

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 11, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Order of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): – Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to the members of the legislature, 45 Grades 5 and 6 students from McCannel School. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Don McDougall, Mr. Wayne Wilson and Ms. Betty Smale. I will be meeting with the students after question period and I'm sure that all members on both sides of the House will join with me in wishing them a pleasant afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Regina Lakeview): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. member for Regina South in welcoming the students from McCannel School. I hope you have an enjoyable day here in the legislature and I also look forward to meeting with you a little later.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melville): – Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I take the opportunity to introduce a group of 44 students from Melville's St. Henry's School. On this stormy day, I've got to congratulate them for taking the opportunity to visit this legislature. There are 44 Grade 8 students and they're here with their teacher, Mr. Garth Gilesinger and Yvette Wojcik. I'm sure that they're going to find the proceedings here this afternoon interesting. I don't know if they are going anywhere else but we are going to be meeting at the well, getting our pictures taken and having a pretty good discussion on the events of the House as they occur here this afternoon. So I'm sure that you, Mr. Speaker, and I and the rest of the members of this House take great pleasure in welcoming the students who are seated in the west gallery from Melville, St. Henry's School.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Legal Action Against CBC

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – I'd like to direct a question to the minister responsible for SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). Two news reports last night, interviewing people in the Warman area, indicated that in fact SEDCO officials had approached individuals in that area to sell land to SEDCO for supposedly a satellite city. That land was subsequently sold to Eldorado Nuclear for its refinery. After these news reports is the minister now prepared to reconsider his answer yesterday, and in fact admit to the Assembly that officials of SEDCO did mislead people in the Warman area as to the reasons for the land acquisition?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): – Mr. Speaker, no I will not

change my decision I made yesterday. I am led to believe by the people in SEDCO that that is not a fact. If you will understand the program in general it was a fictional program and the facts could have been distorted in some manner or other. We take no responsibility for what the film portrayed.

MR. LANE: – Supplementary. Of course my question didn't deal with the film. My question dealt with a couple of news broadcasts yesterday. Have you commenced an investigation into SEDCO and if so what was the extent of that investigation and what officials were interviewed?

MR. VICKAR: – Mr. Speaker, we did not instigate an investigation into the allegations, and I don't think we necessarily should. I take the advice of my people in SEDCO that as a fact it did not happen and I have to accept it at that.

MR. LANE: – Supplementary. Yesterday officials from SEDCO were very concerned about the story and in fact thought they were defamed. Subsequently we found out from the government that at last the Attorney General wasn't considering legal action. Would you answer the following two questions? Firstly, who is the legal counsel who in fact advised you that there was a defamation, and secondly if there was a defamation and concern expressed by officials of SEDCO, what prompted you to withdraw your suggestion of legal action?

MR. VICKAR: – Mr. Speaker, I get my information from the management at SEDCO and whoever the legal counsels are within SEDCO. They probably relate the information to the management and I have not changed my stand. I said right at the outset we were going to take it under advisement. We were going to consider the facts whether we should or should not take legal action, and as of yesterday afternoon I decided we were not taking legal action.

MR. LANE: – You seem to be hedging and avoiding answering the question as to who is legal counsel. Would you advise this Assembly why you contradicted the advice your got yesterday that you were defamed and considering legal action, so that today you are not considering legal action? Is it possibly because, as the minister has been advised by legal counsel, truth is a defence and an absolute defence to a libel action?

MR. VICKAR: – Mr. Speaker, I do believe that if the truth were known, as SEDCO was portrayed in the original portion of that film, we were defamed. I agree with that portion but that's not necessarily saying that's grounds for action, and therefore we have decided against it.

MR. LANE: – A question to the minister. Are you then saying the individuals who were interviewed on television last night, not dealing with the Harvest story – don't interrupt, I think it's very important – the Minister of the Environment welcome back – that the individuals who were interviewed on television last night saying SEDCO had stated the land was to be used for a satellite city, were in fact lying?

MR. VICKAR: – Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't see nor did I hear any of the interviews the hon. member is talking about. I can't comment.

Satellite City

MR. KATZMAN (Rosthern): – New question. Question to the minister for SEDCO. Are you suggesting to this House that your officials when they were in the Warman area did

not say to the people that we are here to acquire options on your land for a satellite city? Are you suggesting that is not what they told the people?

MR. VICKAR: – Mr. Speaker, I said at the outset in reply to the original questions the member asked awhile ago that the information I received was that they did not relate that type of information to the people of Warman.

MR. KATZMAN: – Supplementary. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the minister responsible for the department should check again. The first statement that they made was to the farmers, and it is documented . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order!

MR. KATZMAN: – Did your officials not tell the people of the Warman area that an industrial complex was the second story they used in trying to acquire options?

MR. VICKAR: – Yes, that is part of the reply that the people gave. They were proposing an industrial park for the area, quite right.

MR. KATZMAN: – A supplementary. Is it also a fact that they denied that there was anything to do with the refinery coming in that area at the time of the first statement when they were questioned?

MR. VICKAR: – Mr. Speaker, that is not true, to my knowledge.

Relocation of Highway No. 43

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister yesterday I received answers to a written question regarding Highway No. 43 relocation in which you indicated specifically that there were no plans to relocate any portion of the highway. Further, I also requested information as to whether meetings were held with local groups concerning rewriting the proposals. The answer to this request was also no. Yet a second answer, a sheet attached to the original, indicates that the member for Morse did have meetings with the rural municipality and discussed a proposal to relocate Highway No. 43. Who are you attempting to deceive, Mr. Minister?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): – I am attempting to deceive no one. I notice that a years has gone by and a few months have gone by, and the member for Swift Current is no brighter than eh was last year. The fact of the matter is that there were no meetings. The answer concerned the Department of Highways and Transportation . There were no meetings held by the Department of Highways and Transportation. If you or any other MLA holds meetings, that is none of my business and it is not the business of this House.

MR. LANE: – A gross miscarriage of duty.

MR. KRAMER: – Yes, it is a gross miscarriage of something but I think it is on the other side. It is a pity it had not been.

MR. HAM: – Mr. Speaker, the minister in his answer, has indicated that the original written answer to my question, that there were no plans to relocate Highway No. 43, is erroneous. There are plans to relocate Highway No. 43. You are in fact deceiving this

House.

AN HON. MEMBER: – You're lying.

MR. KRAMER: – As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I repeat . . . What did you say? Who said I was lying? I would like him to have the decency to stand up and repeat it. All right, let it go. Let's take it from where it comes, Mr. Speaker. But let me tell you that there are no plans. There are surveys undertaken and studies undertaken but those are not plans. The plans for any construction are when there has been a decision made regarding any particular project. No decisions have been made. Surveys and studies have been undertaken but that wasn't the question that was asked.

MR. HAM: – A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister since I have received more opposition mail to this proposal than any issue I have had in my own constituency since I have been elected as an MLA, would you and your officials now consider cancelling any 'plans,' 'studies,' of this particular highway?

MR. KRAMER: – Mr. Speaker, I repeat once again, there are no plans at this time to do anything, either to stay on the present route, to rebuild that particular section, or anything else. So again, the member for Swift Current is taking a position that is not valid and he is trying to present erroneous information to the House.

MR. HAM: – Are you trying to suggest that the rams of mail that I received from the constituency of the member for Morse, that the people down there don't know what is going on? In other words, they are writing me for no cause and they are writing you for no cause? Are you answering them, saying, they are writing for no cause?

MR. KRAMER: – I'm not suggesting anything. I'm suggesting that someone has probably spread a rumour that something is going to be changed and they are acting entirely on rumour. When the Department of Highways and Transportation decides to reroute or to rebuild, we will announce it and only then.

MR. HAM: – Mr. Speaker, is this the NDP answer to the old Liberal primrose lane method of building highways?

MR. KRAMER: – Oh, heavens no! Oh, heavens no! God forbid, that's a road that goes nowhere, to nowhere, at a cost which, if it were computed, would be \$5 million. It still has no traffic on it. Oh, there's one member in our House who has an indirect knowledge of that.

Satellite Community at Warman

MR. LANE: – I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Premier takes lightly the statements made by individuals last night that they were in fact informed by officials of SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) that the land to be acquired in Warman was for a satellite community. Would the Premier consider an investigation into the truth of those statements because, if true, they obviously raise serious concerns about other statements made by the government's officials as it proceeds with uranium development?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, when the government receives from any citizen directly, any allegation of wrong doing by a public servant, then we will certainly consider investigating. I doubt whether the appropriate route is to consider what is raised in this House on the basis of a news report – and not even a news report

in the printed media but in the electronic media where it's obviously very difficult to check. I am sure that if we receive from citizens directly any allegations of wrong doing by any employee or any other corporation then we will consider appropriate action to be taken at that time.

MR. LANE: – Supplementary. Are you then saying if the individuals who were interviewed (I assume yesterday or at least the report was shown yesterday) in fact restate or other individuals state that SEDCO officials did approach them on the basis that the land which was to be acquired was for a purpose other than the uranium refinery, you will have a complete investigation?

MR. BLAKENEY: – I don't think I have anything to add to my earlier answer. You can read it in the Hansard to see whether it answers the second question.

Alternate Site for Refinery

MR. LANE: – I would like then to direct a question to the minister in charge of SEDCO. The Premier of Saskatchewan has, I believe, advised Eldorado Nuclear that it should find another site. Is SEDCO attempting to find land for another site for the refinery in Saskatchewan? If so, where are you attempting to find that land? What story are you telling the people in that area?

MR. VICKAR: – Mr. Speaker, all the time that SEDCO was involved with the land development for Eldorado, it was strictly on the basis of an agent acting for Eldorado. Since the spring of 1979 SEDCO has not acted as an agent for Eldorado. What Eldorado is doing for future sites is its business.

MR. KATZMAN: – Is the minister suggesting that during the period in which is agents were representing Eldorado they did not inform the citizens of information that was incorrect when they suggested what the purposes would be and then, after the federal minister admitted it, your government and your officials finally told the truth?

MR. VICKAR: – Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that I will use the same phrase as the Premier used a moment ago. If he checks back in Hansard to the replies I gave a few moments ago he will get the answers to his present question.

Federal Pioneer Spill

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): – Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Environment. My question is relevant to the report from the National Research Council of Canada stating that the 1,500 gallon spill at Federal pioneer has now increased to 10,000 cubic metres. As a result of my conversation this morning with Dr. Gordon Butler from Ottawa, the chairman of the panel of National Research Council of Canada, he indicated to me that in the next two years this would increase. Do you agree with the panel that we must now take immediate action?

HON. MR. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): – Mr. Speaker, I agreed with the recommendations and much of the report that was submitted to us by the National Research Council. When it was submitted we undertook to have a press conference following the press conference the National Research Council had and we set out on that occasion our position with respect to the report. We made it rather clear then what our intentions were and with respect to the specific question you raise – do we think it is serious and immediate? – yes, we do, and it is our intention to pursue the matter on

that basis.

