of nuclear power plants and the problem that the safety studies are never able to come to grips with is that the safety studies that have been done are not able to account for design errors in the reactors and they are not able to account for human operator errors. Many nuclear power plant operators will tell you that operating a nuclear power plant is six months of absolute boredom and 60 seconds of sheer terror. And what happens during those 60 seconds of sheer terror is that human mistakes are made. It is those kinds of human mistakes that I want the hon. member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) to realize are largely responsible for the accident at Harrisburg.

The second thing that the accident at Harrisburg very clearly illustrates is the inability of the nuclear industry to predict what is going to happen in the event of an accident. Nobody predicted that the hydrogen bubble that caused the people operating the Harrisburg reactor such tremendous problems and that was almost responsible for resulting in a melt down, would be a problem, that that bubble would ever arise. This is the difficulty each time we are faced with a new nuclear accident. At Brown's Ferry in 1975, nobody ever thought that seven independent safety systems would fail. At Harrisburg nobody ever thought that we would be faced with this very difficult hydrogen bubble. Nobody predicted that. That is the difficulty. Nobody ahead of time can predict the kinds of problems that are going to arise when a new accident takes place quite contrary to what the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) has suggested. He has suggested that the Harrisburg accident displays the ability of the nuclear industry to deal with difficult situations. Time and time again in the newspaper on the Harrisburg accident we saw accounts from nuclear regulatory commission officials clearly stating that there were all kinds of things that came up that they hadn't expected at all — all kinds of new circumstances.

One of the very frightening things that happened at this accident was that the emergency core cooling system, the back-up system that's supposed to be in place when these kinds of incidents occur, also failed. It was manually shut off, an operator error, and it was very clear at that point that once damage had occurred to the uranium fuel rods inside the reactor, and once that emergency back-up system was manually shut off, it was not able to deal with the melt-down problems that were clearly being faced. It was not able to be put back in place and therefore we had major cooling problems with the inability of the cooling system to prevent the kinds of serious damage to the fuel rods which occurred. And this inevitable led to large amounts of radioactivity distributing itself inside the reactor with significant releases of radioactivity outside the reactor.

In terms of another example of inability to control and predict, there was significant fear that vital measuring instruments, instruments that would measure levels of radiation within the plant, would fail. Several of them did fail. Some of them did not, but the point

April 11, 1979

is that the instruments that were critical to making decisions about how the reactors should be shut down were not in operation. This was not an incident in which the nuclear industry had full control of the situation. This was an incident in which the nuclear industry was operating essentially on an hour-to-hour and day-to-day basis and making judgment about which it wasn't sure about at all. It was taking a lot of chances and it was very fortunate to have escaped with as little damage being done as in fact took place.

Now I want to point out that many people in the nuclear industry have said, well these problems associated with Harrisburg don't apply to Canadian reactors. But I want to point out that the Porter Inquiry, headed by Dr. Arthur Porter in Ontario and similar to the Bayda Inquiry here, indicated that that was not the case. It indicated that there are several design problems associated with Canadian nuclear reactors, and said that the chance of an incident like that in Harrisburg occurring here in Canada is one in 10,000 for every reactor year.

That's something that should make all members of this House very worried because the Porter Commission, unlike the Bayda Inquiry says that Bayda's estimates (in his inquiry about the failure chances of a nuclear reactor), are off.

He says that the chances are only one in 10,000, and as we build more and more reactors the chances increase. Porter says that means if Canada builds 100 nuclear reactors, there would be a probability of one core melt-down every 40 years.

That means, Mr. Chairman, one core melt-down every 40 years (using the nuclear industry's figures) that 3,300 people die immediately. It means that 45,000 people will die within the next few years as a result of latent cancers. It means that another 45,000 people will get very serious radiation sickness. It means that \$17 billion of property damage will be done. And that's using Rasmussen's statistics. That's using the nuclear industry's statistics — the most conservative safety study that has been done in the industry to date. That doesn't take into consideration the fact that a lot of people have been very critical of what that safety study has said, and have said that Rasmussen has underestimated the risks very significantly. One of the things that Rasmussen does is make assumptions about how quickly an area around a nuclear power plant that's having an accident will be evacuated. He assumes that 50 per cent to 70 per cent of the people will usually get out of the area in lots of time. Now, Mr. Chairman, Harrisburg is a very good example of the fact that that just doesn't happen. Here we had days for people to leave and, while an official evacuation was never called for in the sense that it was absolutely required, pregnant women and pre-school children were advised to leave the area. In all 50,000 people left but there was a lot of confusion associated with that evacuation. We had incidents of alarms going off when they weren't supposed to as all hon. members of the House will know from reading the press releases. We had conflicting information about what was happening at the reactor. NRC officials over here were saying one thing and people over here operating the reactor were saying another thing. This was over a period of days. What happens when you only have notice of one hour or so? What happens when you only have an hour's notice? I ask all hon. members to consider that.

I think that the estimate of 50,000 people being affected by this in terms of death is probably a significant underestimate. I ask hon. members to recall as was stated on CBC last week the city of Toronto has no evacuation plan in the event of an accident at Pickering. The officials at Ontario Hydro candidly stated last week that they only have contingency plans for minor accidents, that they are not ready for a catastrophic

disaster.

Now I want hon. members to note . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and especially the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) since he seems to be easily distracted from this debate, that the United States Senate Health Committee has very clearly stated to all members in the United States that great uncertainties still remain about the relationship between cancer deaths and low level radiation leaking from the Harrisburg plant. One of the big problems is that we simply don't know what the long-term effects of these kinds of low level radiation leaks are going to be on the population. More and more evidence — and I'm going to deal with this later in my speech — is going to point to the fact that we have significantly underestimated the effects of low level radiation, very significantly underestimated them.

Now another comment that has been made in this House, a comment by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) is to the effect that the Bayda report is a great report; the Bayda report is in essence the ultimate in terms of the discussion on the nuclear industry . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I like Jack very much, it's just that I don't agree with his position on this particular issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Give us a chance to . . .

MR. PREBBLE: — You'll get your chance.

Quoting from Tuesday night's Hansard the minister said:

I have had the opportunity of talking not only to the uranium industry, but I also have had the opportunity to talk to higher levels of government. Starting with Canada, which I think would not deny and I believe has publicly stated that Bayda is quite likely the best reference that any government could turn to as far as current information and recommendations in regard to uranium mining and related activities are concerned.

Now this is one of the fundamental issues in the debate The Government of Saskatchewan is depending almost completely for its decision on the recommendations of the Bayda report. The Government of Saskatchewan is, to justify the \$78 million on uranium exploration this year, pointing to the Bayda report. We, as a government are pointing to the Bayda report. The government is saying that the Bayda report is a good report, that Bayda is right, we agree with Bayda and on that basis we are prepared to make massive investments in uranium exploration and uranium development.

