

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

May 6, 1980

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. J.A. HAMMERSMITH (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the House, 99 Grade 8 students from Westmore Junior High School in Prince Albert. Some of these students are from the Prince Albert-Duck Lake constituency, and some from Shellbrook. They are accompanied by their teachers and chaperones: Mr. Twyver, Mrs. Kulyk, Mr. Johnson, Mrs. Senkiw, Mr. Stocki, and Mrs. Hankewich, as well as their bus driver, Norm Wicks. Westmore Junior High School makes an annual trip to Regina and makes visits and tours of various places in the city. I think they are to be congratulated for travelling so far. I trust that their stay in the legislature will be interesting, informative, and educational. I'll be meeting with them out in the rotunda at 3 o'clock for pictures, and joining them for questions and refreshments. I ask all members of the House to join me in welcoming this group this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Shellbrook): — I want to add my words to those of my colleague, the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, and welcome to the galleries this afternoon and to the legislature the students from Westmore Junior High. The hon. member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake did indicate that some of the students may well be from the constituency of Shellbrook, and I'm sure there are some although I don't recognize any of you from here. But welcome to the legislature this afternoon. We appreciate you making the effort to come. We appreciate the teachers and the chaperones taking their time and the unit board putting whatever effort they have into getting you here to the legislature. I'm sorry that I will not be able to be with Mr. Hammersmith this afternoon to meet with you for pictures and for discussions later on. I have some appointments and I will not be able to be there. So welcome to the legislature and I trust all members of the House will welcome the students as well.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to the other members of the House, 47 students seated in the east gallery — Grades 5 and 6 students from the schools of Montmartre and Glenavon. They are accompanied today by their teachers, Sandy Brown and Judy Squire, along with their bus driver, Connie MacKay. These students from Montmartre and Glenavon are very proud of the fact that their older brothers in many cases were part of the juvenile hockey team made up of Glenavon and Montmartre that captured the provincial final 'C' championships this year in the province. I'll be meeting with you a little later for some pictures and refreshments. I hope you enjoy the question period, and your visit to Regina and the legislature. Have a very safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to this

May 6, 1980

Assembly 23 students from Briercrest High School, Grades 7 and 8. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Moen and Mr. Johnson. I sincerely hope that the students will find their trip to this legislature rewarding and educational, and that it will give you some insight — good or bad — as to how your government is run. I'm sure we all wish you a safe trip home. I'm trying to cancel something so that I can meet with you afterward.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Bill No. 105

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, I have noticed for the past few days that you have omitted to introduce a bill to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act that has been on the blues, and in reading some of the columns in the paper it indicates the government is perhaps a bit undecided on this bill. My question is do you intend to introduce that in first reading today?

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — I should advise the hon. member that he would be well advised to read certain columns but only lightly. It will be introduced in first reading today.

Receivership re Shane Industries Canada Ltd.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I direct a question to the minister responsible for SEDCO. Can the minister responsible for SEDCO indicate what the loss will be on the impending receivership of Shane Industries Canada Limited, one of whose major shareholders is Reg Parker, three times defeated candidate?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, no I cannot indicate what the loss will be. The firm only went into receivership yesterday so there are no figures compiled until they are all completed. We have no accounting.

MR. LANE: — I would like to direct a question to the minister. Would it be fair to say that the loss will approximate at least \$175,000 on this venture? And can the minister tell us how a project, which as recently as December and January was being fairly highly touted for its great future in both the Leader-Post and the Star-Phoenix, fell so far short of your expectations?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, the produce that Shane Industries has developed and was marketing was, and still is, very viable and a very good project. Unfortunately the entrepreneurs who were involved apparently didn't promote it properly or what have you. I can't give you any answers as to why it went under but it did, and we are looking forward to being able to use that particular project further. We are going to develop it even after the receivership.

MR. LANE: — A supplementary to the minister. Will the minister not admit that his branch of SEDCO in Saskatoon turned down the original application (perhaps the Attorney General want to get into this) by Shane Industries at the outset and it was approved by the Regina office? In fact the project was a bad one from day one and the only reason the officials got the money was because of the political allegiance of Reg

Parker and his immediate family; it's the taxpayers of Saskatchewan who are being made to take another financial bath because of your granting public funds to defeated NDP candidates.