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Will you, Mr. Minister agree with the following proposal: that the Government of Saskatchewan construct an environmentally approved cement storage pit on the most suited property owned by the government?

MR. BOWERMAN: – Well, the specific answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is no, we will not agree to the suggestion until we have some more information with respect to what is being recommended. We do have a consultant firm, which we obtained before the National Research Council report was in, to take the material and to give us their opinion on what the costs are likely to be, what the technical requirements would be for the removal of soils that needed to be moved, where they might be stored and under what conditions they might be stored. And so we're going to wait until the final report of that consultant is in and then we'll act on the basis of the advice we get from them.

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Why wouldn't you agree with Dr. Butler, who intimated to me this morning that my suggestion of a cement storage pit was the logical solution to the problem of temporary storage of the PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) at Federal Pioneer?

MR. BOWERMAN: – Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting by any means that a cement storage pit isn't a responsible suggestion but I'm saying there may be alternatives by those who have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . if it's serious I would suggest that the members opposite sit and listen to what the answers are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: – Maybe if the member's mind wasn't so clouded with respect to his biases the information would be useful to him. I'm not suggesting that a cement storage space would not be a proper facility for the contaminated materials. I did indicate to the member that we have undertaken to have a consultant advise the province as to what technique might best be used for the storage of the waste materials and to give us some advice in addition to that which the National Research Council has left us.

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Mr. Minister I finally thank you for that statement. It's the first time in this House you've ever mentioned an alternative. Thank you.

Resignation of Dr. Mathias

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. Yesterday you indicated to me in this House that there was no undercurrent of antagonism between your department and the medical profession and yesterday you also conceded to members of the press that yes, in fact there was a bit of antagonism between your government and the medical profession. Is there antagonism or isn't there antagonism?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): – Mr. Chairman, I made sure while the question period was going on today that I read what I said in Hansard and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, would you try to shut that vacuum over there?

Mr. Speaker, I checked with Hansard yesterday as to exactly what I did say. At no time

did I say there was no tension between this government and the SMA (Saskatchewan Medical Association). I want you to check the records. I read them today.

Mr. Speaker, I did indicate yesterday that Dr. Rick Mathias' main reason for leaving was that he wanted to return to his home province of British Columbia. He felt this was a personal advancement for him and he did it also for professional reasons. I never indicated once that Dr. Rick Mathias didn't have some concerns, or feelings of what should be done in the Department of Health. I want to tell the members opposite, I would be concerned if I had an official in the Department of Health who would not be a thinking individual and would not have some suggestions to make to the Minister of Health as to how the Department of Health could be improved. I want also to indicate to the members here that the health critic did speak to Dr. Mathias yesterday and in that conversation, it is my understanding, Dr. Mathias made it very clear to her that his main reason for leaving was not his concern with the relationship of this government with the SMA.

Mr. Speaker, I am meeting with Dr. Rick Mathias at 3:30 this afternoon. I have a letter from Dr. Rick Mathias wherein he does state some of his concerns, but he clearly indicates his main reason for leaving was that he thought the position he accepted in B.C. was an advancement for him and that he wanted to return to his native province of British Columbia. Those are the reasons I stated yesterday. Those are the main reasons that Dr. Rick Mathias indicated in his letter. I want to thank Dr. Rick Mathias for suggesting to me some of his concerns and some of the things he would like to see improved in the Department of Health. I welcome those suggestions, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. You say you welcome those suggested changes. Would you be willing to table them? And we will see how long it takes your government to act upon the advice of your officials. Half of your staff has left this province because of your unwillingness to act upon their professional advice.

MR. SPEAKER: – Order! I will take the member for Regina Wascana.

Western Premiers' Conference

MR. C.O. WHITE (Regina Wascana): – A brief question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker. He will be attending a western premiers' conference next month. Will he assure this House he will do all in his power to ensure that the conference does not support separatist views and that he will firmly oppose expressions of separatism such as those expressed by the former leader of the opposition, if such expressions come up at the conference?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I refrain from commenting on views expressed by the member for Nipawin. I do express to the member for Regina Wascana and I give him the assurance that our government, as it presses the cause of our province and of western Canada, will do so strongly but always in the context of a united Canada which I think is essential to the welfare of all Saskatchewan people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Firearms Training Program

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Mr. Minister, 1978 I have called on your government to implement a firearms training program for all hunters 18 years of age and younger. When is your government going to implement this program in light of the latest results showing that firearm fatalities have almost doubled since 1978?

HON. MR. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resource): – Mr. Speaker, the member for Wilkie asks about firearm safety and when we plan to make an announcement. I can only advise him that it will be announced in due course.

MOTIONS

Request for name Substitutions in Committees

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): – Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Swan (Rosetown-Elrose) and by leave of the Assembly:

That the name of Mr. Garner be substituted for that of Mr. Collver on the list of members comprising the select standing committee on Crown corporations.

MR. SPEAKER: – Leave is requested. Is leave granted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – No.

MR. SPEAKER: – Leave is not granted.

MR. BIRKBECK: – Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I move, seconded by Mr. Pickering, the member for Bengough-Milestone:

That the name of Mr. Ralph Katzman be substituted for that of Mr. Collver on the list of members comprising the select standing committee on privileges and elections.

MR. SPEAKER: – Leave is required. Is leave granted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – No.

MR. SPEAKER: – Leave is not granted.

MR. BIRKBECK: – Mr. Speaker, again before orders of the day and with leave of the Assembly, I would request, seconded by Mr. Garner, the member for Wilkie:

That the name of Mr. Larter be substituted for that of Mr. Collver on the list of members comprising the select standing committee on education.

MR. SPEAKER: – Leave is required. Is leave granted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – No.

MR. SPEAKER: – Leave is not granted.

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 3

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current) moves, seconded by Mr. Rousseau (Regina South) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 3 showing:

(1) The number of SaskPass fares that the Saskatchewan Transportation Company sold since the implementation of the SaskPass program; (2) of these, the number that were adult SaskPass fares; (3) the number that were children's SaskPass fares.

HON. MR. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones): – Mr. Speaker, I have a very slight amendment to make and it isn't a great deal. However, I think we should have an amendment just to clear up exactly what is SaskPass and, in that regard, I want to move an amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie), that all of the words after the word 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) What is the SaskPass fare being offered by STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company)? (2) How many SaskPass fares have been sold to date by STC? (3) Of these, how many were adult SaskPass fares? (4) How many were children's SaskPass fares? (5) Are any changes planned by STC for the SaskPass fares?

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 9

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moves, seconded by Mr. Andrew (Kindersley) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 9 showing:

In the 1978-79 fiscal years, the number of employees of the Department of Health who were: (a) classified as 'out of scope' personnel; (b) dismissed for cause; (c) transferred to other government departments; (d) classified as temporary.

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Finance): – Mr. Speaker, I just want to move an amendment to the motion, not to take away from the motion, but rather to put it in the form where we can better answer and provide the information which the member is seeking. I would move that all the words after the word 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the Department of Health, including the Medical Care Insurance Commission, and the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan, how many (a) probationary and permanent employees were classified as out of scope personnel as of March 31, 1979; (b) permanent employees who were dismissed for cause in the 1978-1979 fiscal year; (c) permanent employees transferred to other government departments in the 1978-79 fiscal year; and (d) employees who were classified as temporary as at March 31, 1979.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 10

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose) moves, seconded by Mrs. Duncan (Maple Creek) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 10 showing:

In the 1977-78 fiscal years, the number of permanent employees of the Department of Social Services: (a) dismissed for cause; (b) transferred to other government departments; (c) resigned on own initiative.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: – As with the previous one, and as I will do with the next one as well, I am going to move a slight amendment. The reason for the amendment is that the question can't be answered in its present form. The number of out-of-scope employees, as members will probably know, changes every day and in that case it would be meaningless if not impossible to give a number for the fiscal year and the amendment motion should convey the information which is intended by the questions. Therefore, I would move, seconded by the member for Kinistino (Mr. Cody), that the words 'in the fiscal 1978-79 year' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

as of March 31, 1979.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 11

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose) moves, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 11 showing:

In the 1977-78 fiscal year, the number of permanent employees of the Department of Social Services: (a) dismissed for cause; (b) transferred to other government departments; (c) resigned on own initiative.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: – Mr. Speaker, once again, the changes I am going to propose in amendment to this motion are simply intended to reduce the ambiguity of parts of the present question as it is worded. Ordinarily I would have discussed this with the members prior to the sitting. I have not done that but I am sure there is no difficulty with the amendment from their point of view. I move an amendment to Return No. 11 that clause (b) be amended by deleting the words 'transferred to other government departments and substituting therefor:

resigned from the department to accept employment in another government department.

That clause (c) be amended by deleting all words after 'resigned' and substituting therefore:

from the department.

I move this, seconded by the Minister of Telephones, the member for Kinistino (Mr. Cody).

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 1

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River) moves, seconded by Mr. Garner (Wilkie) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 1 showing:

The name, department and position of every person receiving remuneration from the Government of Saskatchewan for services rendered to the Government of Saskatchewan during the period beginning midnight November 15, 1979 and ending at midnight December 4, 1979.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: – Mr. Speaker, I have some concerns about this motion which I will want briefly to explain to the House and to you. I'm really not quite sure what the motives are in the motion or what the purpose is for seeking this kind of information, which I think can be fairly said and described as to some degree, prying into the private lives of some individual citizens who happen to work for the province of Saskatchewan. From that point of view, I do have some concern. The question further to that, Mr. Speaker, is not restricted to government employees. In order to be able to provide the answer we would have to include all consultants and contractual employees and all kinds of other people who provided services during this period of time who may or may not have been employed by the Government of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that what we have seen here is a question which was asked, obviously, at a different time than this present sitting of the House, that was more motivated by seeking information about people who may or may not have been involved in the recent SGEA strike. I don't believe that it would serve any useful purpose to deal with this kind of information on private individuals. Therefore, I would urge that the members of the House defeat the motion.

Motion negatived.

Return No. 4

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley) moves, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 4 showing:

A detailed statement of all the moneys paid to Raymond Moriyama regarding the preparation of the plan for the Meewasin Valley project.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 5

MR. ANDREW (Kindersley) moves, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 5 showing:

Details of all costs incurred in the promotion of the Meewasin Valley project including the cost of the wine and cheese party as the Legislative Building

around the time that the bill was introduced in 1979.

MR. ROMANOW: – I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 6

MR. ANDREW (Kindersley) moves, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 5 showing:

A copy of the contract between Raymond Moriyama and the Government of Saskatchewan, or its authorized body, regarding the development of the plan for the Meewasin Valley project.