I say, Mr. Chairman, the Bayda report is a rotten report; the Bayda report does not come to grips with the fundamental issues that were discussed at the inquiry; the Bayda report intentionally almost, one would think, avoids the addressing and it avoids a number of the very fundamental pieces of information which were provided to the inquiry. It simply doesn't discuss them, Mr. Chairman. The Bayda report ignores massive amounts of evidence that were presented before the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry and it gives absolutely no justification for doing so at all, absolutely no justification. It takes secondary arguments that were put forward by the anti-nuclear groups. It often throws those aside without looking at the broader issues which were being put forward. It deals with secondary arguments and it dispute those without coming to grips with the major issues.

I am going to go through the Bayda report, Mr. Chairman, and I am going to give several

very good examples, I feel, of where this has taken place, where very important information presented by anti-nuclear groups has been ignored and where the facts are simply not being addressed by Bayda.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the section on standards in the nuclear industry. I want to talk about some of the things which Bayda doesn't talk about in his report. The main problem with the Bayda report, Mr. Chairman, is that certain things are simply omitted. First of all, Bayda doesn't make any reference to the fact — he quotes the International Commission on Regulatory Standards that is being set up — he talks about the fact that we in Saskatchewan and in Canada are following those standards. But he doesn't make mention of the fact that the past head of the international regulatory protection body has very clearly said that he thinks, upon resigning and stepping down that the international standards are not nearly good enough, that they have to be toughened up. Bayda doesn't make any reference to that. Bayda doesn't make any reference to the fact that all of the standards which apply in the nuclear industry, at nuclear reactors, are all put aside in the event of an accident. Bayda doesn't make any reference to that. He says, listen, we have these great standards. In fact, he says the nuclear industry is operating at a hundred times under the standards that are in place. But what Bayda doesn't tell you is that all of the standards are put aside in the event of an accident; they don't apply any more. He doesn't tell you that.

Mr. Chairman, I want all members of this legislature to know, right now, although the public is legally only allowed to be exposed to half a rem of radiation on an annual basis, the industry claims that in normal operation, it operates a hundred times below that standard. Right now, legally, in the event of an accident, the industry is allowed to expose the public to 25 rems of radiation in a year. The interesting thing is that the industry, just prior to the Harrisburg accident, came before the people of Canada and via the Atomic Energy Control Board, a special committee that was reviewing radiation standards suggested that, in the event of an accident the standards be weakened and the public will be allowed to be exposed to 100 rems of radiation, Mr. Chairman.

Now, 19 rems of radiation is known to have caused genetic damage and birth defects among pregnant women at Hiroshima — 19 rems of radiation. Mr. Chairman, 250 rems of radiation is known to wipe out half of the population that is exposed to it immediately. The Atomic Energy Control Board has proposed that Canadians be allowed to be exposed to 100 rems of radiation in the event of a nuclear accident. It also proposes that consideration be given in the event of very improbable accidents for, in fact, exposure levels to reach 1,000 rems. That has been suggested by the Atomic Energy Control Board.

I ask members to consider why this suggestion has been made. The suggestion has been made, Mr. Chairman, because the nuclear industry in Canada knows it cannot meet the standards that were originally set. It knows that there is a very real reality in the event of an accident and it can't meet the standards that have been set. That's the kind of an industry right now that Saskatchewan is selling its uranium to. And standards are better in Canada than in most parts of the world, Mr. Chairman, but that's not the issue. The issue is that the standards are totally inadequate. The Atomic Energy Control Board is attempting to weaken them further. Saskatchewan is playing right into the hands of all this by propping up the nuclear industry in Canada, by assuring the supply of 50 per cent of Canada's uranium, which is absolutely essential for that industry to operate in the long run. We're accepting those kinds of inadequate standards when we participate in this industry. I haven't heard the Government of Saskatchewan objecting to a weakening of the standards. I haven't heard that at all. And I haven't heard the

opposition complain about a weakening of the standards either. I haven't heard that either.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We're against the weakening of the standards.

MR. PREBBLE: — Now you say it. Thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER: — When are you going to give us a chance? For goodness sakes, if you'd sit down we might. You've had this fighting talk, now let us give our views.

MR. PREBBLE: — You'll get your opportunity to enter the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How much longer?

MR. PREBBLE: — You'll have to wait awhile. We waited for Mr. Katzman for a considerable amount of time yesterday. Now, I also want to tell members . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh, if you'd like to leave for an hour, you can. Yes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I might be. I want to tell members that even if we take our existing standards which have been established — half a rem for the public, half a rem of exposure — the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency in West Germany, both those countries, which are major nuclear countries, have not weakened their standards, but rather they've significantly toughened them up. They are now a hundred times tougher than Canadian standards. At the same time when we have the Atomic Energy Control Board proposing to weaken Canadian standards significantly, we see that in the last couple of years the United States and West Germany have considerably tightened their standards, considerably toughened them up. So what I'm saying quite simply is that Judge Bayda in his report did not deal with these facts that I'm now putting forward to members of the legislature and the public. Bayda simply didn't present the facts on standards and, therefore, his conclusions on standards are completely inadequate.

Now, I want to address myself to the next fundamental issue, which Bayda doesn't deal with either, which is the problem of uranium mill tailings — the hazards that are associated with uranium mill tailings. We are essentially now faced with the prospect of thousands of tons of uranium mill tailings left behind in northern Saskatchewan. We already have very significant uranium tailing piles. They are not being properly safeguarded. A further commitment to uranium mining implies having more and more and more of these tailings building up in very, very large volumes over a significant number of years. The problem is not so much with the very highly radioactive tailings which are going to be placed in concrete. I'm not so worried about the concrete faults. I'm worried about the large number of tailings that are going to be left behind that are not going to be protected at all, or not significantly. Bayda doesn't make a recommendation in his report that these tailings should be buried, that we should have deep geological disposal of these tailings. Bayda doesn't make a recommendation in his report that we should separate out the very toxic radium and thorium from the rest of the tailings and bury those in a special way. Those are things that have both been suggested by many prominent experts in the field. Bayda doesn't even address those recommendations. He doesn't even address those suggestions. His conclusions on our overall policy for abandonment of uranium mines are shallow to say the least.

I want members of this House to know that Victor Gilinski, one of the five members of the nuclear regulatory commission in the United States has said very candidly the tailings problem is a major problem; it's a very, very significant health hazard; it's going

April 11, 1979

to be a significant health hazard for the next 100,000 years, the tailings we're leaving behind as a result of our uranium mining operation. Unless we're prepared to spend a lot of money burying those tailings, or disposing of them in some other safe way which is going to make the uranium industry much less profitable, we're going to have a very serious health hazard on our hands.

Now, it's interesting to note that unlike Bayda the Porter Inquiry in Ontario takes this issue of uranium mill tailings very seriously. Porter says:

Uranium tailings will constitute an increasing health and environmental problem. An independent review committee should be established to study the problem in depth and prepare a public report for the Atomic Energy Control Board and the Ontario Environmental Assessment Board. The future of the nuclear program should be assessed in light of the committee's findings and progress in mill tailings containment technology.

