

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Nineteenth Legislature**

**May 1, 1979**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. D.F. McARTHUR (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood, Mr. MacMurchy, who is unavoidably absent from the House this afternoon, I would like to introduce to you and the members of this Assembly, 15 Grade 8 students from Nokomis School who are sitting in the Speaker's gallery. I'm sure all members of the legislature join with me in welcoming these students to our Legislative Assembly and in wishing them an enjoyable and educational afternoon here and a safe trip home. I will be meeting with the students at 2:45 to answer questions and discuss any questions they may have.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to all members of this legislature, 34 Grade 8 and Grade 9 students from Grayson Junior High School. They are seated in the west gallery to your left, Mr. Speaker. The teachers with them are the principal, Mr. Ben Appell, and Mr. Reginauld Lesko. The bus driver is William Ottenbreit, and the chaperones are Gloria Lesko, and Fay Appell. I'm sure that all the members here would like to wish these students from Grayson a fine afternoon here this afternoon, educational and worthwhile. I hope that their trip back home is safe.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**PAYMENT OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION**

**MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). Mr. Minister, some weeks ago during your departmental estimates, I requested certain information be supplied regarding highway construction to uranium development areas of Northern Saskatchewan, and as yet I have not received the information. My question and concern is this, is the Department of Highways paying for the construction of these highways to Northern Saskatchewan, these uranium developments?

**HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** — The Department of Highways and Transportation, Saskatchewan, is in charge and is paying for all of the major highways, the numbered highways, going into Northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. A portion of the road, however, to Cluff Lake will be paid for by Amok Canada Limited. They have agreed to pay a part of the cost in order to get the road in there by a certain time. I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that there are only 35 miles left of that road. We've constructed nearly 100 miles throughout this winter, and expect to have it completed by September. Further, I would like to inform the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham), on another question that he asked. He complained about school bus signs. I've had my staff inspect all the school bus signs that are under our responsibility and I

May 1, 1979

find them all in good order. There is none of them that is illegible. If there are any signs they are the signs that are the responsibility of rural municipalities or school districts. If they request assistance to refurbish those, we will assist them.

**MR. HAM:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the minister is becoming so efficient. I would like to ask the minister this: A number of members of our caucus, including myself, asked for information during estimates which you indicated you would supply within a matter of days and we accepted your recommendation. None of us has received that information yet. Would you take steps now to make sure we receive the information before we prorogue.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that the information has not been forthcoming. I don't know whether my staff misunderstood whether or not it was to be advanced this quickly, but I am sure for any of those questions that were asked, the information is readily available. I'm rather surprised that they have not received it. I will check into that and I don't think there is anything further I can say on northern construction.

I presented a sheet to all members in the House of this year's construction program. I think if they check those out and compare them with the highway map they will be able to identify all of the construction projects.

#### **BROADCAST COMMENTS - MRS. BROADBENT**

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Minister, last night I had occasion to, by accident, turn on a free time political broadcast by the NDP and one of the key points of this particular broadcast was when Mrs. Lucille Broadbent was making a pitch to the housewives of Canada.

Mr. Minister, my question to you is, Mrs. Broadbent came out rather strongly that the price of beef was far too high and that it was at an unacceptable level and that housewives in Canada (while she did not use the word, 'boycott', I believe the words added up to exactly the same thing . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I want the member to get to his question.

**MR. THATCHER:** — A valid point, Mr. Speaker. I was just getting there as I noticed you getting up.

My question to the minister is, Mr. Minister, as Minister of Agriculture in the Government of Saskatchewan, do you support the position being taken by your federal counterparts, the New Democratic Party, and what was being put forward by Mrs. Broadbent, last night on behalf of the NDP?

**HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I think the statement made by Mrs. Broadbent last night was most unfortunate. We think her remarks are typical of the remarks of many consumers across the country who fail to recognize the fact that beef prices have been too low over the last four or five years. Many producers have as a result, suffered very severely and have gone out of business in fact.

We think the price of beef to the producer has now reached an acceptable level and we think the consumer should recognize that. We think basic salaries in the last 10 years

have increased substantially and right now we know that an hour of work will buy more pounds of beef than it did 10 years ago. For that reason, I felt it was a very unfortunate statement on her behalf. I have expressed that opinion to Mr. Broadbent's people and I hope they will refrain from making those kinds of statements because we don't agree with them.

**MR. THATCHER:** — My compliments to the minister in his frankness and honesty in his answer. A supplementary question, Mr. Minister. On behalf of the beef producers in western Canada and specifically in Saskatchewan, which I suppose you are nominally the head of, can you assure us that information to be used on a national level by your party that will not be contrary to the producers will be made available forthwith and that you will make the strongest possible representation so there will be no reoccurrence.

### IPSCO STRIKE

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — I direct the question to the Minister of Labour. The IPSCO (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation) strike in Regina will have continued for, I believe, five weeks tomorrow. I gather that there seems to be an impasse and that negotiations have either broken down or have slowed down and are not being preceded with at this time. Can you tell me what action the government is taking or contemplating in regard to the IPSCO strike in Regina?

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Chairman, earlier this day I had the opportunity to talk with Mr. Duncan, the director of industrial relations in the Department of Labour and we discussed the current impasse at IPSCO and agreed that another effort would be made probably today or tomorrow in an effort to see if there is a method that can be used to get the parties unstuck from what appears to be a dead-centre position.

Failing that, the department, through the director of industrial relations, will be making some additional overtures that I don't believe would be appropriate, at this time, for me to attempt to disclose any strategy which might be involved. But the department is on top of the proposition, attempting to keep in touch with both of the parties. As far as actual strategy is concerned, I think it would be unwise for me to involve myself in giving details when it's not known at this point whether the suggestions might be acceptable to one party or the other or both. But I can assure the hon. member that we are devoting ourselves diligently to the problem in an attempt to find an early solution to that dispute.

**MR. LANE:** — By way of supplementary, obviously the strike, being five weeks old, makes it appear that perhaps the department hasn't been diligent and has been laying back for some considerable period of time.

Now, the representation I've had from people on strike indicates that they feel themselves that it is going to be a long drawn-out strike. Does the minister have any indications that that may not be true? Secondly, with the feeling that it's going to be a long, drawn-out affair, would the minister not feel that more precipitous action by his department would be in order? Would you also, at the same time, confirm that that seems to be a feeling among the strikers?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I think there were some indications offered at the beginning of the work stoppage that the stoppage in effect could last some time. I think there's no one who can gaze into his crystal ball and really determine how long the work stoppage will

last.

With respect to the efforts of the department to date, I think anyone who is close to the industrial relations situation in the province is aware of the fact that there will be times when a set of circumstances representing a solution can be used effectively. If used prematurely, then I think you shot one of your cannons that may not be available to you at a point in time when it will be more effective in bringing a conclusion to that strike. We have seen, for example, instances where a board of conciliation serves a very useful purpose at a point in time when the strike has reached circumstances where both parties are suffering, where if the suggestion were made to the parties involved a matter of a week or two weeks or ten days earlier, the suggestion would not be acceptable. So, I think the hon. member will heed a word of advice; the situation is being looked at very carefully and with all dispatch. When the appropriate moment arrives then our industrial relations people will be making, what I believe to be, the appropriate moves to suit the circumstances.

**MR. LANE:** — A final supplementary. I accept the minister's advice and I hope he'll accept the question in the manner in which it's given as well. The strike is five weeks old and I need not tell the minister the effect on the Regina economy and the provincial economy of a lengthy IPSCO strike. I'm sure you know better than I. But would the minister not admit that the seeming inactivity by the department may perhaps be an indication of the position the government will find itself in when it is in both the position as a shareholder of a company, in fact an indirect employer, and the position of the government itself concerned about the effect on the provincial and city economy?

**MR. SNYDER:** — Well, I take some exception to the member's remark about the seeming inactivity of the department. I think the hon. member should recognize that when our industrial relations people make their efforts on behalf of the parties involved to effect a settlement they don't do it through the media nor do they go to the electronic media or the printed media in order to indicate the moves that are being made or the suggestions that are being offered. I think the department has been diligent in pursuing the matter and I certainly offer no apologies at this point in time for the department in attempting to make whatever moves are appropriate. We will continue to monitor and make those moves that, I believe, will effect a solution, hopefully in the not too distant future.

#### **ALCOHOLIC REHABILITATION CENTRE IN KINDERSLEY**

**MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — A question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes). Last Friday, Mr. Minister, I asked a question with regard to funding by the Government of Saskatchewan to the Danny Fisher Centre in Kindersley, which is an alcoholic rehabilitation centre, on a volunteer basis I might add, the bulk of the money being from voluntary contributions from people in the community. The Tuesday prior to that, the people involved in the Danny Fisher Centre did receive a letter from your department indicating that funding was being cut off on that. Can you advise the House as to the reason for the cutback and the elimination of funding for that rehabilitation program?