MR. ROMANOW: – I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 7

MR. ANDREW (Kindersley) moves, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 7 showing:

A detailed statement of all moneys paid to the firm Long, Mayell and Associates regarding their participation in the study for the Meewasin Valley project.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): – Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth motion in this series re the Meewasin Valley project and the Attorney General has been hesitant to give answers on the others. He seems to want to delay them and not give us any answers and get the facts out to the citizens of Saskatchewan. It makes me wonder, when this motion is about the study regarding the project. We all realize that the original architect is back doing some additional studying. We're not sure what firms are there helping him, if this firm may be back again or not.

But I'm certain that the member who also reside in the Saskatoon area, in the CFQC television area, will see all the information being supplied to the citizens of the area. You make people wonder who is paying and where the remuneration is coming from – games with the people's money; because they have a situation where some of us in the House, including myself, made a mistake on a piece of legislation and are not man enough to stand up on that side of the House and correct legislation which is overbearing upon the citizens of Saskatchewan and Saskatoon area. The facts that are being publicized are not true and I refer to the minister to look at some of the information supplied in the area, a little green pamphlet sent out in the last couple of weeks. I suggest that he is trying to hide under the numbers of 43 to 16 and let his weight say we don't have to tell you anything about what we're doing and, therefore, hiding under the secrecy of government as we saw in the Eldorado episode near Warman as well.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I should have advised the hon. members opposite and

I didn't get a chance to do it. I'm adjourning these motions because quite frankly my files in this area have been mislaid due to an illness of the executive assistant in my office who has been in charge of this. It's as simple as that, and they can attach all kinds of Machiavellian motives to it if they want.

I do think I want to make a couple of points to the hon. member. First of all, I note that the member for Rosthern says he made a mistake in supporting the legislation, and I can only assume that he made that mistake both on second reading when the bill was first introduced and through the piece, and he made that mistake when the amendments were introduced in December. Accordingly, the corollary to that is, not only did he make a mistake in supporting it, the corollary is he is opposed to the legislation and opposed to the Meewasin Valley Authority and opposed to the concepts which are behind the Meewasin Valley Authority. I kind of suspected that about the Progressive Conservative Party in any event. I said in December, Mr. Speaker, that the PCs are opposed to the preservation of this beautiful river valley area, the river and the riverbank because that's what this legislation does. I note that the member for Rosthern now says that he has made a mistake in supporting this legislation. Well, it's unfortunate because he has made a mistake in supporting this legislation. Well, it's unfortunate because he received a full opportunity to make his submissions at the time the committee was meeting. In fact, I remember seeing the hon. member meeting with Mr. Moriyama for an afternoon-long, if not a day-long session in Saskatoon in discussing the project. There were several of the Saskatoon area MLAs who were there and I think that he is opposed. I'm sorry about that because, Mr. Speaker, it in effect has politicized unfortunately a very, very worthwhile community project.

I want to tell the hon. member for Rosthern, there's a little funny way about how things come back in politics to haunt people, and I tell you, in 1983, when this government goes back to the electorate, the position of the PC caucus will be clear. Mr. Devine who comes from Saskatoon must be obviously behind this. He must be obviously behind the proposal to destroy the Meewasin Valley Authority. I indicate to the members for Saskatoon and the people of Saskatoon that it's a very sad day indeed in that regard. However, we'll see how the political test comes out in that regard.

Let me say concerning the second point, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the costs of the pamphlet. There is a green pamphlet being circulated by the Meewasin Valley Authority, being totally borne by the Meewasin Valley Authority. I don't know the figure. We would be prepared to provide that. The drop is being done on a community volunteer basis, supplying hundred of community people in Saskatoon who are supportive of the Meewasin Valley Authority, various community associations, recreation organizations, of that nature. The cost is considerably cut down because of that assistance. It's being dropped off on a door-to-door basis, on a volunteer basis. The advertising that is going on television is also being borne by the Meewasin Valley Authority. I find it rather strange to say the advertising of the Meewasin Valley Authority is an arm of the Government of Saskatchewan. That means the city of Saskatoon has been roped in now to be a publicity arm of the Government of Saskatchewan. Similarly, the University of Saskatchewan has been roped in to be an arm of the publicity arm, and the reeve, Mrs. Peggy McKercher, has been roped in to be an arm of the Saskatchewan government – the reeve, the chairman, the councillor of the R.M., Mrs. Peggy McKercher. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition can't have it both ways. They can't argue you didn't give us the facts on the Meewasin Valley Authority, and therefore you should be condemned when we do proceed to give them the facts on the Meewasin Valley Authority. You can't do it. You should be condemned for doing that too. You can't have it both ways. Only a Progressive Conservative, Mr. Speaker, could walk both sides – no, not both sides, all sides of all streets at all times –

and hope he would come down politically on the right side. Mr. Speaker, I will have a few more words to say about the hon. member's position on this when the debate resumes. I will have a few more words to say about Mr. Devine's position on the Saskatoon riverbank and the preservation of it when this matter comes up next and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 14

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current) moves, seconded by Mr. Rousseau (Regina South), that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 14 showing:

(1) The amount of money allocated by the Department of Highways for highway and road construction in Regina and Saskatoon in 1978, and the total amount of money spent; (2) of the money that was not spent, the plans for this money in both Regina and Saskatoon, and whether the Department of Highways plans to allocate funds to carry out these proposed projects.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): – I am not concerned with Return No. 14. That one is agreed to.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 13

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current) moves, seconded by Mr. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 13 showing:

For the fiscal year 1978-79, a detailed list of all highway construction tenders and contracts let by the Department of Highways: (a) listing in detail the successful and unsuccessful tenders; (b) listing in detail the tender amounts in dollars; (c) the reasons any low tenders were not successful; (d) the reasons successful tenders that were not the lowest were accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: – Could the member send up the motion? Moved by the member for Swift Current, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, that an order do issue for Return No. 21. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

MR. KRAMER: – Mr. Speaker. The question will not allow the Department of Highways to answer in its present form because it refers to tenders rather than bidders, and I would like to move this amendment.: that all the words after the word . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Just a minute.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am confused because I thought Mr. Speaker said that we are discussing Return No. 13. I'm sorry, you said 21. My notation say we are on 13.

MR. SPEAKER: – It's always helpful if you're confused and you know it, but if you're like me and you're confused and you don't know it, you're in trouble and I would caution the member for Swift Current that he has sent up the wrong item. This is Return No. 21.

There's one good thing that can be said about confusion. If you can spread it around everybody it's a lighter load for everybody to bear.

I have before me what I am told is Return No. 13 and a motion by the member for Swift Current, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, that an order of the Assembly to issue for Return No. 13.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): – Mr. Speaker, in order to permit the Department of Highways to answer this question and give the answers that the member desires. I have an amendment: All the words after the word 'construction' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

projects tendered by the Department of Highways and Transportation showing: (a) the name of all bidders and the total amount bid by each bidder; (b) the name of each successful bidder on each project; (c) if applicable, the reasons why the low bidders were not successful in being awarded the contract; (d) if applicable, the reasons successful bidders that were not the lowest bidder were accepted.

I so move, seconded by the Hon. Wes Robbins, member for Saskatoon Nutana.

Amendment agreed.

Return No. 18

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moves, seconded by Mr. Larter (Estevan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 18 showing:

(1) The number of out-of-scope personnel in the Department of Education for the following years: (a) 1974-75; (b) 1975-76; (c) 1976-77; (d) 1977-78; (e) 1978-79; (2) The names of these employees.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 19

MR. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moves, seconded by Mr. Larter (Estevan), that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 19 showing:

(a) The number of innovative projects funded by the Department of Education during the following years: (a) 1974-75; (b) 1975-76; (c) 1976-77; (d) 1977-78; (2) the titles of these projects.

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose a minor amendment to this question. I wish to have added to the question information regarding the sponsoring boards of education. It does not change the nature of the information rather adds to it for clarity of the record. Therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Gross (Morse), that Return No. 19 be amended by deleting all the words after the number 2 and substituting the following words therefor:

the titles and the boards of education sponsoring these projects.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 20

MR. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moves, seconded by Mr. Larter (Estevan), that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 20 showing:

(1) The number of permanent employees that have been seconded from the Department of Education for the fiscal years: (a) 1978-79; (b) 1977-78; (c) 1976-77; (d) 1975-76; (e) 1974-75; (2) the names of these employees; (3) the positions to which they have been seconded.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 22

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose) moves, seconded by Mrs. Duncan (Maple Creek) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 22 showing:

In the 1978-79 fiscal year, the number of social assistance recipients who were repeaters, i.e. on assistance, taken off, then put back on.

MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services): – Mr. Speaker, I am going to propose an amendment to this. The purpose of the amendment is to give more accurate information and some clarification.

The assistance plan beneficiaries are apparently on two payroll systems; the head office and regional services accounts. There is usually considerable lag in the regional offices' information to central office and as a consequence it may not be included. I propose an amendment which will give clarity to the question which is asked.

I propose in the amendment, seconded by the Hon. Don Cody that all the words after 'in the 1978-79 fiscal year,' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

The number of Saskatchewan Assistance Plan beneficiaries that received financial assistance from the monthly payroll system for two or more non-continuous periods.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 21

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current) moved, seconded by Mr. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) that an order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 21 showing:

In the fiscal year 1978-79, a detailed list of all highway equipment

purchased over \$5,000 including: (a) a breakdown of all tenders let by the department for this equipment; (b) a detailed list of successful tenders; (c) a detailed list of unsuccessful tenders; (d) reasons the lowest tenders were not accepted; (e) reasons the tenders that were not lowest were accepted.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): – Mr. Speaker, the way the motion is currently worded, it would require a response regarding the equipment purchased not only by the Department of Highways but Department of Northern Saskatchewan, Department of Agriculture, Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, and perhaps other agencies as well. The member putting forth the question, I'm reasonably sure, is asking the question specifically related to the Department of Highways. I would therefore propose to move an amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper), which would read as follows: That all the words after the word 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

In the fiscal year 1978-79 a detailed list of all highway equipment valued at over \$5,000 purchased for the Department of Highways by the Department of Revenue Supply and Services including: (a) a breakdown of all tenders let by the department for this equipment; (b) a detailed list of successful tenders; (c) a detailed list of unsuccessful tenders; (d) reasons the lowest tenders were not accepted; (e) reasons the tenders that were not lowest were accepted.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Resolution No. 1 – Incentives for Energy Resource Development

MR. R.G. LONG (Cut Knife-Lloydminster) moved, seconded by Mr. Johnson (Turtleford):

That this Assembly encourage the Government of Canada to give priority to establishing incentive programs to ensure the accelerated development of heavy oil resources and other potential energy resources which are not now economically feasible but on which our future energy stability will rely.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to address this Assembly on a matter of utmost importance to all Canadians. Today I will introduce a motion calling on the federal government to establish programs for the accelerated development of heavy oil resources and other potential energy sources. The future stability of our nation will in large part be dependent on our energy supply. Indeed, securing stable and adequate energy reserves is the greatest challenge facing Canadians in the decade of the 1980s.