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, that may be the opinion of the hon. member but I can assure the hon. member that many projects are turned down by the offices within the province of Saskatchewan and are accepted at head office or vice versa. This is no particular reason for the particular project to go into receivership or no particular reason why we granted a loan to the entrepreneurs.

MR. LANE: — Final supplementary to the minister.

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

Use of SEDCO for Political Patronage

MR. LANE: — This is the third project involving former NDP candidates, or defeated candidates. I am referring to Golden Acres; I am referring to David Lange. I am referring to the fact that Mossbank Foods has some financial trouble, and now Reg Parker who was defeated federally on two occasions, provincially once. When is your government going to quit using SEDCO as a lever of political patronage and begin to put the interest of the taxpayers and the business community of this province first?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, we treat all people alike, no matter what party affiliation they have. It doesn't make any difference to us. So for the information of the hon. member, I want him to know that as far as Mossbank Foods is concerned one of these days he'll get the shock of his life to find out that will be a viable project. Golden Acres — I want you also to know we have discussed that subject in this House on many occasions. The member to whom he is referring was not a member at the time that loan was taken out, so it has no bearing whatsoever.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the minister. Would you also give some explanation to this Assembly as to why there was some rather strange financing in Shane Industries in that SEDCO is not in the practice of financing merely inventory (which you acquire after you are in operation) which was for the longest time, if not throughout the existence of that company, the sole basis for SEDCO's security. Could you tell us how the rather strange financing took place and how SEDCO was required or instructed to give such a significant amount of money to people with: (1) no track record, and (2) really no business background (I'm referring to Mr. Parker in particular) other than it being straight political graft and patronage?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with more than one Mr. Parker in Shane Industries. If you will read the track record of the other people involved, you might find a track record. We have no particular reason why we were dealing with one particular person. SEDCO did know that the produce which they were producing is a marketable produce, one which is desirable to all firefighting units right across the country. I say again, possibly if the thing was promoted and developed further, it still can be a viable product.

Formaldehyde Vapours

May 6, 1980

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of the Environment. Concerns are being raised as to the hazardous effects of formaldehyde vapours on humans because of experiences in two schools in Saskatchewan and a dwelling in Saskatoon. My question Mr. Minister, is your department prepared to conduct a full-scale investigation into the use of formaldehyde oriented products such as the foam insulation, plywood or chipboard in Saskatchewan?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I think the question should be more appropriate directed to the Minister of Health. If it has to do with the environment inside a building, in a work area, it has to do with the Minister of Labour, who deals with the area of the work place. If it has to do with a dwelling, I would suspect it is a matter having to do with the Minister of Health. Environment, the outside environment and matters related thereto, has to do with the Department of the Environment. I can't give the hon. member an adequate answer. I can take it as notice and try to get the information to her.

MRS. DUNCAN: — A question to the Minister of Health. In Massachusetts, the Department of Health has banned the use of urea formaldehyde foam. In light of what has transpired over the weekend, is your department at least investigating the possibility of having it banned here in Saskatchewan?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the member last week in this House, the Premier has instructed the various ministers concerned to do an investigation on the health hazards of urea formaldehyde. My department is, at the present time, looking at this particular problem. I can't give a definitive answer to the member. We have been in contact with the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Department of Labour and I would expect in due course we will make a decision in that regard.

Kennedy School Gym

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Education. As a result of a letter dated April 10, 1980 from the secretary of the Kennedy School District Board, I raised a matter of the Kennedy School gym with you. I can appreciate the fact that you did not get back to me about that particular problem, given the serious nature of it, and did not get back to me before I made the national news.

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister obviously is, now that you've taken some action with Kennedy, what action will you be taking as the head of the Department of Education to ensure the safety of our youth in this province as it relates to formaldehyde foam insulation being used in other schools? can you give this Assembly our assurance that you will work to investigate all the school systems in the province of Saskatchewan to ensure the safety of our youth?

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, first of all with respect to the comment about a reply to the member's information, I am sure he will concede that it was only two or three days ago that he passed the letter on to me. I am now compiling a letter to respond to the specific request he passed to me in writing.