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane), I can handle all Grade 1 questions. So, if he wants to get up, I'll answer him.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew), I am sorry I cannot give him the specifics of that question, but since my estimates are coming up later on this afternoon, I'm sure that my officials will have the answer for me at that particular

time. I think the answer probably will be that since it is an alcohol rehabilitation centre, primarily, we are I think, asking the Alcohol Commission to accept responsibility for that centre and not the Department of Social Services. But I will check with my officials this afternoon. I think that probably will be the answer.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Are you telling me, Mr. Minister, that the other program is in fact, going to step in then and keep this program afloat in Kindersley? Or is the program either going to fall by the wayside or simply have to look for local government funding to carry the thing forward? And I might ask a further question, what is going to happen to programs like the DWI (Driving While Impaired) program et cetera within that organization?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated to the member, I think I will have more specific answers for him later on. My understanding of the Danny Fisher Centre originally was that it was a federal project which, when the funds were cut off by the federal government or they came to an end, they came to our department to tide them over for a short period of time which we agreed to. Mr. Speaker, this has happened on numerous occasions and this will not be the last one. If the federal government starts particular programs then they become worthy programs; people come to us for funding. We may pick it up for a short period of time to tide them over so that they can find some other funding. What I'm saying to you is that I believe the answer will be (but I'll get more specific answers in estimates) that because it is primarily an alcohol rehabilitation centre, that should be the function of the Alcoholism Commission. I can't answer for the Alcoholism Commission whether they will pick it up if I'm not the minister in charge. But that doesn't mean, regardless of whether they pick it up, that I should continue as Minister of Social Services to fund that particular project if it does not fall within the priorities of my department.

**MR. ANDREW:** — A further question, Mr. Minister. I think four or five days should be plenty of notice to simply find out the answer to the question as to whether or not your department is going to continue to fund it and why you chose to not fund it. How much more time do you need prior to answering a simple question like that?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, very simply, about three hours.

**MR. ANDREW:** — New question, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this. I question the priorities of your government . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. New question. Order.

#### ADDITIONAL POWER PLANTS

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) (Mr. Messer). Mr. Minister, with the IJC (International Joint Commission) report not slated to come down until late August on the Poplar River development regarding pollution to the environment, water and air, but particularly water, is it now your plan, are you looking very seriously at possibly building a unit seven on Boundary Dam or a possible new power house and a Rafferty Dam on the Souris River which could service the province very well and could probably be built up to a 1,200 megacycle power plant?

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LARTER:** — Has the minister give this any consideration? Has he looked into the feasibility of a possibility of a new power house on Short Creek or on the Souris River or unit number seven?

**MR. MESSER:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I have conveyed to the member on past occasions that we keep all options open and certainly pursue all options as far as increased and enhanced power generation is concerned. But I do believe that the ordering of priority does not put those options high on the list at this particular point in time. It is not to say that at some later date or given a changing set of circumstances that they will escalate. But we are, I think, mildly optimistic that we will continue with Coronach No. 2. I announced some months ago, in fact, in the fall of 1978 that if the IJC was not able to give us sufficient information by way of a final report or interim report to allow us to make final decisions on Coronach 2 we would think seriously of a hydro project at Nipawin. We in fact escalated and accelerated our engineering studies at that point to the extent of something approaching \$1 million, so that by the summer of 1979 we will be able to make a decision. If we feel we are deficient as far as adequate support and/or information for Coronach is concerned it may well be that we would have to then make our decision that the next project would be Nipawin. But it is premature at this time to try to tell the member which one of those options we will be choosing.

**MR. LARTER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister know that the United States government has indicated their willingness to possibly participate in a dam, a Rafferty Dam instead of a Burlington Dam which is going to cost them far more money and that truly a dam built on the Souris River could supply all the water you need for a future power plant there? We have the coal to fire this plant. Does the minister know there could possibly be as much as \$60 million available from the United States government?

**MR. MESSER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there is that volume of funding which may be available from the United States government. I will take notice of the member's information and give it some further pursuit. I do want to convey to the member and to the House that he's talking about a pretty significant project. When I compare the project that he is proposing, the dam vis-a-vis what is underway at Coronach and the related problems which we have had with certain agencies and getting final approval there, I would have to, if I was being realistic, look at a time frame of something in the order of five or ten years before we would ever get the final working authority to proceed with such a significant project. In light of having to have some generation in place, within a much shorter time frame than five or ten years I think that we have to look at alternative generating sources that are available to us at this time. I again remind the member that we look at all options that are open to us, but given the circumstances that we're dealing with today, the options that he conveys to this House are not high on the priority list.

### **KINDERSLEY LIQUOR STORE**

**MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — The Government of Saskatchewan, as you are probably aware, has just opened a very expensive self-serve liquor store in the town of Kindersley. My question to you, is where are your priorities, Mr. Minister, to open and expend thousands of dollars on a new self-serve liquor store to promote the sale of liquor, and at the same time cut back on the program to help rehabilitate those with drinking problems?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I recall, I think, very clearly that the member for Kindersley protested violently to the opening of the new liquor store. I think there was a headline in the Kindersley paper, or maybe I had a dram, I am not sure. But Mr. Speaker, let me put it this way. First of all I indicated to the member for Kindersley that it is not the priority within the Department of Social Service to set up a DWI (Driving While Impaired) project. That is not my responsibility. It is the responsibility of the Alcoholism Commission. Therefore, I should not, as Minister of Social Services, be involved in that particular project. I indicated to you, because the federal government started it, we very often on an interim time limit pick up projects in order to tide people over, because it may have some high priority in that particular community. We would indicate to them, we'll pick them up for a year or two to try and get them on their feet, but then they must look for alternate sources of finances. We think that we have given them sufficient time to look for other sources, and it's now time that someone else funds them. If they can get it from the federal government, fine. If they can get it from the Alcoholism Commission, fine. All I'm saying is for the Department of Social Services, it is probably not a high priority.

### **FUNDING OF NATIONAL FARMERS' UNION**

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, I'm sure you are aware that the National Farmers' Union (NFU), purportedly on behalf of all permit holders, has launched an action against CPR (Canadian Pacific Railways) and Canadian National Railways (CNR). Would the minister tell this Assembly whether his department is involved in any way, shape or form with the National Farmers' Union in this particular action, and specifically, have you made funds in any form available to the National Farmers' Union in this action?

**MR. KAEDING:** — No, Mr. Speaker, we have not.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the Attorney General. Mr. Minister, could you tell this Assembly whether the National Farmers' Union is receiving any assistance, in any way, shape or form, in the form of legal advice or any other form of assistance or intervention on their behalf, or whatever, in their action against Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways?

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — No, they are not.

### **NEW PARTY LEADER**

**MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that there is a new political party running in this election. I wonder whether or not the Minister of Agriculture could say whether or not it's true that the cow-calf party is going to have as its new leader the hon. member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher).

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think it's time for ministerial statements.

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

#### **RETURN NO. 5**

**MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley)** to move that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return

May 1, 1979

No. 5 showing:

The fair market value of each quarter section of farm land owned by the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission as of December 31, 1978.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in this session of the legislature, I have been trying, through various vehicles, to obtain the information that I have set out here in the motion for return, and the information that I seek is the fair market value of the land owned by the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission as at December 31, 1978, which is the end of the last fiscal year of the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission. As I say, I asked in other areas of the legislature, the other legislative processes that we go through, and each time I was directed to the Assembly as the place where I could find this information, and then through the forum that I have presently advanced it, as the way that I can obtain this information. Quite frankly, the information is asked for as is any farm operation you will know, the farmer is interested to determine what his stand is at any given point in time as to the value of the land in question and, in particular, what the capital gain is that he has either realized actually or estimated on the land in question that he has purchased. Now, the land bank program is, I think, in its sixth year now and surely the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know and the opposition is entitled to know what is the exact value of that land in question, what capital gain the government has made on this particular land in question? Now, I'm sure that this is some type of information that the people Saskatchewan and, quite frankly, the opposition are entitled to know as we proceed in this debate. I would, therefore, like to move, seconded by the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) Return No. 5.

**MR. KAEDING:** — When you look at this question you begin to wonder whether the member opposite really knows what he is asking. He is asking for the market value of each quarter section of land owned by the Land Bank Commission in the province of Saskatchewan as of a certain date. I think he will recognize that you can't tell what land is worth unless somebody goes out there and makes an assessment of it. So he is asking the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission to go out there and assess every piece of land which we own in the province of Saskatchewan. We are not adverse to giving him reasonable information. We are prepared to provide for him information which is more general.

We have done a cost analysis and it would cost the Land Bank Commission pretty close to \$500,000, anywhere from \$370,000 and upwards to get the kind of information which you are asking for. If you want specific information, the land bank tells me they would have to hire 20 assessors for six months to go around the province and assess every quarter section of land, because you have to do it individually. That's what you are asking for. You have to do it individually and you would have to have 20 assessors (if you could get them). You likely couldn't find 20 assessors to put on the job. The additional cost of staff, we estimate, will be well into the \$40,000 to \$50,000 range. We estimate it would take four staff people at least 10 months to compile the information which he is asking for.

So we are prepared to provide the estimated market value of all lands purchased by the Land Bank Commission up to December 31, and the market value as of that time, as near as we can estimate it. Even that will be a considerable task because land values, as you know, are not constant across the province. There are areas where land is selling for \$150 an acre and some places where it is selling for \$400 an acre. So we would have to do this more or less on a regional basis to try to get a reasonably accurate assessment of what the land is worth.



I think we have to stress that those figures will be estimates only, because it would be almost impossible to pinpoint the exact price of land in any given area. Again, I am saying that land values at one time of the year may be different than they are at the other time of the year. So you have to relate it back to your date of December 31, which we would do.