There is no doubt the demand for energy will steadily increase in the years ahead. It is equally clear that Canada cannot realistically expect to meet increased demand by increased imports. OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) oil prices continue to rise at startling rates. A \$6-a-barrel increase was announced early in December. Further increases are possible at any time.

Oil price increases since 1973 have shaken economies in western countries to their

foundations. Increased imports will only serve to further weaken Canada's economy which already appears to be headed for a recession. Energy sources owned and controlled by Canadians must be developed. Canadians cannot afford to have a federal government that is unable or unwilling to put forward a meaningful energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, energy self-sufficiency is our only protection against erratic world conditions. Ottawa claims self-sufficiency is indeed its goal, but without specific measures such as I will propose that goal will remain an empty platitude.

Recent federal actions have not been encouraging, Mr. Speaker, Before their well-deserved defeat, the federal Conservatives allowed Canadian gas exports to the United States to be increased by some 50 per cent. The additional exports, amounting to about four trillion cubic feet, could have heated one million Canadian homes for 25 years, Mr. Speaker.

The Tories' energy program would have taken \$90 billion out of the pockets of Canadians. Of that amount only \$1.7 billion, or less than two cents on the dollar, would have been used directly by Ottawa for developing new sources of energy. That kind of approach makes about as much sense as hunting bear with a slingshot.

The election of another Liberal government provides little room for optimism, however as it was the Liberals that first began the massive sell-out of Canadian resources.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we all on the new federal government to live up to its election promises. Those promises, Mr. Speaker, include a stronger Petro-Can and a repatriation of the oil and gas industry. In the past, Mr. Speaker, both Liberals and Conservatives have shown no reluctance whatsoever to break promises to the people. Mr. Speaker, Canadians deserve better. They do not deserve to have their energy reserves sold off in the face of shortages. They do not deserve a federal government that throws itself on the mercy of multinationals. They do not deserve a government whose decisions are made in the corporate boardrooms.

What is really needed, Mr. Speaker, is an accelerated development of energy reserves such as heavy oil. We have heavy oil in the ground. We need to extract it. Mr. Speaker, the heavy oil deposits in Saskatchewan, principally in the Lloydminster-Kindersley area, are estimated by the Department of Mineral Resources to contain some 9.6 billion barrels of oil. However, Mr. Speaker, recovery rates for conventional oil in the province average about 8 per cent, compared with 28 per cent for light crude and 25 per cent for medium crude. Current heavy oil production in Saskatchewan is about 32,000 barrels a day. An acceleration in heavy oil production would be of tremendous value for our country. If Ottawa is serious about dealing with the energy crisis, it must pitch in and help. There can be no mistake about the need for action now. In the first week of December, 1979, Gulf Canada Ltd.'s marketing manager, Bob Scott, declared and I quote: 'If demand continues at its present rate, we could have problems in the future.' Mr. Speaker, demand is going to increase and Canada is going to have problems.

A major problem will continue to be the increasing price of imports. Part of the solution to this problem is to cut the need for imports. A heavy oil upgrader in Saskatchewan would mean, at present production rates, nearly 30 million barrels of Saskatchewan oil a year could be freed to serve eastern markets. That oil is now being exported for lack of upgrading facilities. The federal government continues its \$17-a-barrel export tax on Saskatchewan oil which is used to subsidize eastern exports. That approach is shortsighted

and there is a definite need for federal action now. If the federal government does not act immediately, it will answer indeed, Mr. Speaker, to the Canadian people.

There are many areas in which the federal government should involve itself. Indeed, because energy is a matter of urgent concern to the entire nation, it is the duty of the federal government to take positive action in all areas related to accelerated heavy oil production. Mr. Speaker, an entire infrastructure is being built up around the development of heavy oil resources. The federal government can play an important role in speeding up the creation of that infrastructure. We call upon them to do so.

Federal governments cannot expect to slap one tax after another on our resources and our people, and expect us to continue to bear all of the related costs of development. They cannot expect to continue to skim off the revenue from the development without paying their fair share of the related development costs.

Mr. Speaker, the development of heavy oil means more roads must be built. It means increased traffic on those roads. Now with the pressing need to accelerate that development, the need for more and better roads becomes more pressing. In the initial drilling stages heavy equipment must be moved to the prospective sites. Heavy service rigs must also have access to the well sites. Much of the oil is trucked away from the wells. In fact in all stages of development there is a great increase in the flow of traffic and the traffic itself is primarily of a heavy equipment nature, requiring better roads than necessary for normal traffic.

To speed up the development of heavy oil, the federal government should provide financial assistance to accelerate the construction of roads in these areas. As long as the federal government continues to muscle in on resource revenues, it ought to muscle in on development costs. Further heavy oil development has meant rapid growth in villages, towns and cities throughout the Cut Knife-Lloydminster area. The rapid growth experienced by our centres has meant greatly increased demand for serviced lots, expanded sewer and water facilities, speeded up street paving programs, a need for community recreation outlets, and so on. These needs are all part of the necessary infrastructure to ensure that development is orderly and not disruptive to our communities. Again, accelerated development to decrease our reliance on foreign sources of oil means the demands placed on our communities are and will be much greater.

Federal assistance to meet these greatly expanded requirements would help to speed up oil development. In so doing, it would be a benefit to the nation as a whole. Mr. Speaker, we would welcome federal initiatives to plough back some of the resource revenues they have appropriated from the province into the communities in the forefront of the development.

Development of heavy oil also requires a labour force with skills in a host of areas, Mr. Speaker. To accelerate the pace of development would mean a demand for more workers — workers who can operate heavy equipment; more workers in the operation of service rigs, workers to drive the trucks; more workers at the drill site; more construction workers in our communities. In short, Mr. Speaker, we will need more skilled workers, and they cannot be expected to suddenly appear on the scene. Here at last the federal government has some mechanisms in place through which it can act if it so chooses. Manpower training programs and the financial assistance they provide are one way of helping our own system of community colleges in attempting to meet our need. Mr. Speaker, we call upon the federal government to rapidly expand its programs

and allowances. Such action would be as welcome as it is needed. We are however concerned about the likelihood of such action. Mr. Speaker, the former Conservative finance minister has declared his willingness to have double digit inflation and high unemployment become a fact of Canadian life. Mr. Speaker, he has now joined the ranks of the unemployed.

Sadly, the Liberals had no platform to deal with unemployment. Mr. Speaker, assistance in the training of workers would be one step they could take. We in Saskatchewan will be very interested to see what action Mr. Trudeau intends to take to deal with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, a key component to a rapid expansion in heavy oil production is the improvement of recovery technologies. As I mentioned earlier, recovery rates for conventional heavy oil in Saskatchewan are about 8 per cent. Research into improved recovery rates represents one of the best investments possible in the heavy oil industry. A 1 per cent improvement in recovery rates on existing wells would mean an extra 4,000 barrels a day to the people of Canada.

Developing more wells in conjunction with improved recovery rates would present us with an invaluable opportunity to dramatically increase heavy oil production. A serious financial commitment to this type of research in development is needed, and needed now!

The new federal government also has promised to remain active in research, exploration and development related to oil. That is a commitment, Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to let them forget. Canada needs new federal initiatives in the development of Canadian-owned and Canadian-controlled energy resources.

We expect the federal Liberals to keep their promises to expand Petro-Can. If the Liberals are being honest with Canadians when they talk of meaningful energy programs, they ought to take a direct role in the importation and domestic extraction and marketing of oil. Nor should this task be overly difficult for them. The federal government has at its disposal a vehicle through which to get this job done. It has available to it a vehicle already exploring, developing and marketing petroleum products. Mr. Speaker, it has Petro-Can just as we in Saskatchewan have SaskOil. Petro-Can is the only logical mechanism by which the federal government can take a hand in accelerating the development of heavy oil. Petro-Can should be a partner in the development of the upgrader I mentioned earlier.

As long as the development of our oil, gas and our economy generally is dependent on multinationals, we shall never be masters in our own land. Petro-Can can bear the costs of research, exploration and development from the revenues it generates. It can save Canadian taxpayers the needless charges levied by middlemen importing oil into Canada. Its profits can be kept in Canada and re-invested in Canadian energy projects. In short, Petro-Can was a significant step toward energy self-sufficiency. It is a time to take another step forward by making Petro-Can the number one oil company in Canada.

When multinationals haul billions of dollars out of Canada in profits from all sectors, including energy, they weaken our economy and lower the value of the Canadian dollar. Supply and demand determine the value of our dollar. Dollars flowing out of the country have created an oversupply in international money markets. Consequently, the value of the dollar has dropped and we all pay the price. The solution is not

unconscionably high interest rates, high unemployment or tax increases for middle- and low-income people. The solution is to keep those dollars at home. It is absurd to borrow money to keep out of debt, yet that is what the federal finance policy has been. Petro-Can, Mr. Speaker, is one way of keeping those dollars at home.

Liberals should keep their promise to expand the role of Petro-Can. They should be investing more money in all potential energy resources, including solar power, wind power, tidal power and other sources which, as the price of oil rises, will become more economically feasible. We call on the federal government to increase its role in research and development and to participate directly in energy-related ventures. Anything less than direct participation in such ventures, through Crown agencies, is short-sighted, dangerous and hypocritical. The federal government cannot call for Canadian energy self-sufficiency and then turn the job over to foreign concerns. That's a big barrel of bull the Canadian people are not going to buy.

Mr. Speaker, we are calling on the federal government to take immediate and widespread action to accelerate the development of heavy oil. We have grounds for insisting the Liberals live up to this obligation. In 1979, Ottawa took nearly \$500 million from Saskatchewan through its taxes on Saskatchewan oil. The other provinces do not pay export taxes on their resources. Quebec does not pay an export tax on the hydro-electricity it exports. Alberta does not pay on the natural gas it exports. The Liberals introduced the export tax and now every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan loses \$500 to the subsidization of eastern imports. None of that money, Mr. Speaker, comes back to Saskatchewan.

During their brief tenure in office the Conservatives attempted to introduce a so-called self-sufficiency tax – a thinly disguised attempt to grab even more money from the energy producing provinces. It's time, Mr. Speaker, the federal government ended its resource rip-off and began putting money into energy development projects.

Without direction from and action by the federal government, Canadians face a grim energy future. They are already facing the prospects of higher taxes, higher energy costs. High interest rates, high inflation and high unemployment. The Conservatives continued the Liberal policy of selling off our natural reserves, while admitting, Mr. Speaker, that winter fuel shortages were a distinct possibility. The Tory performance in office is a long, dreary sequence of broken promises, reversed positions, contradictory statements and abdicated responsibilities.