We didn't see any recommendation like that from the Bayda report. We didn't see the Bayda report take the mill tailings problem seriously. I think that's very, very unfortunate — very unfortunate. We're resting on very shaky ground when we depend on Bayda's recommendation in this area. Now I want members to note the problems that have already been caused by the mill tailings that have been left behind in Ontario. In the Elliot Lake area uranium mine tailings have contaminated the entire Serpent River system. The Serpent River in Ontario involves about a dozen lakes, so that water is not fit for human use. There are no fish living in the 55 mile stretch downstream from the mining operation. Now, it's important to understand that the tailings are much more radioactive than the uranium itself is, much more radioactive. When we mine uranium most of the radioactivity is being left behind at the mill tailing site in the North, about 85 per cent of it. The two hazards associated with these tailings are radon gas emissions and radium. Radium 226 is one of the most toxic radioactive substances known to man. It is most dangerous if it is ingested through food or through water. It is not dangerous from the point of view of breath it in. The quantity of the radium contained in the tailings will remain constant for the next 10,000 years and will not be safe for several hundred thousand years.

Now, when radon gas is produced in the hard rock ore deep underneath the ground, it is fairly harmless because most of it disintegrates before it is able to get to the surface. So radon gas that is naturally emitted from uranium is not particularly serious because most of it never reaches the surface. However, once the mining operation goes into place, this radon gas is stirred up. It quickly reaches the surface at about 500 times the regular level — 500 times more rapidly than it would if it was simply sitting there naturally. And I quote in support of this an article that recently appeared in Science, October, 1978:

Unless covered deeply with clay and other material, a tailings pile may exhale radon gas at up to 500 times the natural background rate.

Science, Volume 202. Now the problem is that once this radon gas has been emitted, it can travel for very, very long distances. Bayda suggests that we only have to worry about 1.5 kilometres, but many experts suggest that we have to worry about thousands of miles. The radon gas is capable of travelling thousands of miles. It is capable of reaching populated areas before its radio-activity has declined significantly. Bayda doesn't address that. And Bayda doesn't address the fundamental issue of the hazards

that are associated with these small increases in the natural background levels of radiation.

Bayda completely ignores the evidence we presented to him from the 1977 United States Congressional hearings on low-level radiation. He completely ignores them, Mr. Chairman. At those hearings a great deal of evidence came out that first of all showed that a given quantity of radiation, a given small unit (shall we say a milligram) is much, much more hazardous at a low level than it is proportionately at a higher level. In other words, tiny units of low-level radiation create damage much out of proportion to what units higher up do. It shows very clearly that a lot of sicknesses that we know only too well — heart disease, schizophrenia, mental retardation, diabetes — are associated with this low-level radiation. Now, two or three years ago, we didn't know about that, two or three years ago we thought that the only illnesses that would show up at levels of low-level radiation would be illnesses that we saw at high levels. The new evidence suggests that that is not the fact at all. There's new evidence showing that low level radiation has a similar impact on people that aging does. That, in fact, many of the consequences of being exposed to radiation are not death, but the kind of sicknesses that I've described and a furthering of the aging process. I say that the only sound way of disposing of these tailings is either deep geological burial or the separation of the radium and thorium, the two prime radio active components, from the rest of the waste and special geological burial of those.

Until the Government of Saskatchewan has committed itself and committed the uranium mining companies to that kind of a process (which will be very, very costly) there is absolutely no basis for stating we have put environmental control ahead of profit or we have put health concerns ahead of profit because that is simply not the case. I think that until this problem of mill tailings is properly dealt with, it's simply not right to proceed with more and more commitments to further uranium mines. I must say that technology for the containment of uranium mill tailings is definitely not in place right now.

So that is the second inadequacy of the Bayda report — a very major inadequacy. I have already commented quite extensively on the safety problems associated with nuclear reactors. I don't want to elaborate on those very much at all except to say that the Bayda report did not take account of the human error and design problems that are often associated with nuclear reactors. When the Fermi accident took place in Detroit and many members will be familiar with the fact that the officials at Detroit debated whether they should evacuate the whole city or not. When that accident occurred the fundamental reason for it occurring was a construction flaw. Once that flaw had taken place many experts believe that the risk of an accident at that plant was one in a hundred or one in a thousand.

That's the kind of thing that Bayda doesn't account for. That's the kind of thing that Rasmussen in his study doesn't account for. That's the problem that we are facing now — the inability to predict. Bayda completely ignores the testimony of one of the engineers that we brought in (who resigned from General Electric in California) with regard to design problems. He doesn't seem to make reference to that testimony in his report at all. Essentially, while Bayda admits that if you take into consideration the latent cancers that are caused from a nuclear accident, while he admits that if you could take that into consideration, the latent deaths, nuclear power is more risky than any other kind of accident we know. While he admits that he says very clearly, he makes a value judgment at the end of his report and he say that we find on balance the hazards associated with the use of nuclear reactors are not such as to imply

April 11, 1979

Saskatchewan should not proceed with its uranium resources. He makes a value judgment. He admits that if you consider latent cancers a nuclear accident is worse than any other kind of accident we know about, yet he makes this value judgment, which neither the government nor the opposition seems to question seriously.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why don't you give us a chance?

MR. PREBBLE: — You've had lots of chances in this legislature, Mr. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver).

Judge Bayda also says that if you compare the Canadian and the United States nuclear reactors the problems associated with the Canadian reactor and the United States' reactor are fairly comparable. He depends on his comparison between U.S. and Canadian reactors on Rasmussen. He depends largely on Rasmussen, a report that has already been thoroughly discredited, which Bayda admits has been discredited and which he uses as the main basis for his comparison between Canadian and United States' nuclear reactors.

This report is just full of holes, Mr. Chairman,, and I am just picking a few. I know the hon. members of the opposition would like to get into the debate. They will get a chance, but I think it is very, very important since they have, in the past, never shown any ability to discredit this report at all, that somebody take this report to task, because they have not done so, Mr. Chairman.

Now I would like to turn to the question of waste disposal . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I am coming to that, coming to that now. I have addressed myself, so far, to reactor safety, the inability of the industry to predict and control, the questionable morality associated with exporting uranium to countries where massive parts of the population are protesting that. Now I am going to deal with waste disposal.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tailings.

MR. PREBBLE: — I have dealt with tailings already — uranium mill tailings in the North. I am now going to talk about waste disposal problems at the other end of the fuel cycle. What happens to our uranium when it comes out of a nuclear reactor?

One of the fundamental moral issues which we have to address is whether it is right to allow our uranium to be used in a nuclear reactor and to come out at the other end knowing that it is going to be highly radioactive for the next quarter of a million years, knowing that it has to be kept out of the environment for that length of time, knowing that in the first 10,000 years there are going to be an especially significant number of risks, and knowing that there is no safe method known of disposing of these radioactive wastes — no safe method know.

Now, I want to point to some of the things that Bayda doesn't address himself to in his section on waste disposal.