You can see the difficulty in assessing land values by looking at the annual reports which are available to us. The Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission's annual report indicates that the average land value in 1978 was \$171 an acre. If you go to Stats Canada figures, they say the average price is \$192. So you really can't pick a very accurate figure. You have to look at a figure which will give you a reasonable estimate.

So in order to provide the best information to the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew), we think he is entitled to have the information, we are proposing an amendment to the motion, seconded by my colleague, the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman). The amendment will read as follows:

That Return No. 5 be amended by deleting all the words after 'the' in the first line and substituting the following:

What is the estimated market value of land held by the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission as of December 31, 1978?

I so move.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — We are dealing with an Order of the Assembly for Return No. 5 showing, to which an amendment has been offered. There is a small technical problem with the amendment. The small technical point with the amendment is as follows: when the minister stood he said, strike off all the words after 'the' in the first line, but his instruction which comes in to me, which doesn't form part of the motion, says:

That Return No. 5 be amended by deleting all the words after 'what is the'.

The words 'what is the', do not exist on the blues. Now, if the House would agree, I could strike out the words 'what is the' in the instruction, which is unimportant, and strike out the words 'what is the' at the beginning of his amendment, which would then make it in order and it would read as follows:

That Return No. 5 be amended by deleting all the words after 'the' in the first line and substituting the following: 'estimated market value of land held by Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission as of December 31, 1978'.

Now if the House is in agreement I would do that.

**MR. LANE:** — Now if I could speak on that suggested amendment by Mr. Speaker, I think the precedent was well established during the budget debate when the opposition had a motion which was not quite correct and Mr. Speaker refused to give any assistance to the opposition in amending it. Any proposed changes should be in the hands of the minister making the error in drafting, so we can't give leave.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would draw the Qu'Appelle member's attention to the fact that there is no similarity between the two. This is a technical correction to an amendment which

May 1, 1979

has been offered. The situation the member for Qu'Appelle refers to is one where the Leader of the Opposition, I believe it was, at the time was asking me to draft the amendment for him. It was an altogether different situation which arose and I don't think it's our purpose here to compare situations which may or may not have arisen.

If the members do not wish to give leave I'll have to declare the amendment out of order.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — The amendment's out of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The amendment is out of order then. There is no leave.

Debate adjourned.

## **RESOLUTIONS**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 18**

#### **OPERATING COSTS OF RECREATION CENTRES**

**MR. R. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone)** moved, seconded by Mr. R. A. Larter (Estevan):

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its insensitivity to local recreation centres by compelling them to use demand meters in their recreation facilities, thereby causing an awesome burden in operating costs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to rise and point out some of the main reasons why I've placed this motion before the Assembly.

I will refer my remarks mainly to the rural areas of the province. We are aware that most of the towns and villages contain a skating and curling facility, this in fact being the only recreation available to these communities during the winter months.

The majority of these centres, I admit, are a reality only because of the systems grants and winter works programs provided through the Department of Culture and Youth. For this, I compliment the department and the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I know all members are aware of the cold winters in Saskatchewan, as we've just witnessed one; however we also have milder ones. Because of this most of these communities have decided they must have artificial ice which costs thousands of dollars. Immediately following the installation of our artificial ice the Saskatchewan Power Corporation installed demand metres which increased costs substantially.

An actual example of this — if the energy charged for a month is \$645.24 the demand will increase the bill by \$341.04. This is an increase of more than half of the original cost. In six months, if they were taken out, this would be a saving of well over \$2,000 to \$3,000 in a lot of these centres. This money could be well spent on improvements in other areas.

Another actual example is of ice plants put into service 10 days prior to the monthly reading. The energy charged was \$173.28 for the actual kilowatt-hours but the demand increased the cost by \$296.96. So it also works the other way.

Mr. Speaker, I consulted the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and was made aware of exactly how the demand metres function. If the full energy demand is required any one day of the month, whether it be the first or the last day, this is what the demand charges are based on. Maybe I should just explain that. After the metre reading is taken at the end of the month, if the next day the weather is mild and if the artificial ice plants cut in, all the lights and electrical appliances in the building are on, the demand metre will go up to a point and then it might not reach that point again throughout the rest of the month. It certainly places a financial burden on these small communities in the province.

The increase in power costs force them to increase membership fees, open their facilities late and close early, thus depriving the people of winter recreation. Many of the families cannot afford the increase in membership fees; therefore they have no form of winter recreation.

I am aware that the Department of Culture and Youth instigated an energy assistance grant program in which they were to provide 25 per cent of the energy costs. However, they have not fulfilled this commitment. They only contribute \$60 per month for artificial ice centres and \$30 per month for natural ice facilities for a period of five months. This certainly does not provide 25 per cent of the energy costs. I have been advised that this program has been discontinued as of January 1, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, there are also centres that have been forced into acquiring liquor licensed lounges in the rural areas to help meet commitments. This is causing a great deal of dissension between the local hotel owner and the recreation centres in the small towns during the winter months.

I have also been made aware that on February 1, 1979, there was an 11 per cent increase in the energy rates in the category these centres fall under. These are some of the main reasons why I have put this motion before this Assembly.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks, I would like to so move.

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, in supporting this motion I would like to remind all members of this legislature of the fact that a good portion of the members in this Assembly come from small communities and certainly they must be sensitive to the feelings of people in these communities. As you know, all these community halls and community rinks, particularly the rinks in the smaller towns, have been built with volunteer work and some grants. The volunteer work that goes on every winter in these communities, I think you know, is quite extensive and we couldn't keep operating without the volunteer help in these small communities. In order to provide the recreation and to keep these small towns viable, (and the government opposite preaches very heavily all the time that they want to maintain the small communities), the people in these communities have to have some relief on the power bills in the rinks during the winter time. I would urge every member to support this motion. I would urge the government opposite, particularly the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation (SPC) to take a serious look at aiding these people and maintaining these small communities.

**MR. C. WHITE (Regina Wascana):** — Mr. Speaker, it is my intent to amend the motion placed before the Assembly by the hon. member for Milestone for a number of reasons. A while ago, Mr. Speaker, while speaking on a motion by another member opposite, I had the occasion to remark that clarity of thought was not one of their outstanding

May 1, 1979

characteristics. On this occasion I think I must say that originality of thought is not one of their outstanding characteristics either.

The resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, might well be referred to as the Milestone resolution. Some years ago it was placed before this House in a slightly different form. In the present instance it is moved by the member for Milestone and in the previous instance, it was seconded by the member for Milestone.

When the resolution was first placed before this House, it was in somewhat more specific terms. It called, for example, for a better deal for curling rinks. For reasons unknown to me, the present member for Milestone (Mr. Pickering) has framed his motion in more general terms and added 'condemns' which seems to be a very popular word with the members opposite. So the first point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this is really a recycled resolution. That's not all. It's rather interesting and revealing but it's not an original Tory resolution recycled by a Tory, but it's an original Liberal resolution recycled by a Tory. I don't want to get into the debate as to whether or not there's any difference between Liberals and Tories. That's like debating the difference between a barrel and a bucket of stagnant water. The containers are different, the contents are the same. But I want to emphasize that recycling resolutions is certainly not demonstrating original thought.

While the member for Milestone and his colleague for Estevan (Mr. Larter) were speaking I had in my hand the speeches of the original Liberal mover and seconder. I was rather amused and interested by what was said. First of all, the member for Milestone didn't even have as much to say as the former mover and he really said nothing new. I really liked, I think, a portion of the original Liberal speakers, or one of the original Liberal speakers speech. He said this:

I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak to this resolution not only as a member of this Assembly, but also as an executive member of the Saskatchewan Curling Association.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to point out to the member for Milestone and his colleague, some of the things that have been done by the government and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation which are in line with the spirit of this resolution since the resolution was first placed before the House by Liberals. The present resolution speaks of demand metres. The SPC has been for some time, billing curling rinks and skating rinks on the basis of their highest monthly consumption rather than their highest annual demand. The result of the change of course was reduced energy bills for such establishments. For some years now, rinks that use part of their facilities, such as canteens or clubhouses during the off-season can convert from their usual rate structure to a lower commercial rate structure. This too, has meant savings for them. They can also, as in earlier years, be disconnected during the off-season and cut expenses in that way. And that's not all, Mr. Speaker.

In 1972, the Department of Culture and Youth implemented the Energy Assistance Grant program and this was designed (you mentioned that; that was good Bob) to help about 500 and some communities with skating and curling rinks this year alone. A variety of other government programs have also had a bearing on the provisions of an operation of recreational facilities in Saskatchewan communities. One need only mention the urban package of 1974 which included unconditional grants to urban municipalities and the revenue sharing program of the more recent past. Money provided to communities through these programs eases the financial burden on

people associated with community recreational facilities.

As near as I can determine, Mr. Speaker, since the occasion this resolution was first placed before this House, the rate charged for electricity has risen only 1 cent per kilowatt hour. A much more significant increase in costs has been the result of rises in natural gas prices. And we know who sets the price for natural gas — good old Tory Alberta out West.

The hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Pickering) has chosen to overlook a number of these developments when recycling the resolution. And why has he done so? The most charitable explanation I can offer, Mr. Speaker, is that in the course of a bonspiel he tripped over his broom, hit his head on the button and conveniently forgot everything he didn't want to remember.