The most notable aspect, Mr. Speaker, of their performance was their utter lack of leadership. Perhaps the new federal government will indeed bring forward new initiatives to meet the challenges of the 1980s. However, Mr. Speaker, their record in office is not one to inspire confidence but we urge them to live up to their responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, the motion I wish to place before the Assembly today calls on the federal government to take positive actions. I have outlined several areas in which they can take positive and direct action. I call upon my colleagues opposite to support the motion, for they too have a responsibility to the people of this province. It is in their own interest, Mr. Speaker, to urge positive action by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, all those who do not support this motion I am about to put forward are in effect opposing it. For that, they must answer not only to the people of this province but also to the future generations who will be directly affected by the positions we take here

today. Our energy resources are far too important to be squandered in the interest of a short-term return. The federal government cannot afford to play politics with Canada's energy future. Our energy resources are rapidly dwindling. Time is short and we have a responsibility to shoulder. We must conserve what reserves we have; we must actively seek out new sources of energy and we must investigate all potential energy sources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Assembly to support the motion and in doing so, tell the federal government it is time they took constructive action to meet the energy crisis. Mr. Speaker, we are running short of time in which to act.

Mr. Speaker, I move Resolution No. 1.

MR. L.E. JOHNSON (Turtleford): – Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to second the motion put forward by the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster. The accelerated development of heavy oil must become a priority of the new federal government if Canada is to make a significant reduction in the volume of oil imports. The motion is worthy of support from all in this Assembly because it calls for positive action which would benefit all Canadians. Canada's future economic stability will be determined by actions taken today.

As we enter a new decade, new initiatives and new programs will be required to meet the nations' problems in energy. The motion put forward by my colleague calls for such programs. It will require leadership in Ottawa, that has sadly been lacking in the past.

Canadians have for too long been victimized by the failure of successive Liberal and Conservative governments to come to grips with Canada's energy problems. We, in Saskatchewan, have reserves of heavy oil estimated to be 9.6 billion barrels. These reserves once fully developed, will do much to offset Canada's deficiency in portable energy. However, if these reserves are to be developed in the national interest, the national government will have to play a major role. Ottawa can no longer tax or provide incentives if meaningful development is to take place. It must participate in the development.

I want to stress that care must be taken to ensure our energy resources are developed for the benefit of our people. For too long, successive federal governments have relied almost exclusively on the efforts of foreign multinationals to develop the energy for Canadians. To assist them in this massive rip-off, Ottawa has provided the industry on request with tax breaks, incentives, outright giveaways and in the recent past increased high prices. In essence, the federal policy to date has been to publicly finance the development of privately owned reserves. The result of that policy has been to make Canada a net importer of hydrocarbons and to some degree has caused a situation where we now have an increased trade deficit.

It was the Liberals who began this massive export of portable fuels after the oil companies said that we, in Canada, had enough to last hundreds of years. Last December, the Conservatives followed in the footsteps of the previous government approving new natural gas exports. The reason, I believe, was something about excess natural gas (something that had been stated previously in regards to oil). I believe it had more to do with the balance of payments that Canada had and the attempts of the Conservative government to cover up the situation in the short-term. Mr. Speaker, it is because Canada has exported oil and gas at fire-sale prices that we have a balance of payments problem in the first place. Meanwhile, the profits generated from the

domestic consumption of these fossil fuels continue to flow out of the country in the form of dividends and profits or have been reinvested to increase foreign ownership in Canada. This creates an increased trade deficit leading to heavier taxes and pressure for further exports, a vicious circle that must be broken and can be broken if we move in the right direction today.

The recently defeated Conservative budget proposed a giveaway in this regard on a scale that, I believe, is the largest we've ever seen in the history of Canada. The Tories proposed to deal with Canadian energy problems by giving the oil companies \$33 billion in increased revenue over the next four years all paid for by Canadian consumers. The Canadian oil industry is approximately 80 per cent foreign owned. The Conservative proposal under these circumstances would have given those foreign multinationals \$27 billion at a time when the same companies were recording record profits. Mr. Speaker, that is the way to secure an assured energy supply for our future. That is a sell out of our future. Canadians rejected the Tory plan on February 18. Their rejection came, in my mind, just in time to alleviate what would have been a disaster. It was obvious that Canadians expected the new government to implement a new national energy policy and the abandonment of policies which so plainly failed in the 1970s.

I join with my colleague for Cut Knife-Lloydminster in calling on the new Liberal administration to live up to its campaign promises. Some of them were taken from the New Democratic Party's platform. The NDP has long argued that Petro-Can should be the number one oil company in Canada. The Liberals promise to strengthen it. We will see if they produce on this promise.

Petro-Can could play a major role in building a heavy oil upgrading plan in Saskatchewan. It could develop a tar sands plant. It could be the sole importer of oil. It could expand exploration, research and development.

New Democrats have long argued for Canadian ownership of Canadian resources as a way for economic development. The Liberals have promised 50 per cent ownership of the Canadian energy resource – if Trudeau keeps this half-step promise.

New Democrats have long argued for action to prevent takeovers in Canada by foreign concerns. The Liberals have promised to strengthen the foreign investment review agency significantly. Trudeau gave no details about this promise during the campaign. However, I am sure that he will be reminded of it during the months ahead. Only the future will tell if the Liberals will once again, as in 1974, betray the trust placed in them by the electorate.

As Mr. Long mentioned, Ottawa now taxes Saskatchewan heavy oil to the tune of about \$450 million a year. That, Mr. Speaker, is more than the province itself receives from the resource – a resource owned by the people of Saskatchewan. While the subsidization of eastern oil imports is not in itself wrong, it is only a Band-Aid solution unless it is accompanied by programs to reduce the volume of imports and programs to develop alternate energy sources. There was no such realistic commitment from the previous Conservative government. We shall have to wait and see what the Liberals have planned.

the accelerated development of heavy oil is one of the obvious areas in which action is needed. Research to improve recovery rates, along with stepped-up production, is a major challenge. Petro-Canada is one of the vehicles which could and should play a

major role in meeting this challenge.

However, as well as urging the Government of Canada to establish programs that ensure accelerated development of the heavy oil resources as put forward by the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster, it also urges development of other potential energy sources. Alternate energy sources may not now be economically viable but as the world price of oil continues to climb and as the supply is reduced, they most certainly will become so. Failure to develop an alternate energy source now will only mean more expensive development costs in the future. Should the federal government fail to recognize this fact, we will all bear that cost.

Renewable energy sources do hold promise for the future but efforts in research and development to investigate the possibilities have been sadly lacking. In the last three years Ottawa has only spent \$63 million in research and development aimed at renewable energy resources. In other words the federal government has been committing less than \$1 per person per year to researching renewable energy resources. That is hardly a serious commitment in the face of the present energy crisis. The now infamous Conservative budget proposed no serious commitment in this area, but once the election was on the federal counterparts of those members opposite proposed a \$200 million program to try to recover gas from a pile of manure in Quebec. In Prince Edward Island they were talking about running cars on rotten potatoes. Both are possibilities but the electorate saw these election promises as what they were – gimmickry by a confused and desperate party attempting to win an election. If the Liberal Party can do no better, Canada will have serious problems in the years ahead.

The federal government ought to be investigating tidal power on the coasts of Canada along with solar and wind power in other parts of Canada. It is vital that the new federal government address itself of these areas. Alternate energy development must become a priority of the new government. Supplies of conventional fossil fuels are running low in Canada. The cost of discovering and developing frontier reserves is very high and they demand for energy is expected to continue to increase. The failure to secure a future energy supply at this time will have disastrous economic consequences for all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Assembly should support the motion put forward by the representative for Cut Knife-Lloydminster, which I second. We must encourage the Government of Canada to give priority to establish incentive programs to ensure the development of heavy oil resources and other potential energy resources which are not now economically feasible but on which our future energy supply will rely. Thank you.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): – Mr. Speaker, you know I'd like to tell the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster that we had planned on giving our whole-hearted support to this motion. But once the member for Turtleford got up, he loused everything up and started going on that very short-lived Conservative government that put in a very responsible budget towards energy self-sufficiency. I might say that their counterparts in Ottawa aided in the defeat of that government which would have done wonderful things for Canada and the members opposite are going to have to live with that for many, many years.

I would like to say also that this government does have its priorities mixed up. They talk about energy self-sufficiency and then they spend \$300 million to \$500 million on uranium. I think their priorities are a little mixed up. I hadn't heard that we needed a nuclear power plant in Saskatchewan in the next 20 or 30 years. I would also like to say

that we wanted to support them on this but we haven't seen any action from this government to support Saskatchewan producers on bringing in oil and gas and then when they do bring it in, putting it into the pipelines. We haven't seen any action there, in fact, they've stifled the oil industry in light and medium oil ever since Bill No. 42 in 1972.

I would also like to ask the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster if he has seen – if the cabinet has shown him the sweetheart deal that your government made – the front benchers made with Gulf Oil on 500,000 acres in your area in the Lloydminster field? Have you seen that document? I'd like to know that and I'd like to know what's in that document. Mr. Speaker, I'm waiting for this document to come into my hands and I have much more I would like to offer so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 3 – Purchase of Hopper Cars

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry) moves, seconded by Mr. Lusney (Pelly):

That this Assembly commend the Government of Saskatchewan for its initiative in responding to the needs of the Canadian Wheat Board and western farmers through the placement of orders for one thousand steel hopper cars to be delivered in 1980 for dedication to the grain fleet for the movement of prairie grain.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it's with pleasure that I move this motion commending the Government of Saskatchewan for initiative in purchasing 1,000 hopper cars to move prairie grain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: – It gives me a real sense of pride to be a part of a government that can recognize the importance of a healthy agricultural sector in our economy and make moves necessary to maintain the good health. Agriculture has always been a priority of the Blakeney government.

The farm families and the people of rural communities across Saskatchewan know it was the Blakeney government that saw the need for young farmers to get them started in farming, and moved quickly to set up programs like land bank and FarmStart.

Mr. Speaker, when beef producers were suffering badly deflated prices and adverse conditions in general, it was the provincial government that established the beef industry assistance program with its millions of dollars in loans and grants that poured into the economy of rural Saskatchewan.

No matter what it is, Mr. Speaker, from financial assistance to move grain dryers and combines in a wet harvest, to technical and monetary help to over 100 villages and towns, whose water supply was affected by a recent drought, rural Saskatchewan knows it has a friend in the New Democratic Party.

There is an old saying, Mr. Speaker, that when agriculture is healthy, Saskatchewan is healthy, and with programs like land bank, FarmStart, beef industry assistance, and many others the New Democratic Party government has instituted, Saskatchewan

agriculture and it has been healthy.