First of all, Bayda says, and I quote: 'the method considered most promising at the present time for waste disposal is deep underground burial in dry and very stable rock formations.' What Bayda doesn't say is that the Russians have already rejected that kind of waste disposal method. He doesn't indicate that in the report to the government. He gives no evidence of that at all.

What Bayda doesn't tell you is that there was a very, very serious accident already in Russia, associated with waste disposal, the Kymchyn disaster in 1958, in which thousands of square miles of the Ural Mountains were contaminated as a result of an explosion associated with burial of high-level radioactive waste. He doesn't tell you that. He doesn't tell you that hundreds of people died and were ill as a result of radiation sickness from that accident; he doesn't tell you that.

Bayda doesn't talk in his report at all about the tremendous problems associated with the decommissioning of nuclear reactors. Even Business Week, last year in December, addressed itself to that particular question. Business Week concluded that there were going to be very serious problems associated with reactor decommissioning, the cost would be at least \$100 million a reactor and the problem of decontamination was something that was only beginning to be addressed.

When a nuclear reactor has done its life, after about 30 to 40 years, it's highly radioactive inside. It has to be cut up into little pieces with remote-control cutting technology. It has to be cut up into little pieces and it has to be buried and disposed of. Nobody has really dealt with that problem yet, and the kind of problem that is going to be involved in cleaning up the Harrisburg reactor shows again the tremendous cost that is associated with cleaning up a reactor after an accident has occurred. The cost of doing that is estimated at, at least, a billion dollars.

Now is it right for us to be selling our uranium to fuel the reactor that is going to have such tremendous problems associated with its decommissioning? Is that right?

We have to address ourselves to that question. When we have no good examples yet of successful decommissioning of reactors, and clean-up of reactors, is it right to be selling our uranium to that technology?

Bayda doesn't tell us about the decision that California made not to build any more nuclear reactors until the uranium waste disposal problem was solved. Bayda doesn't talk about that. Bayda doesn't address himself at all to the very lengthy, extensive report produced by the California Energy Commission talking about the problems associated with burying nuclear wastes and concluding that waste containment technology was not in place, and concluding therefore, that a moratorium on further nuclear power plant construction in California was justified. Bayda doesn't talk about that.

Bayda doesn't talk about the United Kingdom inquiry into nuclear energy. Sir Brian Flowers in the United Kingdom very clearly and candidly stated that until there's a safe way of disposing nuclear wastes we shouldn't be making more commitments to nuclear power. He doesn't say that the United Kingdom inquiry candidly stated that there is no safe way of disposing wastes right now, and no safe way on the surface. No, it doesn't look like, in the immediate future, we're going to come out with a solution to the disposal of high level radioactive wastes.

The United States has been putting back its projected date for having a disposal technology in place, further, and further, and further, and further, and yet we in Saskatchewan have taken no notice of that at all — no notice. Bayda talks about disposal in salt vaults — disposal of wastes in salt vaults as being promising, but he doesn't tell members of the legislature and the public that for 15 years the United States had a proposed salt vault disposal project operating in Kansas. They made large commitments, millions and millions of dollars to the development of that salt vault project. Then they made an announcement that they were just about ready to proceed with

April 11, 1979

containment in the project. Three months later they had to announce that because they had made a major error and found that brine and water would be able to get at the wastes in the disposal projects, they were proposing that they had to cancel their \$150 million project. Bayda didn't tell you that.

Three states in the United States at this time have decided not to make further commitments to nuclear power until the waste disposal problem is solved. In the fall of 1977 the United States President's Advisory Council on environmental quality unanimously recommended a moratorium on further nuclear expansion until the waste disposal issue had been reached.

Now Bayda rests a good deal of his case by saying that waste disposal is a problem that can be solved. Bayda rests a good deal of his case for that on the Hare report — a three month job that the federal government did, a three month rush job to tell the people of Canada that there was no problem with nuclear waste disposal, and that the problems associated with it didn't justify slowing down expansion in the nuclear industry.

Now I want to say that the Hare report can even be more thoroughly discredited than the Bayda report. If you look at the people who were appointed to the Hare Commission, and this is important because Bayda rests a good deal of his case on the Hare report, only one of them had expertise in the nuclear field, the other two did not. The one who did, Archie Aiken, is known for his public statement in 1978 that the waste disposal problem is a public relations problem. That's what Bayda rests his case on. The Hare report and the Bayda report seem to very conveniently ignore not only the problem of decommissioning of nuclear reactors but also the very important problem of reprocessing Canada now appears that it is going to make a commitment to reprocessing.

I shall close my remarks on this issue of reprocessing, Mr. Chairman. I am only about one quarter finished the remarks which I want to say on this issue. I think it is important that the evidence discrediting the Bayda report come before this legislature. I am going to say in regard to reprocessing that (and Bayda makes no reference to this) the Canadian plans for reprocessing were clearly displayed at a special secret briefing of federal deputy ministers and senior officials in February of 1977. We can see the kinds of risks which are associated with reprocessing when we look at the U.S, where not one single reprocessing plant in the U.S. is operating economically, where the State of New York is now facing a problem of cleaning up some 600 million gallons of high level liquid waste that was associated with a reprocessing operation, with the problem of not having any satisfactory technique for solidifying these wastes. I think it is important for members to realize that reprocessing is almost inevitable if we make a major commitment to nuclear development in this country. Because there are only limited supplies of uranium, if we go ahead in a big way with nuclear development it is absolutely inevitable that we will eventually have to take the wastes which come out of a nuclear reactor (take our uranium wastes) separate the bomb grade plutonium from the rest of those wastes and use that bomb grade plutonium from the reactors again. That is absolutely inevitable. By propping up and ensuring that an expansion of the nuclear industry will take place in Canada, by supplying uranium on the Canadian and international market, by backing up that expansion of the nuclear industry in Canada, it's absolutely inevitable that reprocessing will become necessary. That means dealing with hundred of millions of high level liquid waste. It also means dealing with pure bomb grade plutonium and all of the security problems that are associated with that. Yet Bayda does not address himself to those problems in nearly the kind of way he should.

Bayda makes no serious reference to the problem that earthquakes pose for waste disposal, and yet we have had four nuclear reactors closed down recently in the United States because of the fear that the piping systems in the reactors will not be able to withstand the effects of an earthquake . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm going to be quitting in just a minute. You will get your opportunity to speak.

The final comments that I want to make in this portion of my contribution to the debate, Mr. Chairman, is that Bayda, in terms of the waste disposal problem, never addresses himself to what happens to a so-called undisturbed area after it has been disturbed by digging shafts down it to create a depository for waste disposal. Bayda says, let's pick an area where there has been no serious earthquake problems in the past, where we have a record of an area that is relatively undisturbed. Yet we have already had clear evidence that a couple of sites that the federal government is proposing for waste disposal are prone to earthquakes. Bayda makes no mention of that and Bayda makes no mention of the fact that an area that was previously undisturbed, could very well be disturbed after we have finished digging all the shafts and other things that are associated with the waste repository.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are the kinds of inadequacies that the Bayda report reflects. I have only dealt with about one quarter of them. I could deal with a lot more of them. I hope hon. members on the other side who have read the report will deal with some of them that I haven't dealt with. I will be dealing with them later.