While I am on my feet I want to say a few words about SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) rates and policies respecting recreational facilities such as curling rinks and arenas. I sincerely hope it will benefit the member for Milestone, (it would benefit the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter), but he is gone now) and the other gentlemen opposite.

The SPC presently applies the general service rate classification for both electricity and natural gas to curling and skating rinks. The specific category applied, general service 2, 3 or 4 depends on consumption. Rates are, of course, higher in rural areas as the costs of transmission facilities to provide service to those areas are higher.

Why has the SPC seen fit to apply this rate classification?

First of all, many community facilities are operated as business enterprises. For example, arenas and curling rinks charge annual fees or ice rentals and some of them charge admission charges too.

Secondly, capital costs incurred by the SPC for the installation of service for artificial ice facilities is much greater than for farm or residential hookups. For example, a three phase hookup for rinks requires two transformers. Costs are three to four times higher than for a hookup on a farm.

This being the case, the SPC must ensure that energy rates provide a reasonable return on the investment. I think the gentlemen opposite are aware of the importance of a proper return on an investment.

Another important reason for categorizing skating and curling rinks as general service customers is to achieve uniformity in rate application. Special consideration for curling rinks would lead to the same request from other organizations throughout the province, such as hospitals, schools, churches, swimming pools, customers with electric heat and so on. They would be asking for a special rate.

The objective of simplification and reduction of the number of rate structures would be destroyed. This would lead to higher administrative costs. And the gentlemen opposite should be aware of keeping administrative costs in line.

If special reduced rates are granted, the emphasis on conservation would become a secondary item for rink operation and maintenance staff. Subsidies or special rates destroy the incentive to conserve. For example, in Calgary, where the government

May 1, 1979

subsidizes private companies, the annual residential consumption of natural gas is 215,000 cubic feet compared with 185,000 cubic feet for the average residence in Regina. Temperatures are colder in Regina. It is quite obvious subsidies produce waste.

Finally, the SPC recognizes the seasonal operation of rinks and arenas and permits them to disconnect entirely during the summer months. Facilities do not have to pay a minimum bill during the shut-down period. If electrical service is required during the off-season the electrical rate charged is the lower rate applicable.

One last point. The Department of Culture and Youth is also presently offering a training course (and I believe the hon. member for Milestone mentioned that) for operators of recreational and curling facilities to improve their efficiency in the utilization of energy. Mr. Speaker, in the future, when the hon. members opposite recycle a resolution, I would urge them to do their homework and research matters properly. Therefore, I propose to move, seconded by the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Johnson), an amendment to the resolution:

That Resolution No. 18 be amended by deleting all words following Assembly in the first line and adding the following:

commends the government for its initiative taken to promote conservation and the wise use of energy, including the arena, rink and swimming pool operator's course, and for their consultative services to municipalities, providing expertise in how to build, renovate and improve the energy efficiency of recreational facilities, and

Be it further resolved that this Assembly commend the government for projects and programs designed to promote energy conservation such as the Saskatchewan Conservation House and the Warm Up Saskatchewan program.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — We're dealing with Resolution No. 18 to which an amendment has been offered, and deciding whether an amendment is in order is sometimes a difficult exercise. I think a person can look at the motion and the amendment, and if the debate which would follow from the motion or the amendment would be roughly the same, then it would be in order. But if the debate that would follow from the amendment is entirely different then it would have to be out of order. Now, keeping that in mind, the amendment which has been offered in its second part says:

Be it further resolved that this Assembly commend the government for projects and programs designed to promote energy conservation, such as Saskatchewan Conservation House and the Warm Up Saskatchewan program.

I feel that the debate that would result from that being in the motion is irrelevant to the motion which is being amended. Therefore, I'm going to declare the amendment out of order.

**MR. L.E. JOHNSON (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, the last speaker, the member for Regina Wascana (Mr. White), provided some information that I found very interesting. I would like to take some time and look it over again, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## RESOLUTION NO. 22

### GRAIN HANDLING AND TRANSPORTATION

**MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry)** moved, seconded by Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn)

That this Assembly urge the federal government to take positive action in dealing with the grain handling and transportation system in western Canada by: (1) implementing the Crowrate Guarantee Plan of the province of Saskatchewan; (2) ensuring adequate levels of service to the producer; (3) taking necessary steps to ensure the proper development at Prince Rupert, British Columbia, and Churchill, Manitoba for the export of western grain and other products; and (4) appointing a rail co-ordinator within the Canadian Wheat Board to co-ordinate the rail shipments of on-board grains.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to advance this motion. I think that all members will agree that it is a subject that is as important as any we will ever deal with in this Assembly.

The grain handling and transportation system of Western Canada has been an absolutely indispensable part of our agricultural economy ever since the prairies were first settled. It was a vast network of seaport terminals, railways and small prairie sidings that brought settlers into this vast plain, and it was that same network that allowed the homesteaders to ship their products to market.

Without an adequate transportation system in the future, Mr. Speaker, the agriculture sector of the Saskatchewan economy will be in severe trouble. We who are the second or third or even fourth generation descendants of the original homesteaders will begin to wish that our ancestors had never come to the Canadian prairies, and that is how important the grain handling and transportation system is to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time twenty million tonnes of grain a year leave the prairies for export. By 1985 a number of reputable agencies tell us that thirty million tonnes of grain will move off the prairies and into the world markets. Now that is good, Mr. Speaker. The increased sales will help our financially hard-pressed farmers and allow us to do our part in feeding a hungry world.

But what is not so good, Mr. Speaker, is that all the indicators at the present time point to the fact that we will not be able to assume our share of the world market or increase farm income or help feed the Third World and why? Why will we not be able to do these things, Mr. Speaker? All of them are very worth while. Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason is clear. The policies of the federal government will not allow us to do those kinds of things. Look at our grain handling and transportation system right now, Mr. Speaker. Look at the shape it is in. Delivery points are full to capacity, thanks to the inadequacies of the transportation system.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote, just briefly from the Thursday, August 24, 1978 edition of the Western Producer. This was a front page story and the headline read, 'Plugged Elevators Greet New Year.' The text of the story goes as follows, Mr. Speaker. I quote:

The country elevator system across western Canada is up to 95 per cent

May 1, 1979

congested as quotas open for the new crop year, according to grain company officials interviewed last week. While no exact figures are available, Neil Boughton, regional manager for Manitoba Pool elevators estimates his company would be about 95 per cent congested when the new year's quota came into effect August 21.

The situation is the same in Saskatchewan says Merv Ryan, manager of the country elevator system for the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. We have practically no storage space. It is congested throughout the country elevator system he said.

In Alberta 250 elevators were plugged July 31 and the situation hasn't improved much in August says Irvin Larkins of the Alberta Wheat Pool. He said farmers traditionally finish the crop year with a great grain delivery flourish but this year has been worse than usual. Deferred grain delivery permits aggravated an overloaded elevator system he said. The Canadian Wheat Board offered deferred delivery permits so farmers could haul grain on last year's quota past the July 31 deadline. Farmers could haul until August 21 when the new quotas came into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I read down to the point in the story to include the bit about the deferred delivery permits. Deferred delivery permits were the solution offered in the last crop year by the federal government to solve our transportation problems here on the prairies. What it amounted to was this, Mr. Speaker. It pushed the problems of the previous crop year ahead into this crop year and there is no answer at all.

Mr. Speaker, the front page story in the Western Producer was similar to stories in numerous other newspapers and farm publications throughout the summer and late last fall. Every elevator company was affected. The story from which I quoted goes on to say that the United Grain Growers and Pioneer Grain delivery points were just as plugged as those of the three pools.

What has been the effect at the other end of the system, Mr. Speaker? How has the inability of the railways and export terminals to move grain out of the country elevator system affected our sales in the international market?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is anyone left, outside of the federal government, the Tories and the railway companies, who thinks that the tie-ups in our grain handling and transportation system has not hurt our foreign sales of grain, I would refer them to recent statements by the Canadian Wheat Board Commissioner, Charles Gibbings, who was speaking at a district meeting in Weyburn, the first week in March. Mr. Gibbings had this to say about the effect our grain handling and transportation system has had on international sales of prairie grain. I will quote from the Leader Post story covering the meeting:

A total of three million tonnes in sales had to be deferred in the 1978 calendar year. The sales displaced cost western farmers nearly \$460 million. At least another two million tonnes in sales had to be turned down because the system could not handle the transport to export position, he said.

What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that if Canada had some better means of getting grain from the prairies to waiting ships at export terminals, we could have sold between 27



million tonnes and 28 million tonnes of grain in the export market last year instead of the 21.5 million tonnes which we did sell.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask all members to look at this situation. Farmers are producing more grain than ever before and the country elevator system is certainly the best means of handling that production. The Canadian Wheat Board could sell another 7 million tonnes of grain annually and in coming years much more than that. But in between the two, Mr. Speaker, between the prairie elevators and the ships waiting in line in our ports to take on the grain, is our grain handling and transportation system and it is that system which is costing western farmers at least \$460 million a year in lost sales.

Mr. Speaker, in the wording of this resolution are several suggestions as to how this current situation might be cleared up: suggestions like greater use of the ports of Churchill and Prince Rupert, which I want to spend a few minutes talking about now.

The port of Churchill, Mr. Speaker, as a grain exporting terminal, was developed in the early 1930s. Since that time a little over 600 million bushels have moved through that port. This is an average of 12.9 million bushels per year over the past five decades.