The decision to buy 1,000 hopper cars is but one part of that overall effort by the Blakeney government to keep rural Saskatchewan economically sound. It is however a very important part as anyone who knows the value to our economy of the export sales of grain will attest. The purchase of the cars is a sound decision, Mr. Speaker, and I think anyone who examines the facts of the present situation in grain handling and transportation will agree.

When the Government of Saskatchewan was asked by the wheat board a year ago last January to participate in the purchase of hopper cars, we said no, that it wasn't the farmers job or the provincial taxpayers' job equip the system; it was the railways' job. But we began to discover during the year that the railways had no intention of buying cars, and the ones who were suffering from this policy were not the railroads but they producers. The Canadian Wheat Board could not do its job of selling to available markets if it couldn't get the grain to the port. Farmers' incomes were being cut to the tune of \$1.5 billion a year because of the deficiencies of the transportation system. Through no fault of its own, confidence in the board was being undermined.

We decided that we couldn't afford to let that continue. Saskatchewan made the commitment to invest \$50 million of resource revenue to purchase 1,000 hopper cars to move prairie grain. The cars will be delivered by the fall of 1980, and they will move \$1.25 billion worth of grain every year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, Mr. Speaker, if the members want to get in debate I'm sure they'll have lots of time to get in and express their views on the hopper cars when I'm done moving this motion.

Following Saskatchewan's decisions, the federal government announced the lease of 2,000 hopper cars. Alberta announced that they would possibly purchase 1,000 cars. Manitoba announced that they would lease, or probably would lease 400 cars. CN put out bids for 1,000 cars and CP committed itself to buy 95 locomotives. Now this is definite action, Mr. Speaker, action to get the system moving, and I want to point out to members across the way that it was action initiated by the New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan that started it.

And I want to say just a few words about the position of the Conservative Party on this issue. It was the late great Joe Clark, speaking in Saskatoon on September 21 of last year, who said it is, and I quote, 'absolutely astonishing, unbelievable' that grain deliveries have been hampered to the tune of \$2 million a day in lost grain sales. Apart from the fact that a lot of things tend to astonish Joe Clark, it seems strange that the leader of the federal Conservative Party should be surprised at all by the fact that western grain growers were losing thousands of dollars apiece as a result of lost grain sales.

In the election campaign of 1979 the Tories promised solemnly to implement the Hall report recommendations in the area of grain movement. What did we get? Another study. And that study, which has now become public, what did it recommend? Were the Conservatives going to maintain rail service wherever the elevator companies wished as the Tories had promised? No, instead we got Wishart without rail service, Lintlaw and Nut Mountain without rail service, St. Louis and Waldheim, Big Beaver and Coronach without service. Instead, we got recommended abandonment of Foam Lake to Wishart line, Kelvington to Preeceville, the St. Louis line and Coronach to big Beaver line. And at the delivery points surrounding these communities the elevators would be plugged up even more than they are now. Without these elevators, it will make it even more difficult

for the grain storage capacity and the grain fleet we now have to handle an average size crop.

Former federal minister Don Mazankowski's initiatives in improving grain transportation were even greater than those of his illustrious leader Joe the Slow. When Mr. Mazankowski heard that the wheat board could not meet its export commitment because the Great Lakes shipping vessels contracted through the board were lured away by U.S. grain companies, he took the bold step of announcing that he would call a meeting.

And finally, while we were promised by those same Conservatives that grain exports would be up 20 per cent in 1979, the only thing the Conservative government managed to raise was Hugh Horner's salary to \$75,000 a year. Total grain exports are almost unchanged from last year. As a matter of fact, our exports of wheat are not up at all but rather down 15 per cent from 1978. Now whatever increases there have been came on non-board grains, in keeping with the Tory policy of wrecking the institutions that best serve farmers.

I think the decision by the Government of Saskatchewan to buy this rolling stock is the kind of action our national grain transportation system needed. All of those people who know the system best, have called for more hopper cars. Esmond Jarvis, the chief commissioner for the Canadian Wheat Board did so at the annual meeting of Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in November. Charlie Gibbings, Ted Turner, Emmett Hall, and numerous others have called for more transportation capacity in the system.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few more words about the Conservatives' policy on grain movement. We all remember the now-famous statement by the former prime minister, while on tour of southern Manitoba, when he said he doubted it would be a good idea if the private grain traders were permitted to compete with the Canadian Wheat Board in selling on the international market. It had apparently not occurred to the Conservative leader that the result of that type of competition would only be to bid the price down as one agency undercut the other. We remember Jack Murta, the Conservative member of parliament for Lisgar, when he advocated such things as closing of the Port of Churchill and long distance trucking to the main railway lines. We also remember the resolution moved by the member for Rosthern last year in this House, when he attacked the Canadian Wheat Board for buying hopper cars.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservatives sit up late at night thinking up new ways to do harm to those institutions that move our prairie grain to market. The very worst example of that, Mr. Speaker, was the former Transport Minister Mazankowski's talk of crow benefits. To hear him talk you would think that our hopper car shortage would be solved all but immediately. If only producers would see the light and pay the full compensatory rates to the railway for grain movement.

Well, according to the Conservatives once the freight rates on grain moving to export were raised to whatever the market would bear the railways would gladly produce enough rolling stock to fill all the wheat board orders. I want to tell Conservatives sitting here in this provincial legislature that is not the case. I have recently seen evidence to prove it.

Mr. Speaker, a number of members on this side of the House took a trip last week to points in Montana to see for ourselves. There we met with civil servants, members of

state grain companies, and members of elevators. We looked at many of the branch lines and did inquiries on freight rates in that area. We were particularly interested in the issues, like the whole area of railway service to local farmers, of which car allocation is a part.

We talked to the elevator manager in Havre, Montana. He told us that last summer he simply could not get hopper cars or box cars out of the railway company. Havre is served by the Burlington Northern Railroad. Burlington was charging farmers \$1.48 per hundredweight to ship wheat west to Seattle or Portland. The elevator manager also told us that he shipped 17 semi-trailer loads of grain in one day all the way from Havre to Seattle on the highway because the Burlington Northern could not supply him with hopper cars or even box cars to move grain out of his plugged elevator.

I would also like to tell the Conservatives that we saw branch lines in Montana in just as bad condition as were our branch lines here in Canada – badly worn rails, poorly maintained road beds and trestles – over which hopper cars could not be taken. Some stretches of rail line are facing abandonment.

The American farmers we spoke to are facing the very same kind of neglect and poor service which the CPR and the CNR provide to Canadian farmers. The difference in rates did not make one bit of difference in allocation of cars or anything else. Service was not better than that at Shaunavon, which is just north and little east of Havre, but at Shaunavon it cost producers 24 cents per hundredweight to ship their grain to Vancouver. So I ask you Conservatives, why should Canadian farmers trade their Crows Nest Pass freight rates for rates six times as high if it does nothing to provide them with cars to move their grain or maintenance of their railway network?

Mr. Speaker, we were told by state wheat marketing officials that the turnaround time in cars in parts of Montana is from 35 to 40 days. Here in Canada we are looking at anywhere from 17 to 19 days, which indicates again the superior system to theirs. In fact, at Havre we were told that it took 18 months for the GTA elevator there to receive an allocation of 10 cars.

Mr. Speaker, the rail freight rates in Montana are of particular interest to us. In visiting many of the points such as Chinook we find the freight rate at \$1.54 a hundredweight or \$92.70 a bushel. Harlem the next elevator point at \$96.60 a bushel or \$1.51 a hundredweight. As I already mentioned Havre, which is the next town, is \$89.10 a bushel. You could go just south of us to Wolf Point where it is 116.7 cents a bushel or 194.5 cents a hundredweight and car shortages are worse there than they are here.

Amazing enough, Mr. Speaker, the state of Montana has been using trucks to make up the deficit in cars to move grain. At one point up to 40 per cent of the grain was being trucked. But that was until the railroad decided that it was a threat to their business. Then the railroads suddenly decided to provide boxcars and cut the freight rate, which they have the power to do. What the result was is that out of some 200 truckers who belong to the farmers' trucking association, 150 went bankrupt. They had truck payments to make in the area of \$1,800 a month, so you know what the consequences are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to point out to this House is that the variable freight rates have not improved the railroads. They haven't improved the grain fleet and they certainly have caused road damage and closed elevator points. On the Milwaukee line, for example, which runs from Denton to Lewistown, we were informed by individuals

there that the railroad has two maintenance men to look after 80 miles of track and you can see why that line is up for abandonment. I don't believe we want that kind of system in Saskatchewan. The importance of the hopper car purchase here is to make sure we don't get into the same situation as Montana, which would destroy the orderly marketing system we now have.

Saskatchewan's purchase of 1,000 new steel cars is meant to fill a gap left by the railroads and the federal government. I know grain growers in my constituency and across the province see it that way and will welcome the move. The Saskatchewan hopper cars will serve Saskatchewan people well for decades to come and future generations. We'll look back and say that the New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan served its people well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. N. LUSNEY (Pelly): – Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to second this motion. As an elected member from a rural riding. I represent several thousand grain growing families whose livelihood depends on export sales of Canadian grain. The purchase of 1,000 hopper cars by the Government of Saskatchewan will help ensure that prairie grain does move to export market position and that farm families realize a better income as a result.

I would like to say to the opposition members that I hope they will join us in supporting this motion because, as the mover of the motion, my good friend the member for Rosthern said, the list of those who have called for an increase in our grain moving capacity is a long and impressive one. Mr. Speaker, the former prime minister and the federal Conservative leader loaned his voice to those who have called for more hopper cars when he spoke at a meeting in Saskatoon on September 21 last year. At that meeting the Conservative leader, on behalf of the federal government, announced the leasing of 2,000 hopper cars at a cost of \$10 million a year. The hopper cars are to be built by private companies and these private companies will in turn lease them to the federal government for the \$10 million a year. Mr. Clark as never bothered to make it clear why he chose not to buy the cars and thus give the people of western Canada a lasting asset that will only be worth more as the years go by and our international grain sales increase. Mr. Clark decided rather that he would follow the same line of Tory thinking that killed the Auto Arrow in the early '60s and almost killed Petro-Can in the late '70s. When it comes to a decision between a government making a bold move that is imaginative and prudent at the same time and, on the other hand, a government paying off some private corporate entity to do the same job less effectively, a true Conservative will always choose the latter course.

Mr. Speaker, there are at the present time by the railway's own figures, less than 22,000 hopper cars or box cars in the Canadian grain hauling system. If no cars were added or rehabilitated the fleet would drop to below 13,000 by 1963. I would remind members that it is by the mid-1980s that we are told our share of the international market will be in the neighborhood of 30 million tons of grain. In 1977-78 the Canadian Wheat Board deferred sales of 75 million bushels and turned down sales of some 80 million bushels. We had the grain but we could not deliver it from here on the Prairies to export position. The result was the loss of \$450 million in sales for western farmers. In 1978-79 the loss was even worse. Export deliveries were down a further 80 million bushels and financial loss to grain growers was in the neighborhood of \$0.5 billion. Only 58 per cent of the available grain on the Prairies could be delivered into export position in the '78-79 crop year and sales were being turned away.