I say that is this government is going to base is \$78 million investment in uranium exploration on this report, on this disgusting report that is so full of loopholes, that is really an insult to our children in the International Year of the Child. If this is what this legislature is going to base itself on, if it is going to ignore the evidence that has come in since the Bayda report, if it is going to ignore what the state of California is doing in its moratorium, if it is going to ignore the implications of the Harrisburg incident, then I say what is wrong? What is wrong with people in this legislature if they cannot see that the report is full of loopholes, and if they cannot see that at the very least, it makes sense to pause, to re-study the situation, to re-assess the implications of uranium development in light of the facts that I have just stated, in light of the evidence that Bayda ignores, in light of the mass of evidence that has come forward since the Bayda inquiry?

If we cannot do that, and if we are going to rest on this Bayda report as the ultimate in our decision, then I say that we are in very, very bad shape.

Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing the motion very strongly and I urge other members of this legislature to consider what I have said, to read it again in Hansard and to support me in my position.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Chairman, I think the minister should pay attention, at least, to some of the remarks which were made by the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) because I am afraid the minister is not aware of the obvious increase in radioactivity that has already occurred. The mutation that has just been presented to this House, the mutant, apparently has already received massive doses of radiation in the way he has reacted to this whole issue.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the minister is concerned and insofar as the

April 11, 1979

member for Saskatoon Sutherland is concerned, how can he spend up to one and one-half hours of the time of this legislature attacking Bayda? Bayda didn't decide to involve itself with the people's money in the uranium business. The NDP did. Bayda didn't decide on the issue; the NDP government did. How can the member for Saskatoon Sutherland pretend to be sincere in his views when he attacks Bayda alone and does not attack the people who made the decision? The NDP chose Bayda to make this inquiry. The NDP decided to adopt the Bayda report as the complete and definite report.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. COLLVER: — If you wait a few minutes you will hear . . . decided in its wisdom to adopt it as the definitive report on uranium development in the province. How the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland can approach this legislature with any sincerity at all and spend one and one-half hours of the time attacking Bayda is beyond us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that it's extremely interesting to note the motion which has been put forward by the NDP today. I would like to read this motion again for the edification of the members who may, for the last hour and one-half, have forgotten what the motion is. This is for the members opposite, especially.

That this committee support the continued mining of uranium in the province.

Who does the bulk of the mining in the province? Multinational companies and the federal government, that's who. That's who does the bulk — multinational companies and the federal government — an industry with a 25 year tradition in Saskatchewan provided that the necessary environmental and occupational health and safety controls are in place and there is appropriate involvement of northerners.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you think about this motion, the debate in the province of Saskatchewan with reference to uranium development, the remarks (many of which were well taken, by the way) by the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble). The debate is whether or not the safety controls are in place. That's the issue. The whole issue, surely, in the province of Saskatchewan is whether or not the safety controls are in place. Who knows whether the safety controls are in place? Because the Minister of Mineral Resources says so? Are we to believe that in the light of what a member of his own party is saying? Are we to believe that? Are we to believe it because the Premier says they're in place, in the light of incidents that have occurred in the last little while all over the world, the most recent of which filled our television screens for weeks on end and still is filling our television screens? Are we to believe just the minister? Are we to believe just the Premier?

I say that's the issue. Not only is that the issue, but are we to believe, for example, that all of these incidents that have occurred are not going to effect materially the markets for the very resources that we're talking about investing huge sums in? Suppose that you are to believe the Premier and the minister and Mr. Justice Bayda that the safety controls are in place and you can take that position, some have. Suppose you are to take that position. Others have not. The member for Saskatoon Sutherland talks about the state of California; that's a fact. If you want to talk about Japan, they've just placed a moratorium on their development; that's a fact. These are all facts. Other states in the United States have placed a moratorium; that's a fact. These moratoria being placed by others have got to materially affect the markets for Saskatchewan uranium or the

uranium of any other producer. Mr. Chairman, we have asked time after time in this legislature that the studies that were made available to the Government of Saskatchewan — the market studies — be made available to the people of the province of Saskatchewan openly and above board. We have asked that the Government of Saskatchewan review and reassess its position in the light of the development of the uranium business in Australia. We've asked you to take another look and give us a study and provide it for the people of Saskatchewan, on the implications of the involvement of the Government of Australia and of the new developments in the uranium business in Australia. We've asked you to re-assess your position in that regard; you've refused. You have refused to provide the market studies . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We'll see. We have asked you to provide the market studies so that we can determine publicly so the people of Saskatchewan can determine, publicly, whether or not the uranium development in Saskatchewan is a good investment. Are the people entitled to know whether their investment is being wisely spent by the government? Even when a member of the governing party disagrees, are the people entitled to know? The answer is yes, we feel. What has happened? Nothing! Will the government provide this information? No, it will not. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Saskatchewan refuses to deal openly with the people. It won't give the people the facts.

This issue, which is probably the most important and burning issue in Saskatchewan today is probably the one that is plaguing the most people and causing the most people in the province of Saskatchewan to think about. On this issue the people are entitled to the most information that they can possibly get. They have to have the most information. Without this information, how can the people make up their minds? And if the people can't make up their minds, how can we, the representatives of the people, make up our minds? We are supposed to represent the views of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, but the people of the province of Saskatchewan are not being provided with the necessary information to make up their minds. So, therefore, we, in our positions as representatives throughout the area, can't make up our minds either.

The point is that a reassessment, Mr. Chairman, of this position is necessary right now. And that, I think, with all deference is what the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) is trying to say. I think he becomes overly involved in the so-called expertise position. He tries to put himself off as an expert in this field by suggesting today for example, that he knew of the right way to dispose of waste. I don't suggest, for a moment, that I know but I don't think the member for Saskatoon Sutherland knows either. I think he becomes overly involved in the discussion as a so-called expert in the field, which he isn't. But I think that even he is unable to make up his mind appropriate if all of the information is not made available to him because the Government of Saskatchewan has refused to make the necessary information available to us. And it is not available to him either.