To be fair, Mr. Speaker, I do admit that the use of the Hudson's Bay Route has picked up to some extent recently. In the past ten years the total throughput has averaged 24 million bushels per year and a record year of 28.4 million bushels was handled in the 1976 shipping season. But we should look at these figures in the proper context. Mr. Speaker, 28.4 million bushels sounds like a lot of grain, but it is less than the grain storage capacity that will exist at Vancouver when expansion now under way is complete.

Greater grain movement through Churchill could have a number of advantages for farmers, Mr. Speaker. Grain producers receive a larger net return on grain sold through the port of Churchill than that sold via the St. Lawrence Seaway system. Rail freight rates to Churchill are significantly less than to Thunder Bay for hundreds of delivery points in northern and eastern Saskatchewan. The shorter routes should also mean more favorable turn around time for the railway equipment. The length of the shipping season could be extended at Churchill. Presently, the season runs from the third week of July to the second week of October and that has been the length of the shipping season since the mid-1950s. Just until recently, this winter as a matter of fact, we are informed that the Canadian Marine Insurers are willing to write insurance for Hudson's Bay at minimum rates from July 20 to October 31. Now, this will extend the season somewhat, something like 11 days and that's a small breakthrough in all of these years.

Now, many technological changes have taken place since the late 1950s. Ice forecasting and satellite weather information is now very advanced. Ships have improved their radio equipment, their sonar and radar equipment as well. Even without the use of icebreakers, the season at Churchill could be considerably extended. Mr. Speaker, Churchill is approximately the same distance from Great Britain as Montreal. The CN rail line to Churchill is just over 500 miles from the nearest prairie elevator, a great deal less than the shipping route through the Great Lakes. Clearly, Churchill is an export port for prairie grain that should be used to a much greater extent than it is at present and the reason it is not used, Mr. Speaker, is the policy of neglect of successive Tory and Liberal federal governments.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BANDA:** — At Churchill, Mr. Speaker, a decision is required with respect to the Herchmer subdivision, either reconstruct it or dedicate a complete fleet of boxcars for use exclusively to service that port. However, it's my opinion that a long-term plan should be the upgrading to handle all cars and that it should be done immediately. Estimates are that double the current movement through Churchill could already be achieved if sufficient will was there to do it, insurance changes, more orders and use of modern marine technology; with these changes and with the rail line issue resolved and with some modernization of the plant, Churchill could assume a stable and significant long-term place in Canadian grain exports.

However, Mr. Speaker, on July 21, when a special train was run from Churchill to Gilam to view the Herchmer sub, Mr. Hansen, the vice-president of CN made it known to all of those aboard that his organization had no intention of spending money on the line and all moneys would have to come from the federal government. With that attitude, we know the railroad's position and farmers know and that's not new. A federal commitment is needed badly in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the Prairie Rail Action Committee report is a deterrent to better utilization of that port and I use the example of the abandonment, proposed abandonment of the CN Kelvington-Preeceville section as recommended by the Prairie Rail Action Committee which would cut off access to Churchill for a large volume of grain unless CP would agree to haul it, and CP has strongly opposed this position in the past. Mr. Speaker, much the same situation exists at Prince Rupert. Of the 8.4 million tonnes of grain exported through the West Coast in the last crop year, 7.6 million tonnes went through Vancouver. The remaining 800,000 tonnes was exported via Prince Rupert. When you look at the situation on the West Coast, Mr. Speaker, you are struck by the similarities between there and the Lakehead. Like the seaway, Vancouver is where the federal government spends the money and directs the export grain. Like Churchill, Prince Rupert has been neglected.

The Vancouver terminal storage has been increased by almost 10 million bushels. That will mean Vancouver will be able to ship 10.5 million tonnes of grain a year in the near future. That is the capacity they will have, Mr. Speaker, despite the almost legendary rail bottlenecks in the lower mainland of British Columbia.

Why has the federal government not acted on the requests of the Canadian Wheat Board to build a major expansion of facilities at Prince Rupert where the rail and port traffic is a fraction of that in and around the Vancouver docks? The size of the facility the board is pushing for is dictated by projected export requirements. As I said earlier, Canada's future for grain sales looks bright and an ever-increasing amount of our exported grain is likely to move west to the Pacific Rim and Asia. The time to expand facilities at Prince Rupert is now so that we can handle 5 million or 6 million tonnes of grain which the wheat board predicts will have to be moved through the port annually by 1985 or the 9 million to 10 million tonnes the board estimates will move through Prince Rupert by 1990.

Mr. Speaker, another important part of this resolution is that having to do with the appointment of a rail co-ordinator within the Canadian Wheat Board. We will all remember the findings of a group of farmers, belonging to the National Farmers Union (NFU) (and I know the members opposite like this group) when they looked into the grain-hauling system last fall. They found more than 1,200 boxcars carrying work orders sitting on sidings around the countryside, some for as long as four years. All that was needed, in some cases, was to put the boxcars back into service by a minor repair

or a thorough cleaning. Yet they sat on sidings for months on end and, as I said, in some cases as long as four years. This was occurring at the very same time our country elevator system was plugged to the rafters. The NFU members also found boxcars and hopper cars held up at delivery points from eight days to three weeks waiting for a train to pick them up. Again, Mr. Speaker, remember these NFU farmers were conducting their survey in the last week of August, 1978. At the time our delivery points could not accept any more deliveries of grain because they were full to the shingles.

The survey also found a sizable quantity of Canadian railway rolling stock in the United States. Mr. Speaker, that is an average of three Canadian boxcars for every mile of track surveyed, rolling stock that could have been used here in Canada except for the fact that the railway companies can charge three or four times as much hauling U.S. grain on Canadian rail lines because American farmers do not have the protection of the Crow's Nest Pass freight rates.

Mr. Speaker, I repeated the findings of those Saskatchewan farmers to demonstrate the kind of job the railway companies are doing in co-ordinating their grain-hauling equipment. It is quite apparent that the railways are not the ones seeing to it that the rolling stock and locomotive power our two national railways have is most effectively employed in moving prairie grain.

A rail co-ordinator within the wheat board with enough power to force the railways to act would be a step forward in moving to correct the abuses I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the reduction in demurrage charges alone would pay the staff salaries a thousand times over.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of a rail co-ordinator, together with other improvements to our grain handling and transportation system which I described earlier, would go a long way towards correcting the present disastrous and tangled mess. To do other than act on some of these proposals will mean that the federal government is robbing western farmers of millions of dollars of future grain sales.

Adequate levels of service have to be provided to the producer. At present, a yearly volume of about 21 million tonnes seems to be the maximum quantity the system is capable of moving into exports. Considering the projected rate of growth in grain exports and the rate at which box cars are going out of service, there would be a shortfall of over 15,000 grain cars by 1985, resulting in an export loss of between 10 to 14 million tonnes. An export loss of this magnitude has enormous economic implications for the three prairie provinces and for Canada's balance of payments.

Assuming a price of \$200 per tonne in 1985, which doesn't seem unreasonable, the loss to the prairie economy would be between \$2 billion and \$2.8 billion. With Saskatchewan's share of grain exports around 56 per cent, the loss would be between \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion annually to Saskatchewan farmers. This does not take into account any multiplier effect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the wheat board says it can market 30 million tonnes by 1985 and there is general agreement that farmers in the Canadian Wheat Board area can meet that target through reduced summer fallow, increased fertilizer usage, higher yielding varieties and improved farm management practices and so on. The golden opportunity however, will be lost unless steps are taken now to deliver the kind of grain delivery system to meet the grain export demands of today and the 1980s.

May 1, 1979

Farmers can and will produce the additional quantities providing they are sure they can deliver their grain and of course, receive a fair price. As a part of a national transportation policy it is the responsibility of the federal government and the railways to provide the adequate trackage and rolling stock to enable western farmers to take maximum advantage of expanding world grain markets.

This is particularly so since there are not practical alternative modes for transporting grain, in effect, making farmers captive to the railroads. The branch line system to support the elevators must also remain in place. Maintenance throughout the years would have averted much more costly repair work now.

I believe that the greatest long-term social and economic benefits can be derived from a branch line/country elevator system for grain collection. Increasing the capacity for grain handling by rail means effecting a complex series of cause and effect relationships.

More movement requires putting more trains through in a day. Putting more trains through in a day requires that each train moves faster. In order for trains to move faster, particularly in the mountains, grades need to be less steep, curves need to be more gradual, and tracks need to be in better condition. Some solution must be found for delays caused by trains meeting each other. And some solution must be found to blockages caused by the increase in maintenance crews and the increase in movement that has made necessary.

Increasing rail capacity means moving more cars on the same trains, moving larger cars rather than smaller ones to increase tonnage, and that means more horsepower.

Increasing rail capacity means including a margin for natural disasters in physical facilities. The storms will occur, but there must be sufficient capacity in the overall system that they do not dictate the difference between being able to move desired quantities and not being able to, over the period of a year.

The increased rail capacity means not one improvement but a series of improvements costing a lot of money. Our government is prepared to put some moneys into a plan to help a part of that problem — a guaranteed Crowrate plan — and my colleague from Weyburn will be elaborating more in this area.

Mr. Speaker, we need a federal government with a commitment attitude, not a blame-the-other-fellow attitude. Mr. Speaker, I've covered a number of areas and I hope members opposite will support this resolution.