Mr. Speaker, in northeastern Saskatchewan, including part of my own constituency where many of our elevators are provided with boxcars only for the movement of grain, many farmers had to accept low quotas in the '78-79 crop year because the grain transportation simply could not get their grain out. Our country elevator system was and still is heavily congested. In 1977 the elevator system had working space of 30 per cent. In 1978 the figure had dropped to 12 per cent, and when the final figures are in for the last year it seems quite likely that the available space in our elevator system will be down still further.

Meanwhile, at the other end of the railway, ships sit in Vancouver harbor waiting for weeks to be loaded with Canadian grain. They sit at anchor and wait, and for every day that they wait, thousands of dollars in demurrage charges must be paid and ultimately it is the producer who must pay these thousands of dollars. The only way demurrage charges could be kept down at Vancouver in the winter of 1978 was to direct boxcars away from Churchill and Thunder Bay. The result was then that those two ports when they reopened in the spring were short of grain. This was the situation we found ourselves in, Mr. Speaker; a terrible glut of grain here on the Prairies, and at a time when we could sell more it could not be transported to export terminals.

Until very recently, it was possible to point to the two major railway companies and say that neither one of them had purchased any hopper cars for grain movement. The CPR had not bought a boxcar for grain movement since 1950 and the CNR hadn't bought any since 1946. Recently the CNR announced its intention to buy some rolling stock and the CPR as indicated it will buy some locomotives, but still the two railways combined are allowing 1,800 cars to be retired from service every year.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the decision by the Blakeney government to buy 1,000 new steel hopper cars is exactly what was required. Each 100 ton hopper unit can move 3,000 bushels per trip and make an average of about 19 trips a year. If you work through the figures, you find the hopper cars will haul an additional 57 million bushels of grain annually, and if wheat is at \$4.25 a bushel, that would mean an injection of cash into the farm economy of about \$242 million each year. That is almost \$1.25 billion, Mr. Speaker, for an investment of \$50 million. I think it is also important to note that the hopper cars Saskatchewan ordered will be built in Canada and maintained in Saskatchewan shops wherever possible. They will be built to include the most advanced safety features, such as improved breaking capacity and screens under each hatch door. They will be available in the off-season for hauling potash and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will similarly make its potash cars available for grain movement when demand on them permits.

The cars will be under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board and used for transport of grain under wheat board jurisdiction. There will be no fee charged to the railways so long as the cars are used for the movement of grain from the Prairies to Thunder Bay, Churchill, Vancouver and Prince Rupert, and so long as the wheat board controls quotas through the block shipping system. Mr. Speaker, the entire arrangement is a sound one for the people of Saskatchewan, and I am pleased to second this motion.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): – Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to no end to enter one of the most exciting debates I've seen in this House in some time. I support in principle the motion the hon. member has put on the order paper. I take some issue however with the jiggery-pokery he's been playing with the numbers he has advanced.

I'm going to give you a brief breakdown of what came on stream as it relates to rolling stock and commitments that were made, as it relates to rolling stock during the reign of Hon. Don Mazankowski. For instance, as it relates to boxcar rehabilitation there were 3,000 committed prior to the reign of Don Mazankowski. They were only started. Don Mazankowski committed to finishing them, plus an additional 2,000, for 5,000 boxcars added to the grain fleet. As it relates to hopper cars, the federal government leased 2,000 hopper cars under Don Mazankowski. The wheat board under Don Mazankowski bought an additional 2,000 hopper cars and they're coming on stream at the rate of 21 a day.

I ask your member for Redberry, where are your hopper cars today? Where are they? How many bushels have you moved in your hopper cars? Under the reign of Don Mazankowski and the spirit of co-operation that he inspired, CNR bought 1,000 hopper cars. The spirit of co-operation inspired by Don Mazankowski brought Alberta on stream with another 1,000 hopper cars. This same spirit of co-operation, although it was only one-sided, brought an additional 1,000 hopper cars from this beautiful thing called Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation. Manitoba leased 4,400 hopper cars, and my friend, in spite of the efforts of your party to hose them out of the Canpotex cars, they loaded the first Pillsbury car yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: – In addition, on the recommendation of Dr. Hugh Horner, there is a test project on now with 800 government ballast cars. They are going to put fibreglass tops on them, load them with barley during the winter, rail this to Churchill so that we don't have a repeat of past history, where we bring ships into Churchill and then start railing the barley from Peace River. Talk about demurrage, talk about . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . speak up . . . There are 800 government ballast cars. There are 66,000 owned by the two railroads. I just want to touch briefly on the disproportionate commitment. You guys haven't got a lot to be proud about, not a whole lot to be proud of. You have come up with 1,000 hopper cars that we haven't seen yet. You've stuck them in a Crown corporation that we can't get access to; you're avoiding public scrutiny. You grow 60 per cent of the export grain of Canada right here in Saskatchewan; Alberta grows 25 per cent and committed the same number of cars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: – You were a little critical of the Alberta commitment when some overly enthusiastic Albertan said they will be used to haul Alberta grain. In fact, they are under the jurisdiction of the grain car co-ordinator. Where are yours? You have tied so many strings to them that it is unlikely they will ever roll. Compare 12,400 additional rolling stock brought on stream or committed as a result of the co-operation inspired by Don Mazankowski; they will be on the road by 1985.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: – In addition, through this spirit of co-operation inspired by the Hon. Don Mazankowski there were \$40 million spent by CPR to buy 75 locomotives. There is a very good chance that the grain will move. In fact, under Don Mazankowski's reign, farm deliveries were up 26 per cent over the same period the previous year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: – And where was Saskatchewan? Where was the minister responsible for your Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation during this co-operative effort to get the system moving? Nobody seems to know where the Minister of Agriculture was when the federal minister was in town. No less than three times Don Mazankowski was in town to meet with the provincial minister. He knocked on the door and no one was home. Where was he? He was down at the press screaming for lack of co-operation from his federal counterparts. Mr. Speaker, the one other question I have as it relates to the whole Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation is why a Crown corporation? Was it to avoid public scrutiny? Or was it to enhance your shaky heritage fund by having some better piece of the action through equity or both? All in all, you don't have a lot to be proud of. You play jiggery-pokery with all of your figures while you were laying this out on us. I will be reviewing those numbers and countering them at some later date. I therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 18 – Select Standing Committee on Environment

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley) moved, seconded by Mr. Muirhead (Arm River):

That this Assembly establish a select standing committee of the Assembly to deal with the environment and further that the committee be allowed to investigate all environmental concerns.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to approach the subject of this motion in basically two parts. I would first like to speak on what I think is an important move by the legislative process, not only in this province but in all provinces across this country, and that is to develop further, stronger and more active committees of the legislature. That is number one. Then, number two, I would like to elucidate on why I think the area of the environment is one area that should be approached on this whole subject.

Now there has been a fair amount of discussion, and I suppose that has been primarily in parliamentary circles, with regard to reform of our parliamentary system. I think we all recognize that as parliamentarians, and as members of the legislature, we have to look at how we are going to upgrade our system. And to our credit we do have a committee of this legislature looking into this problem. We tabled an interim report today and it is hoped that perhaps by this time next year, or sooner, we are going to have a further report setting out what vehicles we hope to have in the area of committee work.

Now I think what has happened in the total field of the legislative process is that the balance that has traditionally existed between the legislative branch and the executive branch of government has shifted. Democratically elected governments have been experiencing that power shift away from the legislative to the executive branch of government. I suppose there are various reasons for this, one being the growth of government (and that is not peculiar to this government). I think, looking at this again, growth of government has caused problems, and perhaps is going to continue to cause problems, that we as legislators must face. But in the system of government we have are the people who make the rules and tell us how we play by those rules. It is this problem, I think, that creates a problem for all of us as legislators. I think we all must look at perhaps a system of developing the committee as a vehicle by which we can bring the

legislature into more prominence.

When you look at that question of where the government stands and how the government (and when I say the government – the executive branch of government) is controlling everything. I was fortunate to be at a meeting of legislators this past fall in Toronto. I was at that point very impressed by a member of the Labour Party from the parliament in Great Britain. As legislators, if we are going to make the House more effective, if we are going to make the system more effective, he said: I don't believe that any parliament can work unless the member, however he is elected, however much party affiliation played in his election, behaves very independently of his party. You can say that parliamentary democracy always lies in trust with the backbenchers of the government side of the House. Unless we are prepared to take it to the minister as backbenchers and as members of the opposition, the function of the legislative process is not going to work in the way it is supposed to work.

I think, first of all, if we are going to make the legislative committee a viable operation that legislative committee must consist by its nature of an all House committee – members from this side, members from the backbenches of that side. Perhaps in a starting fashion we must take the abrasive politics out of that to a degree so that we can start looking at the solving of a solution. I think we did that step today with the tendering of our report which is a unanimous report, small as it might have been, but it was a unanimous report of the committee on rules and procedures.

Then we must give the committees a vehicle by which they can become effective. That means staff, that means research and those types of things. Now with the people from all sides, from both sides of this House, we sit in this legislature for perhaps two, three or at the most four months of the year. For the other seven, eight or nine or ten months of the year we're at home and as legislators we become glorified ombudsmen if we really want to get serious with ourselves. That's you and that's you in the back row and it's I. But really that's what's happening to us and as members of the backbenches and as members of the opposition I think we deserve more than that. So we must look at vehicle by which we can create a mechanism by which the legislature of this province becomes more relevant to the people of this province. That's an important issue for the democratic system. From that point of view I would encourage the people, and I'm sure that we can have co-operation on this given motion to make a stronger system, to make a stronger democratic system.

O.K. having said that, having said that we agree with strengthening our committees, the members of your party various other provinces are strongly in favour of that. The members of the New Democratic Party in the national parliament of this country are strongly in favour of strengthening the committees, giving them more investigative powers, giving them more research and more things to do. If you simply look at the province of Ontario which is a tremendous example, at the Ontario Hydro Commission which is empowered to investigate a tremendously wide range of things including the total uranium development, the total power development of Ontario Hydro with a huge budget and a huge research staff, and they have addressed that problem and made effective change. Now I say that we in this province can use the vehicle of the legislative committee to make effective change.