Now, he can take whatever position he likes (and he has been taking it for some number of years). At least he has been relatively consistent in his views. He stands on one side of the coin as an individual. But if, in fact, he is going to represent the views of the people of his constituency, he'd better make certain that the people in his constituency have access to the best possible information. I think that he should stop criticizing Bayda and start criticizing the NDP government for refusing to release the information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Unless the people gain this information they can't make up their

minds. Now every member of this Legislative Assembly is responsible to his local constituents, is responsible to ensure that the views of the local constituents are both represented in this Assembly and are provided with the best possible information on which they could make up their minds. I don't think it's incumbent upon the members of this legislative Chamber or the Conservative side or on the NDP side to stand up for the multinational corporations. Thank you very much, they can stand up for themselves. I don't think you fellows have to stand up for them but that's what you are doing in this motion. You are saying in this motion that the mining companies today are concerned because there are a bunch of people out there who are questioning whether or not there should be a process. Every citizen in the province of Saskatchewan wants to gain the maximum economic benefit from our resources. There is not a single citizen, including by the way, the member for Saskatoon Sutherland, who doesn't want to see that the people or the province of Saskatchewan receive every dime's worth of benefit from our resources that we can. What he is saying, what a great many people are saying in Saskatchewan, what every member of this caucus is saying (I don't know what your caucus is saying) but what every member of this caucus is saying, is that as a result of those recent incidents, as a result of these questions, as a result of the attack by a member from Saskatoon Sutherland on Mr. Justice Bayda's report, are we right in our decision to proceed, are the economic benefits that we derive worth the risks that we might take? That is the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — That's the question that's on everybody's mind right now. Is it worth it? And that's what the people are saying and that's what the member for Saskatoon Sutherland is saying. Is it worth it? I don't think the Attorney General is telling the truth about his own member. I don't think the Attorney General is trying to suggest the member for Saskatoon Sutherland, if every single aspect of this industry were proved safe beyond a reasonable doubt, that the member would want to prevent the children and grandchildren of the people of Saskatchewan from benefiting from our resources. And don't you try and put those words in his mouth because he does not. He believes if it's safe it should be used. I heard him say that myself. If it's safe it should be used. The question becomes, Mr. Chairman, is it safe? We are right back to square one again. Is it safe?

Now, everybody in Saskatchewan has questioned, that every person with any reasonable intelligence, as a result of that incident at Harrisburg, and others, has got to reassess their position. Surely you can't look at something like that and say, I'm going to do exactly the same thing that I did before, ignoring that incident. I say you are stupid to say the least, if that's what you say. If you say, as an individual member, if you say as a responsible representative of your constituents, that you can examine that incident and say it hasn't put a question in your mind — how you answer that question is beside the point — but if you say that hasn't put a question in your mind, then you're just not being straight with anyone, including yourself.

It's put a question in everybody's mind. Now, Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General says, from his seat, how in the world does mining affect this? I just listened to a member of your very own caucus, Mr. Attorney General site chapter and verse on what mining has to do with this. And I say this to the Attorney General. Mr. Chairman, I sat there and listened to the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) talk about what mining has to do with it. I don't think the member for Saskatoon Sutherland is an expert, but, Mr. Chairman, I believe that he's sincerely expressing the concerns of his constituents and I think that any member who

doesn't say that in this House is being untrue to himself.

Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, we will, yes we will. Mr. Chairman, the fact . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm sorry. I'll just wait for the lawyers to finish and then . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. Would everyone please . . . there's a member on his feet speaking, and it would certainly be nice if the Chairman could hear what the member has to say.

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's a good ruling. Mr. Chairman, there's another fact to consider here, and that is the fact of money. The Government of Saskatchewan has poured \$100 million last year and another \$80 million this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ask one more time. Would you ask the Attorney General to please speak from his feet and not from his seat?

Mr. Chairman, there's another aspect — \$100 million last year and \$80 million this year of the people's money, of the heritage fund, were poured into northern development in Saskatchewan. No one, no one, oh well, he's going to refute that. Perhaps it's less than \$100 million last year; certainly it was \$80 million this year. I don't have the figures in front of me, so I'll say only \$80 million this year. I'll be more accurate \$78.6 million is estimated to be expended in uranium development in Saskatchewan in this current fiscal year. This money comes from the heritage fund primarily, but what kind of a heritage are we providing for the future of the people of the province of Saskatchewan? If those markets collapse, what's going to happen to that money?

Mr. Chairman, anyone who hasn't watched the development of uranium stocks in Saskatchewan, and who didn't involve himself some years ago . . .

MR. THATCHER: — \$78.7 million.

MR. COLLVER: — \$78.7 million is it? Sorry. I was out by \$100,000.

MR. THATCHER: — And \$40 million last year.

MR. COLLVER: — And \$40 million last year? Mr. Chairman, I just wished to elucidate and I'll withdraw my former comments and say it was \$40 million the Government of Saskatchewan poured into the uranium business last year and \$78.7 million this year.

MR. THATCHER: — For those of you who can read it's on page 118.

MR. COLLVER: — A total of \$127.7 million out of the Heritage Fund is to be expended over the two-year period. But, if you watched what happened to uranium stocks just after the last war you will remember that there was a tremendous uranium boom after the last war too, a tremendous uranium boom.

Gosh, almighty, there were people pouring into Uranium City looking to shake out claims, and people pouring into Elliot Lake. The stock zoomed, you'll remember! I'll bet the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy) even had some of that stock. As a matter of fact, I notice the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) smiling. I'll bet you — He comes from an area where my wife comes from and I know that my father-in-law got touted with some of that stock in the 1940s and early 1950s and, unfortunately, had to

April 11, 1979

pick some up.

The members will know that the bottom fell out of the market. The companies were unprofitable. As a matter of fact, the companies were so unprofitable that a great many of those stocks were de-listed and pulled right off the market! They had mining claims, all right. They had their land staked out which was radioactive, all right. The bottom fell out of the market.

The question, Mr. Chairman, is quite simply this. How can the government take all of these actions without recognizing that in the last little while there have been some incidents which could seriously affect those markets, some obvious incidents, not ones that are hidden from view!

People you might banked on before to be customers suddenly might look at the situation and say, hold it, we're going to pull back! Japan and some states in the United States. Even the President of the United States says we've got to place more emphasis on coal and on solar energy and perhaps de-emphasize the uranium business.

The point is that these were customers you were banking on, Mr. Chairman, and these customers may not be there. They may disappear as a result of these incidents.

So we asked you before to provide to this Assembly some studies and reassessments. Here are the facts, show us how you are going about it. Show the people of Saskatchewan how you are going about making your decision. You have refused to provide anybody with this information. How can any intelligent citizen of the province of Saskatchewan decide the inherent risk versus the economic benefit, unless they know what the inherent risks are? How can they do it? The answer is they can't, Mr. Chairman, and neither can any member of this Assembly. If that little clique which runs the province and has access to all of these reports would make it clear to every one of you, you could make a more intelligent decision too. You might be able, for example . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . we noticed a lot of head shaking over there from time to time during the remarks of the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble).

AN HON. MEMBER: — I noticed it was all over there.

MR. COLLVER: — No, it happened on both sides. And do you know something, Mr. Chairman. The point is that one of the reasons you were shaking your head and one of the reasons we were shaking ours is that we are not provided with these facts. That little clique doesn't give it to you. You don't have all of this information, and neither does the member for Saskatoon Sutherland. And maybe you'll be able in caucus to be able to convince him of your position if you had all the information, but you don't have it. And so you have to take what one member says, or what the minister says, as being the gospel. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is supposed to be a government by the people, a government of the people and the government with your response as representatives of the people. But it isn't if you forever take as gospel what the minister says without ever asking for clarification and publication of that information.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to move the following amendment asking that the following words be added to the motion:

and only after the Government of Saskatchewan recognizes the public's right to review all market studies in order to determine if the inherent risks in uranium mining are worth the economic benefit to the people, and only after

recognizing that recent events have added to the uncertainty of world uranium markets thereby increasing the economic risks of huge government investments in the uranium business.