I was thoroughly disappointed to read the Leader Post of Wednesday, March 28, 1979, in which a report was given on the western premiers' conference at Prince George. And, Mr. Speaker, the great Tory tradition came home to rest, by the report on Premier Lyon's statement made at that conference. I'll quote from that article. This is the article that was written, and I quote:

But, trying to take a universal approach to the complex problem, Manitoba left the door open for changes in the statutory rate structure, didn't emphatically condone the Prairie Rail Action Committee report on rail line abandonment and mentioned possible highway transfer of grain, which would suggest possible inland terminals.

Lyon insists that he said nothing that was new, or hadn't been said by grain producers in Manitoba before, and didn't think it would create any problems for Progressive Conservative candidates in the federal campaign.

He's probably suffering under a bad misconception.

Well, Mr. Speaker, was Mr. Lyon truly stating Tory policy? I believe he was. I think this attitude is deplorable.

Mr. Speaker, I read articles like the April 12, 1979 edition of The Western Producer. Here is the headline: Crow Fix-up Group Takes the Case to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to just quote a few of the comments made in here, because I think it is very interesting, and I quote:

Promoters of a plan to change the statutory freight rates on grain movement quietly took their case to the federal government officials last week.

Then it goes on to state:

We want to start getting an understanding here, said the producer official, who asked not to be named. He said a planned meeting with the caucuses of the Liberals and Progressive Conservatives had to be cancelled because of the election. So the pitch to the politicians will have to wait until May 22.

And I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker. Further down another interesting little writing here, and I'll quote again. I quote:

The attempt to develop a plan to change the Crow's Nest Pass freight rate system has been couched in secrecy since it began last winter with a series of private meetings involving some producers, some processors, some politicians, some cattlemen and senior officials of the railways.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Tories and Liberals say one thing and do exactly the opposite. Federal candidates, on numerous occasions in this election, are standing up at public meetings and saying that they are supporting the crowrate if producers want it. Then they turn around and have secret meetings on what they're going to do with the crowrate as soon as the federal election is over.

Mr. Speaker, the entire national transportation policy, encompassing not only the implications which underlie the possible loss of statutory grain rates, but the possible abandonment of thousands of miles of branch lines have far-reaching implications toward the economical viability of thousands of farmers in rural communities in this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I move this resolution, I hope that the people of Saskatchewan will really assess the old-line party policies in this area, and if they do, they'll elect an NDP government into Ottawa on May 22.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BANDA:** — If they assess the facts, Mr. Speaker, they'll elect an NDP government

May 1, 1979

on the 22nd which will implement the parts of the resolution that I'm going to move. I know that the people of Saskatchewan will be interested. I know that members opposite will be listening to hear what their comments are and whether they will support this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker I move Resolution No. 22.

**MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to second the motion of my colleague, the member for Redberry (Mr. Banda), and I'd like to compliment him on his presentation in moving the motion.

The subject matter of the resolution before us has received considerable discussion in Saskatchewan over the years, both in these Chambers and outside these Chambers, and I might say that the spokesmen of the political party that sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, whether they were at the provincial or federal level, have over the years made the New Democratic position abundantly clear, and that position has been consistent.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think members of both sides would agree that, of those making the case for a decent transportation system for Saskatchewan farmers, one of the most powerful spokesmen we have had is the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy), our Minister of Municipal Affairs in charge of transportation.

We on this side, Mr. Speaker, have taken the position that our transportation system ought to be an instrument of national policy in this country. If it is to be such an instrument, and at the same time be effectively used as such, it is not rational to expect the system to have profit instead of service as its primary objective.

In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, we could probably look at every mode of transportation we have in this country and find that if it weren't for the public subsidies, either stated or hidden, if it weren't for such public outlay of capital, none of the different modes would show a profit in the usual sense.

By way of example, I think it would be fair to say that the air transport business probably wouldn't turn a profit if it had to finance airport construction, maintenance and operations.

Our trucking industry, Mr. Speaker, would probably have a great deal of difficulty remaining competitive with other modes of transport if fuel taxes were closely related to and financed anywhere near the full cost of highway and road construction and maintenance.

I wouldn't want my remarks to be interpreted as somehow depreciating the contribution made to our transportation system by the air carrier and the trucking industry, far from it. Both of these modes have advantages of speed and convenience in moving people and goods about.

What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that somehow the idea has got into people's minds that it's only our rail system that's at issue here and that it's only our rail system which is involved in public subsidization.

I think it could be established that this is a wrong idea, though I don't propose to go into it at length. What is important to realize however is that we would get a radically

different analysis and set of proposed solutions if we took the view that transportation was, in fact, an instrument of our national policy and if, as a country, we were prepared to act on that belief.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want, this afternoon, to comment in a little more detail in regard to our crowrate guaranteed plan for western Canada.

It is a fact that the major markets for our agricultural products will be in other parts of the nation and the world. The prairie provinces have five million people; the rest of Canada has 15 million. We are a country of 20 million in a world of four billion. Obviously, the real market for our products which we can produce with such quality and quantity is not our market here at home but is the market outside of Canada.

The export of our agricultural products is not only of great benefit to our primary producers but it is of benefit to our entire country. One only has to consider the positive impact on our balance of trade situation to appreciate this point of view. Because of the national benefits, members on this side think it is not unreasonable to expect the entire country, through our transportation policy, to see to it that our products remain competitive on the international as well as the domestic market.

For this reason, among others, we believe the costs of putting our products in export positions ought to be shared by all Canadians just as all Canadians in many cases pay a premium for many domestically produced manufactured goods because of protective tariffs. That is why members on this side take the view that the crowrate for moving our products is not some handout for which we should be grateful but rather part of a deal called confederation.

Now, some will argue that the problem for secondary industry in western Canada is the crowrate. We say the question should be viewed from the opposite perspective, for the reasons I have already outlined. We take the view that if rates for our agricultural products, including refined agricultural, were tied to the crowrate our competitive edge in international markets, Mr. Speaker, for these other products would be as solidly established as it has been for wheat and other cereal crops.

Now furthermore, if you accept the concept that the crowrate is a legitimate part of the confederation deal, it is difficult to imagine why it should only apply to a limited list of raw products and not to these same products in a refined state. Surely the arguments for moving rapeseed at crow, apply to moving the refined product at crow as well. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the refined product really ought to be more attractive to move from the railway's point of view since a good deal of the bulk is removed and only the marketable part of the product is being shipped.

The only argument against moving the refined product at crow is the notion that too many Eastern politicians still have, that western Canada is a hinterland and that Canadians in general and western Canadians more particularly should remain as hewers of wood and drawers of water. That argument, Mr. Speaker, we here reject.

Mr. Justice Hall in his report recommended that the benefits of the crow be extended to more agricultural products to allow development of secondary agricultural industry in western Canada. Our government has indicated it is committed to do everything it can to hasten and facilitate the implementation of Hall, including this aspect. We are aware of the jurisdictional limits to provincial government involvement but we have said that we are prepared to co-operate with the federal government to implement such a plan.

May 1, 1979

Certain parts of the proposal only the federal government can do. They must guarantee crow to the producers and the railways must be compensated for grain movement. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that we get these kinds of guarantees from the minister in charge, Mr. Lang, only during election campaigns and nothing in between.

The federal government must act to give the Canadian Wheat Board a stronger hand in co-ordinating grain movement as recommended by Hall. Here again it is unfortunate Mr. Lang's response was not to act and implement Hall. Instead he hired a consulting firm IBI of Toronto, if you remember, to study the inland grain gathering system and the operations of export ports, as though these things hadn't already been studied to death before. He hired Booz, Allan and Hamilton another American firm to investigate the rail-car allocation system, as though this too hasn't already been studied at length.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, among those things the federal government could do, they must arrange to have products in addition to grain moved at the crowrate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our government has said that if the federal government would act on these three points, instead of procrastinating, this provincial government would accept the responsibility for providing the rails with compensation on the movement of rape seed products, alfalfa, dehydration products and processed specialty crops such as peas and lentils. We have, in effect, Mr. Speaker, said implement Hall and we will provide compensation in the case of the third point made by Hall.

Mr. Speaker, in this year's budget there is provided \$3 million because we mean business to do it. We mean business because if the crowrate guaranteed plan were implemented it would mean they wouldn't have to worry about the crowrate being checked out and with it the future of our rural elevator system placed in jeopardy. It would mean farmers wouldn't have to worry about the \$150 million that would be coming out of their pockets if the crowrate were checked out. It would also mean that many producers could take advantage of diversification in their crops thereby increasing prospects for a more healthy and stable return on their operations.

For the secondary agricultural industry, which we could develop, the guarantee that processed products could move to export positions at rates competitive with the raw product, would mean opportunities to set up operations at the source of supply of the raw products. And for possibly hundreds of Saskatchewan young people, this would mean jobs, Mr. Speaker, here at home instead of seeing them exported abroad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are good reasons why producers, industry spokesmen and others in Saskatchewan, have reacted favorably to our crowrate guarantee plan when it has been explained to them.