Each parliament or each legislature has to look at its own rules. What applies in Ottawa or in Ontario does not necessarily apply in Saskatchewan. I believe that our committees here should be composed of members of the opposition, members of the backbenches on the government side, so with the 61 member House and the 21 or 22 member

cabinet that, by its nature, eliminates that down to 40 members. If our committees are to be effective and something more than, let's say for example, the agriculture committee that hasn't sat or hasn't convened for something like 28 years in the province – that's ridiculous – if we are going to have those committees, to make them effective they must sit intersessionally and they must have something to deal with. As we only have 40 members to staff these committees we cannot have a committee for this, and one for this, and one for this, and one for this. We must draw a priority. I suggest to you that obviously the committees we have now being public accounts and Crown corporations and various other smaller committees but those two primarily, must exist and must continue and must be strengthened.

I suggest further we look at the subjects that are going to be a matter of debate, that are pressing or immediate issues faced by the people of Saskatchewan. I suggest that one of those is the total question of the environment. For that reason I suggest and I put forward the proposition that we in this House, all members of this House, vote for the establishment of a select standing committee. That means it becomes a permanent committee, not simply a special committee that whenever the government decides we should do some investigating we can strike. This committee would be permanent. It would last for the full term of the legislature, the full four year term of the legislature. It would probably be chaired by a government backbench member. It would be represented proportionately to reflect the proportion of representation in the House, in other words perhaps two to one or some combination like that. And it would be empowered not to be restricted by whether the Attorney General or the Premier wanted the investigation to be restricted.

The committee would be given the power to investigate what that committee determined proper. In other words if that committee said, it strikes us there is a problem with the Poplar River project, this proposed standing committee of the legislature could in fact convene, be it in Regina or be wherever it might be. It could call witnesses whether it's the minister involved or whether it's members of his department or expert witnesses from around. Surely in the area of the environment it is going to be a debate that is going to continue not only in this province but in every province of Canada through this decade. That's clearly an area that we should be facing as legislators.

We sit here today, Mr. Speaker, I suppose talking about the motions. Oh, and the motions tended to be talking about yesterday's news, quite frankly, and I think as legislators we have to face the things we're facing now, not whether we should have bought 1,000 hopper cars. They've been bought. It's over with. O.K. let's get on with the job. That type of thing does nothing to enhance the members of this legislature. We have to look at the problems that we face now and when the issue is there we have to have a committee. I suggest to go out to meet that problem. The member for Arm River I think, to his credit has raised various questions as they relate to the PCB issue in the Regina area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: – There are scraps coming here and scraps coming there why don't we as a legislature have a vehicle by which we can call the gentleman that he referred to today? Or by which we can call the Minister of the Environment, or call deputies of the Minister of the Environment so that we can do our job for the people, to elucidate the information so that the people can have that information. Surely that is the function of a legislature. Surely that is only a proper job that we do. We are afraid as legislators to do that. If we are collectively afraid to face those problems then I think we probably

deserve the contempt that a lot of people have for politicians. We have to face the music. We have to face it in a new way. I suggest this committee is one way to do it.

You don't restrict to those things . . . the uranium debate. It has been debated here and it has been debated there. There have been inquiries. Usually they have been highly technical questions. But as legislators we seem to want to delegate that to a technical person, or to a lawyer – the Mitchells of the world or the other people of the world. What are we doing? Why shouldn't we have a committee that investigates Warman? Why shouldn't we as legislators have a committee which investigates Key Lake? What's wrong with it? Are we shirking our duties as members of this legislature? I suggest that we are. I suggest that you members in the back row – perhaps you are afraid, some of you, perhaps you look kindly toward the chance that some day you will be a member on the front row or a member of the Executive Council, so you don't rattle the chain. That's not the way to go. If you look at the parliament in Ottawa, a committee headed by Dr. Mark MacGuigan, who is now the Minister of External Affairs, did an extremely thorough investigation of the penitentiary system in this country. It was an all-party committee. It was a unanimous report. It was critical of the federal government but it was effective legislative work.

I suggest to the members opposite and I challenge the members opposite to stand up and say, yes, we as legislators deserve a better lot than we have. Quite frankly, if we look inward to ourselves and are honest with ourselves, we are not very effective as legislators. That's me and it's you and everybody . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the member for Rosemont, I suppose, does have ambitions for the cabinet. He would like the front row too. I suggest that perhaps the member for Rosemont, other than the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, more than anyone else on that side of the House, is prepared to address many of the problems and to act in a more independent fashion. I suggest that he would support, and I think he does (to his credit), the same type of concept. I would be interested to see if the member for Regina Rosemont is prepared to stand up to speak on this issue.

It is with that, I move Resolution 18.

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): – Mr. Speaker, I've been in this House for approximately a year. There's one conclusion I have come to and that's that we're lacking one thing and that's freedom of information. What really bothers me is this freedom of information. We can't get it from you boys. We can't get it from your Premier. Well, I asked him some questions the other day in a press release. I made a press release and I asked the question. The press went straight to him with it and this is what he came up with. I like to start my speeches with a joke. Now here's a joke. Here it is. I asked him some good questions here . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Anyway there were some good concrete questions here and the Leader-Post printed it three times last week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Nuclear policy defended . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: – All that says is that the Leader-Post is a joke too.

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Oh no. They printed it but then they also printed this. The Premier was reacting to Conservative environment critic, Gerald Muirhead and this is what he

said. He said Saskatchewan's safety record has been better than Ontario's. That's got to be the grand daddy of them all. You know that puts him in the middle. It puts him right in the middle. You know that the middle is as close to the bottom as it is to the top. We haven't got too much time. I'm going to cut this short.

The decision made to delay burying these PCBs out here for another year or two has got to be an insult to the people of Saskatchewan, especially to the citizens of Regina. It's just an insult. Mr. Speaker, do the members opposite realize when that spill occurred there were 1,500 gallons which would have fitted in the back of my farm truck? I've got a 1,500 gallon tank that would have held the whole works if they had clean it up that day. But no, what did they do? Now there's between 10,000 and 20,000 cubic metres.

Now I would like to ask this question. Why has the Department of the Environment bothered contacting the National Research Council of Canada to see what they could do about the situation? Why do it, then wait for a year? They come down as a result and they say no, we've got a better idea; we'll wait some more. What a simple language! You people are so naive over there. I'm absolutely quite certain that I've made a disastrous mistaken when it comes to PCBs. If I had never opened my mouth about them, I'm sure they would have been buried. They would have been hauled out of here. But I've hollered so much now that you've put your stubborn block up and say, we'll do it when we say, not when the opposition or when the National Research council says.

I can't understand why the Minister of the Environment fails to come to this House in the last while. We sat 12 days last fall. We was there 3 out of the 12 days. He wasn't here yesterday but he's here today. I don't think he wants to face me in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – But, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame him. Who looks after this province and this city? Where was he last summer when the PCBs were in the drinking water? Where was he – on a holiday along with the rest of you joe boys over there? That's a serious question now. That is a serious point I just made. They couldn't find anybody to make a comment. There were seven sitting MLAs in this city, including the mayor, a member from Moose Jaw, and the Premier and it should have been their concern. But where was he? They couldn't even find him for comment. They had to phone Gerry Muirhead out of Craik and get him off the tractor.

I made a suggestion in the House today as to what they could do with the PCBs but they will probably laugh at that too. I'll tell you, that when I talked this morning to Dr. Gordon Butler, the chairman of the panel, he didn't think it was any joke. His statement was this: Make the government tell you why they cannot remove it to a temporary pit, a cement pit as I suggested to him and he said it's a good solution to the problem. He said make them tell you why they can't. Don't bring up the subject of dollars and cents after you've blown \$500 million playing around here with the nuclear development and uranium mining – \$500 million of the taxpayers' money is going to be spent by April of 1981. It came from him. I want to know why this can't be done.

Ten thousand cubic yards of sod and PCBs can be hauled out to some property that you people own at a suitable location, put in a cement pit. Put a cover on it and leave it until there is some better solution. Then you don't have to worry about the people in Regina walking down the street saying, when are they going to do something with the PCBs? When are they going to do it. You people seem to think that the majority of the people in this province are NDP. Was it that way in the last federal election? You got 36 per cent.

There happens to be 64 per cent of the people who don't agree with you people. I guarantee that if you walk downtown today and you ask the first hundred people you see on the street, what do you think we should do with the PCBs – leave them there until they finally get into the drinking water or move them out of the city . . .

Mr. Speaker, I can't understand why the people seem to think this is a joke. It is no joke . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . To answer my buddy's question – he's got some decent questions to ask. How many metres will there be in two more years? How close were the PCBs to the drinking water in 1976? It wasn't very close was it? The PCBs were sitting right on top of the ground with no danger. Where is it now? It's down in the ground seeping and seeping every day, crawling to the drinking water wells in this town and to the aquifers. So why don't you do something about it? In 1977 I'm sure they were a lot closer. In 1978 they were closer but in 1979 when the research panel did their inquiry, it looked pretty serious to me. I have a map right here of the building and I was out there today talking to the manager of Federal Pioneer. He showed me the whole set-up, related to the map and measured, to see what the whole set-up was here – where it was in 1976 and where it is now. If you don't get something done with it very quickly, you're not going to have just PCBs to move, you're going to have to move the entire building of Federal Pioneer. You're going to have to bear the cost to move the whole set-up. Somebody's going to have to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He said, why doesn't the PC Party do it? When you guys let us come over there, we'll do it. I'm in no hurry, you know. You people have been in no hurry for years over this business. I happen to be on page no. 11. I wonder why you printed this in here. I wonder if the Minister of the Environment has a Webster's Dictionary so he can look and see what the word 'immediately' really means, because they say here that it is essential that facilities for storage of PCBs be provided immediately. What does it mean? Where are the remarks of the minister in charge of uranium? You had lots of remarks a few minutes ago. Silence!

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to Hansard, where in estimates one year ago in this House, I asked the Minister of the Environment, what are your plans for the removal of the PCBs at Federal Pioneer? Mr. Speaker, this was his answer.

The National Research Council is now doing its studies as how to and what the nature of this placement will be. Until that report is received from the National Research Council, I am unable to answer the member's question.

Well now we've got it: one year later we've got it. Do we get any answers from you people? Zero. Absolutely zero.

Mr. Speaker, I have been wanting to face the Minister of the Environment in this debate. He doesn't seem to want to come into this House, so I ask permission to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Clarification of Bill No. 47

MR. SPEAKER: – Standing on the order paper for second reading is Bill No. 47 – An Act respecting The Right of the Public to Government Information. In the name of the member for Kindersley I wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to section 14 of the bill, which provides for an information commissioner to be appointed by the

Lieutenant-Governor in Council and to be paid a salary out of the consolidated revenue fund. Provision for the payment of salaries imposes a charge on the public revenue and therefore a bill containing such provisions must be accompanied by a Crown recommendation. (Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth edition, citation No. 243; Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 19th edition, page 754). I find that this bill would impose a charge on the public revenue and is, therefore, out of order under rule 30.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:58 p.m.