And we will be moving this amendment to this motion. And then we will support the amended motion. We will say to the member for Saskatoon Sutherland, look here, we say that all the information has to be made public by the NDP, not by a judge, by the NDP who made the decision. Put the information forward, lay it on the table. Let the people decide. Oh, Mr. Chairman, since I haven't moved the motion, there was one word left out. I want to add this to the amendment, market and safety study . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, you didn't give it to me at all. It was already marked on this sheet but not on this sheet.

Mr. Chairman, we're going to be moving this amendment. We know the member for Saskatoon Sutherland is opposed to the motion. I say to the member for Saskatoon Sutherland, you should be opposed to the NDP government who made the decision, not Bayda. Bayda was a servant of the NDP government. He was hired by . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — He's not a servant of the government.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, when the NDP cabinet appoints anyone to do a job on its behalf, that person whom it appoints is a servant of the government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'm not going to explain it but for the benefit of the Attorney General, he's a servant of the government. Mr. Chairman, it isn't Mr. Justice Bayda who is wrong; it's the NDP who made the decision who is wrong. I think the time has come not to place recriminations as to who made certain decision but we're going from today on . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, I'm just going to add one more thing for the benefit of the Attorney General I think Mr. Justice McDonald who is conducting an inquiry into the RCMP is a servant of the Trudeau government too. Absolutely! You see, Mr. Chairman, the difference is when that judge is in court he's no longer a servant of the government but when he appears on a commission he is a servant of the government.

Mr. Chairman, at any rate, I'm sure the Attorney General will try to change the issue, try to change the point. He's afraid to stand up and talk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I assume the member was moving a motion.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, I hope for the benefit of those members here that the members on this side of the House, at least, will allow me to conclude my remarks and then the Attorney General can get in as he sees fit.

I say to the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) with reference to this motion, and with reference to the amendment you can support this amended motion. You can support the amended motion because, if all safety factors are known and if they are true, if all safety factors are met, you don't want to stand in the way of future generations benefiting from Saskatchewan. If all are met! But you are prepared to say that they are not met yet. That's what this amended motion says. We don't know yet whether or not this is good or bad. We don't know yet whether these things can be overcome. But we have to reassess our position, we have to look at it again; we have to

April 11, 1979

examine it. No one is going to suggest for one minute, not for one minute, that we should take precipitous action today. What we should do is re-examine in the public view how decisions are being made in the light of what has happened over the last little while.

Mr. Chairman, don't you think it is interesting that the Attorney General continues to yap in his place about what servant would you appoint, and what study would you permit? This man is not our servant. My goodness gracious, everyone in the public service is a servant. Mr. Chairman, the point is, to try to chip away at that because he knows that they are wrong. Even a member of his own caucus today said, you are wrong. He asked, where are we going? He asked, what are you doing? He said that anybody who would stand on that report just isn't listening. That's what he said; I heard him. He knows he is wrong on this; he knows that when we ask for market studies and safety studies to be tabled in the legislature for an examination by all of the people, that's a reasonable step forward. Mr. Speaker — not appointing servants — tabling reports and tabling studies.

When we ask you to recognize that recent events are affecting your markets, then conduct a review right now as a government, in a public way. That's a positive thing that you can do.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that the following words be added to the motion:

And only after the Government of Saskatchewan recognizes the public's right to review all market and safety studies in order to determine if the inherent risks in uranium mining are worth the economic benefit to the people, and only after recognizing that recent events have added to the uncertainty of world uranium markets, thereby increasing the economic risk of huge government investment in the uranium business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate continues on both motions concurrently.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the Leader of the Opposition would have the courtesy to also convey to me the amendment as I conveyed to him the main motion. I hope that during the course of my remarks he will undertake to provide me with that.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard some incredible speeches in this Legislative Assembly but surely the address that the Leader of the Opposition just gave has to top them all. If we go back and recollect how he began his remarks by attacking the member from this side of the House who had just taken his seat, he said, why are you attacking Bayda? Don't attack Bayda. Bayda should not be attacked, it should be the New Democratic government. It should be your colleagues here in the Legislative Assembly who should be attacked. They made the decision to develop uranium.

Mr. Chairman, we make no apologies for making the decision to extend the development of uranium. We announced that to the people of Saskatchewan and we stick by it, but it is interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition before he took his seat spent 10 minutes doing nothing other than attacking the credibility of an independent inquiry by Chief Justice Bayda. It's interesting, Mr. Chairman, to note that not one of them, including the Leader of the Opposition, had the intestinal fortitude

when Bayda presented that report to criticize it. Nothing — not then.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that we went through a provincial election in this province and they didn't criticize Bayda at that time because they knew what the result of it would be. They knew, Mr. Chairman.

They talk about some means of being able to be open and to be frank with the people of Saskatchewan. This government has done that with the Bayda inquiry. It has done it by introducing some of the most progressive occupational health legislation known in Canada.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, wasn't here for most of the speech by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman). He wasn't here for most of the speech that was given by myself earlier today, when we talked about how Saskatchewan had set a precedent and had, in fact, set an example for all the rest of Canada as far as occupational health and safety was concerned, not only in the uranium industry, but everywhere. We put that first and foremost before any dollars and there is no amount of twisting and turning that the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts can do that will change that impression in the minds of Saskatchewan people. It is there and they know what we stand for. We are now asking the, what does the Conservative caucus and the Conservative opposition stand for?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — He says we should reassess. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you, the people of Saskatchewan, by and large, know that Bayda was an independent inquiry doing the best that was humanly possible to present to the government facts and recommendations that it could base its decision on uranium development — whether to go ahead or not to. We looked at that. We considered it and almost without exception, we have incorporated their recommendations as far as uranium development is concerned to this point in time.