At the present time we have less than a lame duck government in Ottawa because there is an election campaign finally in progress. Now, this campaign, Mr. Speaker, might provide Saskatchewan people with just the opportunity to wring some commitments from those people who are going to be making decisions in Ottawa (or not making them as the case may be). We ought to use this opportunity and demand that spokesmen for each of the parties state, in unequivocal terms, where they stand on these recommendations of Hall. What we don't want or need to hear is that they will promise more studies. I say, of those we have had enough. What the situation demands is decisions and actions. We are entitled to know whether or not these Hall recommendations and our offer in the guarantee plan have the support of the parties asking for the public support.



Mr. Speaker, I know what the answer will be from a party at the federal level. Our position is already on the record. Perhaps what we need after May 22 is another government at Ottawa that depends on votes from the New Democratic Party caucus for its survival. I can assure you that this proposal would be part of a shopping list. Perhaps only then, just as with medicare and with indexed old age pensions, would we get some action instead of stalling and studying. It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that this is exactly what it will take.

My colleague, the member for Redberry (Mr. Banda) has given many good reasons why this resolution deserves the support of all members of this Assembly. I hope, too, Mr. Speaker, that I have been able to show good cause why we should accept this resolution now. Therefore, it gives me considerable pleasure to second the motion and I ask all members to bring it to a speedy and positive vote.

**MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, prior to adjourning debate on this motion I wish to say a couple of words.

First of all, at the member for Redberry (Mr. Banda) I think, perhaps, this House has seen the next Minister of Agriculture coming forward, eh? Fantastic deliver of this particular program. I have a few more things to say about the program. The other thing, the member for Redberry (Mr. Banda) elevates the position of agriculture in this House to the highest position. Quoting from what he says:

This is the most important, the most important motion ever discussed in the Assembly for many years.  
Above medicare, above mineral resources development.

People of rural Saskatchewan are with you on that particular position. I question whether it's quite that important though with your colleagues. Now this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, could quite easily have been made by a member from this side of the House, as it relates to developing the crowrate plan, as a base to implementing a co-ordinator for the transportation problems . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We're talking about implementation of the crowrate guarantee plan. I read from the newspaper:

National unity depends on a viable east-west trade and the statutory Crow's Nest freight rate is a major economic incentive encouraging such trade. Therefore, the crowrate should be retained and even increased with taxpayers absorbing the difference.

Pretty good stuff. He went on to say:

Inflation has caused the operating costs to rise far beyond what they were when the rate was set and increase their need to let the companies upgrade lines and buy new equipment. However, because the benefit of the crowrate ripples through the economy benefiting all, the increase should be paid by the public purse rather than by the farmer.

Sounds like Allan Blakeney. January 25, 1978. Speaker, Dr. Grant Devine, University of Saskatchewan.

That is where the crowrate guarantee plan came from. You didn't invent the crowrate

May 1, 1979

guarantee plan. There's where the program is, so what do we say about the crowrate guarantee plan? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The estimates for this year, \$3 million; \$3 million knowing full well this is our program, but if these other guys go along with it, and they go along with it, the \$3 million will never be spent this year or next year, because you tie it to too many conditions. Why don't you take some leadership? Why don't you go out and spend some of that \$3 million and help supplement the crowrate so that we do attract some secondary, more secondary industry to this province?

Now we want to co-ordinate transportation. I'll tell you the one political party in this federal election campaign that is advocating a co-ordinator to insure that the transportation problem will be put into better stead, is the Progressive Conservative party, not the NDP party. We advocate that the Canadian Wheat Board should be going out and selling the . . . go out and sell some grain to the Canadian Wheat Board. And the transportation system under the Department of Transport should be looking at co-ordinating that program. Co-ordinating car programs. Now the hon. member for Redberry talks about how we're going to help out Prince Rupert, develop the Prince Rupert port. I don't see the provincial government doing very much to help out Prince Rupert. The province of Alberta is on record, \$100 million to assist a conglomerate, a group of companies . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's a loan!

**MR. ANDREW:** — I said that it was a loan. How much are you going to lend him? Why don't you lend him support? You wouldn't give him anything. You're not even giving him your support.

So, we say we want to proceed with Prince Rupert and it's probably going to be the provinces of western Canada that take the initiative to proceed with Prince Rupert. It certainly is not going to be Otto Lang (federal Minister of Transportation) who proceeds that way. It's not going to be Broadbent (federal New Democratic Party Leader). Well, what's he got to do with it? He's not in the race anyway.

Now we come to developing a total. I see the member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) wearing a badge which says, the perfect union. I see a minority government the perfect union — NDP and Trudeau. When we have some problems on the west coast where the ships are shut down because of labor tie-ups, where is the member here going to stand — exactly where the NDP stood between 1972 and 1974. You can't interfere with that. Ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding), he spoke against it. Some perfect union! That's the perfect union, as we come to the end in this election campaign. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) states the NDP's position — minority government, we're going with Trudeau. One of our conditions of course, is that we would have to have Trudeau step down.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — We're going to win it!

**MR. ANDREW:** — You're going to win! Trudeau has to step down and as the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) says, who are we going to replace him with?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I seem to have lost the member on the debate. I was following the debate on Resolution No. 22 and apparently, the member strayed from the debate.

**MR. ANDREW:** — To expedite matters, Mr. Speaker, on this, I'm sure there are other

members of this House who would also like to speak on this motion. At this point in time, I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### **BILL NO. 02 — AN ACT TO REPEAL AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE CANADIAN CO-OPERATIVE IMPLEMENTS LIMITED**

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **BILL NO. 03 — AN ACT TO AMEND AND CONSOLIDATE AN ACT RESPECTING SASKATCHEWAN CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY LIMITED AND SASKATCHEWAN CO-OPERATIVE FINANCIAL SERVICES LIMITED**

Sections 1 to 36 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **BILL NO. 04 — AN ACT TO CHANGE THE NAME OF NORFOLK TRUST**

Sections 1 to 4 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **BILL NO. 05 — AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF PROPERTY OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF CANADA SASKATCHEWAN PROVINCIAL COUNCIL**

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The committee reported progress.

## SECOND READINGS

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved second reading of Bill No. 104 — **An Act to amend The Vehicles Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, my concern regarding The Vehicles Act I've expressed on numerous occasions in this House. It has to do with the section of The Vehicles Act that pertains to the school buses. The section is section 152 and it reads as follows:

Section 152(1). The driver of a school bus equipped as provided by subsection 123(21) shall, unless driving on a public highway with a posted limit of 55 kilometres, which is 34.18 miles per hour or less (and it goes on to say) . . . activate the flashing lights when stopping for the purpose of loading and unloading school children at least 350 feet before the point of loading or unloading.

May 1, 1979

Now, my concern is this. I feel the matter of loading or unloading school children is of prime importance to us in Saskatchewan. I feel that we have had incidents of near loss of life and I think it would be foolish to think that there couldn't be loss of life in situations such as this. I pointed out that the laws and regulations enforcing the loading and unloading of school buses are not adhered to as strictly as they should be. I have seen incidents and many incidents throughout this province where school buses unload children in a manner that is against the law; they go across in front of that bus and over towards their school grounds. Also, if we are driving on the public roads we often see again, the children must cross in front of the bus.

I feel we, in our society, should not be in such a rush we have to be concerned about holding up traffic for a few moments for the safety of the life of a small child, especially in this International Year of the Child. I think it is time we in Saskatchewan, and as legislators in this province, took a serious look at this. My feeling is that if by changing this law, we could save the life of one child, it would be well worth the change.

I feel there are perhaps a few buses that do bus in the urban centres. I have checked into this and it is about 10 per cent of our school buses. I don't think the matter of loading or unloading children is going to take that long a period of time. I feel, as I have said before, that the people who are driving our buses for young people in Saskatchewan are, in the main, very responsible and conscientious people. I don't think they would be activating those lights in such a way as to tie up traffic or be of a hindrance to the motorists of Saskatchewan. I think we should be taking a serious look at this and I urge this Assembly to support this amendment to The Vehicles Act, by which the lights on school buses would be activated at all times, regardless of the speed zone in which students are being loaded or unloaded from our school buses. Mr. Speaker, I so move.

**MR. J. GARNER (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to rise on Bill No. 104. I think it is a very, very important issue to be dealt with in this House and to be dealt with before we leave this House. Hopefully, the members opposite will join with us and this bill can pass through. I believe it is time for us to start putting children's lives first, speeding and people being in a hurry to get from point A to point B, second.

If we don't protect the lives of these small children, who is going to? This is a very personal issue with me because there was an accident in my constituency. If the law had been as we're proposing it to be right now, maybe that accident would not have taken place. Maybe a little girl wouldn't have to go through a lot of pain and suffering. What we're asking this House here today on this bill is nothing outrageous. It's not going to cost any money. It's just a matter of amending The Vehicles Act.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan want this. I believe they should have it and have the protection for their children riding buses all over Saskatchewan. I am very pleased to second this motion.

**MR. R.G. LONG (Cut Knife-Lloydminster):** — Mr. Speaker, just a few words regarding this motion.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Stand up, Bob. Don't hide behind your desk.

**MR. LONG:** — Come over and stand beside me, Colin.

Mr. Speaker, I tend to support many of the aspects that have been mentioned in this motion. I think there are a number of good points that have been made by the

opposition, but there are a few other things that should be said about this motion and at this time, I would like to possibly comment on it later. I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski (Minister of Health) that Bill No. 69 — **An Act to provide for Community Health Units** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski (Minister of Health) that Bill No. 84 — **An Act to establish the Saskatchewan Cancer Foundation** be now read a second time.