The member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) does not choose to recognize that not only do we recognize this as being one of the most outstanding independent reports on uranium development and related activity, but so does Canada, so does the United States, North America. I mentioned here, last Monday, other countries — France, Italy, Japan, Scandinavia, England — all of which relate to Bayda with confidence because they know that as far as current information is concerned, it is the best that is available in the globe today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what we base our decision on and we make no apology for it. I mentioned also an election of a short while ago. We stood by our resource development policies. We told the people of Saskatchewan what we were going to do with uranium. That is more than the members opposite did. And if they want to go back and review the polls or if they want to take the time to count the heads over on this side of the legislature and remind themselves of their 17, they know that we openly and frankly addressed ourselves to the people of this province in that election. In that election they endorsed this policy. They endorsed uranium development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

April 11, 1979

MR. MESSER: — It is interesting, again, that the Leader of the Opposition addressed almost all of his remarks to financial and economic implications of uranium development. Only when the Attorney General says, and safety, and he amends his motion to include, as a smokescreen, a consideration and concern for environmental health and safety concepts of people in this province. He addressed his entire remarks up until that point in time on the economic and financial considerations. He talks about the market studies. He wants to see the market studies because that is the basis of making the decision of whether we're developing uranium in a proper or an improper manner. I say that's nonsense. It's nonsense! If the member took the time to acquaint himself with what the policy of Saskatchewan was, he would know the environmental studies that are carried out take into consideration not only the environmental implications, but all, Mr. Chairman, of the occupational health problems that may be encountered in a mining industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — He would know in the instance of the Amok environmental hearings all of the environmental implications as well as occupational health were contained in that study and they were openly and publicly (not only distributed in Saskatchewan) discussed in Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! In order to expedite the business of this motion and the Committee of Finance, I'm going to ask the members to listen carefully and allow the Minister of Mineral Resources to make his remarks uninterrupted.

MR. MESSER: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. No amount of heckling is going to be able to deter me from putting on the record of the Legislative Assembly the position that the Leader of the Opposition has enunciated for is party today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — It is contrary to the position of the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that it is on the financial implications and the financial implications and rewards only that they would make the decision on uranium development — not on health, safety and environment. The member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) may try to say that's what we said, but it's, in fact, the speech that his leader gave in this Legislative Assembly only moments ago. He bases all of his decision on the financial rewards and that is a significant departure from the attitude of this government. We have proven that to be the case and we assure the people of Saskatchewan that will continue to be the case. Again, I think it should be noted that he should be well aware all of the occupational concerns of uranium mining are now public, not only a record of public information but there for public debate while the inquiries are carried out, such as was the case in Amok. He should not attempt to mislead this Legislative Assembly and mislead the people of Saskatchewan that we have been secretive in any way in regard to the health and safety aspect of uranium mining in Saskatchewan. Mr. Chairman, will you please bring the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) to order or ask him to leave the Assembly? Mr. Chairman, we have assured ourselves and we have conveyed to the people of Saskatchewan that we will constantly reassess implications that affect environment, health, safety. We have assured the people of Saskatchewan that we will do so and we are. And we are, Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The members opposite

cannot control themselves because they know it's only a matter of time — it might be 5 o'clock today, it might be tomorrow, it might be next week, it might be in May — but they're going to have to stand up and be counted when they vote on this resolution . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order!

MR. MESSER: — . . . and we're going to get to the question.

MR. ROMANOW: — Point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — What is your point of order?

MR. ROMANOW: — I legitimately cannot hear my colleague who is about 10 feet away with the kind of absolute heckling that is going on on the opposite side. I ask that you bring the House to order, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — In order to expedite the business of the Committee of Finance, and more particularly the motion that's under discussion, I'm going to ask all members to co-operate and allow the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) to address himself uninterrupted to this motion.

MR. MESSER: — Thank you again, Mr. Chairman. It seems like your request goes unheeded. I have the right to complete my remarks and I think that it is of utmost concern that they are properly recorded because this is one dilemma that the Conservatives have got themselves into, and they are not going to be able to extricate themselves from it. They are going to be busy for a long time, Mr. Chairman, trying to explain the situation that they have got themselves into here, not only on the issue of uranium mining and its related activities, but as the Attorney General has pointed out, that they are now on record saying that the Bayda inquiry headed by Justice Bayda was nothing other than a puppet of the Government of Saskatchewan. I could hardly believe that the member undertake to say that when everywhere else in all legitimate jurisdictions it's considered one of the most comprehensive, legitimate inquiries, reports, that is available to mankind today on nuclear and uranium activity. And it's going to be interesting as to how the people of Saskatchewan respond to this kind of performance by a group of people who are here to attain political gain and nothing else, and could care less really, Mr. Speaker, about the well-being of Saskatchewan people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I said when I started my remarks that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Collver) was only concerned about the financial economic implication and it was as an afterthought that he introduced the environment, health and safety issue. The record speaks for itself in that regard. But, Mr. Chairman, he faults us for wanting to invest some tens, yes, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars in uranium development by joint venturing in northern Saskatchewan. He criticizes us for that, condemns us saying that we have no good basis to do that.

He knows full well that we have the basis. He knows we have the studies. He knows that we can't provide him with the studies and jeopardize our position. What other private company would put forward the studies indicating why they are going to mine certain volumes of uranium based on what prices? He knows that that is not acceptable. He knows because of the very joint venturing features that we're involved in, that the private enterprise partners that are there with us would not tolerate studies to be made public because it would seriously jeopardize their operations. He's shouting back then saying get out of the private enterprise joint ventures say, that if they do it they don't

April 11, 1979

have to make it available to the people of Saskatchewan — they only have if we are.

Well then, what is the relevance of getting out of it because you know they would not. And there would be no opportunity for you to force them into tabling those studies because it would absolutely jeopardize their ability to operate in the international marketplace and move that uranium. But, Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make here is after he gives this financial argument criticizing us, he chooses to totally ignore the situation in the province of Ontario.

In Tory Ontario, Mr. Chairman, where that government confronted supposedly with all of the problems of uranium, and supposedly with all of the problems of nuclear development, committed the people of (like we have committed the people of Saskatchewan's money to development here) Ontario's money to purchase 197 million pounds of fuel for nuclear power at a conservative price of some \$10 billion. It was not several hundred million dollars, Mr. Chairman, but \$10 billion.

The member for Qu'Appelle asks me for questions. I would want to have the question before this is recorded as well, because he can't extricate himself from that conservative government decision in Ontario to commit the people to \$10 billion of fuel for nuclear power. Regardless of what the problems may be in the future, they are committed. They are committed to that.

Now, Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the member wants a question. The member will have the opportunity to have the question put before 5 o'clock. I can assure him of that. But I wanted to make certain, Mr. Chairman, that the analysis and the relationship is made so that we can truly test and question the credibility of the members opposite when they try to make a case out of Saskatchewan investment which is clearly in the best interest of Saskatchewan people with rewards compared to giving two people in Ontario \$10 billion worth of business regardless of the problems. So, Mr. Chairman, when I close my remarks here on the amendment to the motion I want the members of this Assembly to keep in mind the very words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Collver) when he addresses himself clearly only to the financial concerns, is prepared, as his cohorts are to disregard and ignore environmental and social concerns. We stand by our policy. We have made no mistakes by it. We know that the people of Saskatchewan support it. I ask the members of this Legislative Assembly, when we vote on the amendment, to defeat that amendment and support the main motion and we will all, with interest, await the response and the position taken by the Conservatives opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Chairman, I am not finished my remarks. I accommodated members of the opposition. If members of the opposition or members of the government would like to continue the debate I will certainly sit down but if nobody else is going to speak I am going to continue with the remarks that I was making. I sat down originally to accommodate members of the opposition or other members of the government who wished to speak to the motion.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:03 p.m.