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this particular bill. In general, I have to say I support the principle of the bill, but I question the sincerity of the government in bringing the bill forward. I have a news release here dated December 7, 1978, in which the minister indicates that he's going to establish the cancer foundation. He says, I have initiated consultations with interested organizations in preparation for the presentation of the legislation in the Legislative Assembly.

Unfortunately, I have had a hard time finding anyone he has solicited input from. Dr. Watson indicated that such a foundation should be formed with the advice of interested consumer properly constituted groups. Yet, Mr. Speaker, since at least February 23 of last year, there has been at least one particular group that I'm aware of, and it's called the Cancer Lifeline Group from Saskatoon, that has been trying to set up meetings with the Premier (Mr. Blakeney), and with the Minister of Health (Mr. Tchorzewski), etc. to try and have some input into this legislation. They have been denied this input at almost every turn. Only recently, I think, did they in fact get a meeting with the Minister of Health and, from my understanding, the meeting, you know, was a day late and a dollar short. There was no real input provided through that meeting.

In talking with the Saskatchewan Medical Association, they're going to give their support to the bill only because it's better than nothing. It's a step in the right direction, but it really doesn't provide for the autonomy that Dr. Watson says is imperative for the foundation to function properly. That has been the only group I have found that has any input into the legislation and, of course, the input wasn't listened to in any case.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the minister wasn't just flirting with the people of Saskatchewan when he said, I have initiated consultations with interested organizations in preparation for the legislation, so when second reading is voted on I'm going to be moving a motion to allow the minister to have those inputs properly provided.

There are several concerns that I have as it relates to specifics in the bill, which shall be

May 1, 1979

dealt with in that committee, or whatever committee the House deems the bill should go to. With those few brief comments, Mr. Speaker, I will indicate to the House we support the bill in principle. However, we are not satisfied that the minister properly solicited input for the legislation as recommended by Dr. Watson and as indicated was going to happen by the Minister of Health.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 46**

Pepper	Kaeding	White
Dyck	Feschuk	Larter
Bowerman	McArthur	Berntson
Smishek	Johnson	Katzman
Romanow	Allen	Swan
Snyder	Vickar	Thatcher
Kramer	Rolfes	Taylor
Baker	Cody	Ham
Skoberg	Lusney	Pickering
Kowalchuk	Long	McLeod
Matsalla	Gross	Andrew
Robbins	Nelson	Duncan
MacMurchy	Thompson	Garner
Mostoway	Engel	Muirhead
Banda	Poniatowski	Rousseau
Whelan		

**NAYS — Nil**

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) that:

Bill No. 84 be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, maybe this is a . . . maybe indeed I have been outsmarted but I would like to know what rule this is by. A motion usually is done before the bill be read a second time. The mover gets up and says that this bill be not now read a second time, but be referred to law reform etc. etc. The business of the day is ordered by the government. We've done with the bill. We're moving on to the next item.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — You are both wrong. What the Attorney General is referring to is a motion of referral which is quite in order at that time, but that is not what we are dealing with at this time. The member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) is out of order because the Clerk has to declare second reading and then I have to say — when shall this bill be dealt with in committee and then the member would be in order. At this point the member for Souris-Cannington, I believe, is out of order.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry . . .

**MR. THATCHER:** — Roy, you have been hooked, just take it like a man.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I may be hooked all right but I want to know what precedent is being set here. Is Mr. Speaker saying that when Mr. Speaker asks (which by the way I am not saying is wrong, but the first time in my 12 years in this House) that when Mr. Speaker asks, on a government bill — when shall the bill be read in committee, that anybody — opposition or government — can introduce a motion relevant to that? If so, I would be appreciative if Mr. Speaker would give me the appropriate rules and/or Beauchesne's quotes to allow that, because I have never had that in 12 years.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I will supply that to the Attorney General, very quickly, I hope.

Order, order! I refer all members to rule No. 52. The marginal note says, readings before committal.

Every bill shall be read twice in the Assembly before committal or amendment.

That is the position we are at now and this is before committal to a committee. The Attorney General asked if this procedure is used or if there is any precedent for it. If the Attorney General will just go back to page 10 of the blues, where it says second readings, Bill No. 105. Now, if that bill had been dealt with today, it may have been referred to a committee other than Committee of the Whole. It is quite likely that that bill would have professional bills dealing with the professions and would have been referred to a committee other than Committee of the Whole by a motion of the member piloting the bill.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — On public bills, yes. It's not a government bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I agree with the Attorney General that this is not used very often. However, the mechanism is there and there is no rule prohibiting a member rising and moving that it be sent to a certain committee. If the members of the Assembly do not like that direction that the bill is being directed to, they can vote against it and defeat it. If in fact it is the will of the House that it go to that committee, then it would, obviously, pass and would go to that committee. That is something the members have to decide among themselves at this time.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Rule 38 says the following:

Forty-eight hours notice shall be given of a motion for first reading of a bill, resolution or address for the appointment of any committee or for the placing of a question on the order paper, but this shall not apply to public bills after their introduction (that is the example you gave, a public bill) or to private bills (which is also now applicable here), or to the times of meetings, or adjournment of the Assembly. Such notices shall be laid on the table and be printed in the Votes and Proceedings of that day.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we would be left in the ludicrous position where virtually every other motion requires a pink 48-hour notice — government motions, bills, government bills. Everything is 48 hours in notice except that a private member can get up on a government bill without notice at all and move a substantive resolution. Surely, that

May 1, 1979

can't be the position of the House. I say, Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any precedent in the last 12 years that that has ever happened.

If that is the case, then with all due respect to the governance of the House any member at all can simply say, well I am not going to give 48 hours notice, I'll move any motion that I want. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to reconsider that motion and to perhaps hold this motion in abeyance until you consider all the aspects of the ruling, because this will be an important precedent which you are setting.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Since this is a subject which is not very seldom touched on, I will ask the members at this point if there are any further comments on the point of order? I want the members to understand that once I reserve decision on it I won't take any more comments on the point of order. I'll ask the members now if they wish to make any further comments on the point of order?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, may I make a suggestion? It is 4:40, could we agree by agreement of the House to revert back to this bill to hear Your Honour's ruling after the supper hour, and that way we could at least get Committee of Finance started and it would give everybody a little more time, because I think it is a unique point? Can we keep it going? I am not worried about the motion, but I am worried about the procedure, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — This is a public bill, Bill No. 84, and the rule which the Attorney General referred to is Rule No. 38. What Rule No. 38 does is exclude public bills, if it is read properly. I will just go over the rule again:

Forty-eight hours notice shall be given on a motion for first reading of a bill (and that's what this is), resolutions, address, or for the appointment of committee, or for placing the question on the order paper, but this shall not apply to public bills after their introduction.

This is a public bill and it has been introduced. Therefore, the rule cannot apply to this, so I take it that the motion is about to be made.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) that:

Bill No. 84 be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

#### YEAS — 15

Larter  
Berntson  
Katzman  
Swan  
Thatcher

Taylor  
Lane  
Ham  
Pickering  
McLeod

Andrew  
Duncan  
Garner  
Muirhead  
Rousseau



## NAYS — 32

Pepper	MacMurchy	Cody
Dyck	Mostoway	Lusney
Bowerman	Banda	Prebble
Smishek	Whelan	Long
Romanow	Kaeding	Gross
Snyder	Feschuk	Nelson
Baker	McArthur	Thompson
Skoberg	Johnson	Engel
Kowalchuk	Allen	Poniatowski
Matsalla	Vickar	White
Robbins	Rolfes	

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski (Minister of Health) that Bill No. 97 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. BERTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, this is just barely more than a nothing bill. Sections 1 and 2, of course, are just procedural things. Section 3, as I understand it, is just to clarify something where the only place there was any confusion was in the Department of Health. Everyone else understood it perfectly. Section 4 is to provide for an approved form.

The doctors have to use an approved form on mode 3 billing so that patients can in turn collect from MCIC (Medical Care Insurance Commission). The minister has indicated to SMA (Saskatchewan Medical Association) that this will not be proclaimed at this time. All I can see happening here is an additional overhead expense for the doctors in Saskatchewan, putting them further behind the eight ball than you already have them. Since the minister has indicated that he just wants it on the books, he's not going to proclaim it till he needs it, I wonder if he's just not using it for a tool to further hammer the doctors and further deny them mode 3 billing.

It's really a nothing bill except for that. I don't think the doctors have any particular strong feelings. Had they been asked to do it instead of just hammered with this silly little bill, they probably would have done it. Since somebody decides that the clarification was necessary, we'll probably support the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time on the following recorded division.

## YEAS — 45

Pepper	Kaeding	Poniatowski
Dyck	Feschuk	White
Bowerman	McArthur	Larter
Smishek	Johnson	Berntson
Romanow	Allen	Katzman
Messer	Vickar	Swan
Snyder	Rolfes	Taylor
Skoberg	Cody	Lane

May 1, 1979

Kowalchuk  
Matsalla  
Robbins  
MacMurchy  
Mostoway  
Banda  
Whelan

Lusney  
Prebble  
Long  
Gross  
Nelson  
Thompson  
Engel

Ham  
Pickering  
McLeod  
Andrew  
Duncan  
Garner  
Rousseau

**NAYS — Nil**

The Assembly recessed from 5 to 7 o'clock.