However, with respect to the broader question he raises. I would point out to the hon. member that we do continue to monitor through our system of superintendencies,

directors of education, and regional superintendents the general condition of our schools in this province on a regular basis. In undertaking that kind of monitoring, we certainly do take into account on a continuing basis particular and potential health hazards that may be identified.

I will indicate to the hon. member that as a result of that kind of process we for instance very recently undertook a thorough and complete survey with respect to asbestos. The experience with the Kennedy gymnasium is currently being assessed with the help of highly professional experts from a number of government departments and private agencies. As a result of the analysis of that experience and the advice provided, we will then be taking whatever further steps should be added to our regular monitoring to determine whether or not this particular problem is one that could potentially have more general application.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. I would also ask, Mr. Minister, that you give the Assembly the assurance (notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of the Environment is attempting to exclude himself from the problem), that you will be in direct consultation with the Minister of Health and the Minister of Labour concerning the building codes and building standards, since it is well-known in the Kennedy situation that the contractor is not about to do anything at this point in time. You have not furthered any action whatsoever as the head of your department in that regard.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find it incumbent upon the minister to make sure he is in direct consultation with these other two ministers, so that they can collectively get together to resolve this particular problem in the schools in the province of Saskatchewan. I surely can't understand how three departments could muck up all at the same time.

MR. McARTHUR: — I can assure the hon. member that officials from the three departments he identified have been engaged in the analysis of the problem with the Kennedy gymnasium. I will comment on the hon. member's suggestion that the minister should in some way step in to impose a solution to the problem that exists between the school board and the contractor. I have to advise the hon. member that the laws of this province give me no such powers. The relationship between a contractor and a school board as the contracting agency rests within the civil law arena. I think the hon. members would be the first to criticize me if I were to attempt to abuse the powers of my office by trying to step into such a relationship.

MR. TAYLOR: — New question to the Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, have you checked the McLurg School in Regina, where the students are suffering from eye irritations and skin irritations from formaldehyde insulation?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't personally checked the McLurg School, but I can assure the hon. member that dating back to early last fall officials of my department, officials of the occupational health branch of the Department of Labour, and private consultants in the occupational health and safety field have all been engaged in an ongoing analysis of the particular problems at McLurg School. The problems there have proved to be particularly intractable in terms of identifying the source of the irritants.

As the hon. member will perhaps know, there are irritants being identified that are causing itching of eyes and so on among the students. There has been a great deal of professional attention paid to that problem. I have to tell the hon. member that those

May 6, 1980

professionals, we agree, have not been able to finally determine the source cause of those irritants. But all alternatives are being examined and every effort is being put into trying to determine the cause of that particular problem.

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplementary to the minister. I realize that as late as six months ago the Minister of Consumer Affairs was trying to get formaldehyde put on the restricted list. You did a study of the schools for asbestos. Can you tell me why you didn't study the schools for formaldehyde and other dangerous chemicals that could be compounded in these schools?

MR. McARTHUR: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, with reference to McLurg School, I can't tell the hon. member whether or not formaldehyde is a problem there. All possible potential sources of those irritants are being analysed. I will tell the hon. member that we have not, at this time, undertaken the same kind of survey with respect to formaldehyde as we did with respect to asbestos. We are still undertaking to analyse the source cause of the problems, as has happened in the Kennedy situation so that we could know exactly what it is that we are out there to try to search for.

AS the hon. member will know, I think there appears to be a problem with particular applications of the formaldehyde substance. An attempt is being made to further identify that so we can carry on with the general survey to identify whether or not that particular problem has more general application.

Validity of Food and Drug Act Standards

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, back in February the Supreme Court of Canada issued a little noticed decision which would appear to render most of the federal standards under the Food and Drug Act as invalid and unconstitutional so far as content and purity of the food product is concerned. Mr. Minister, this would seem to indicate that it has been tossed back to the provinces and that food processors and consumers are going to face 10 different sets of regulations in food products across Canada. Obviously this has got to mean a dramatic increase in food prices just through bureaucratic red tape.

My question to the Attorney General is: how is the province of Saskatchewan reacting to this Supreme Court of Canada decision?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I do not have the legal opinion before me which was prepared for my consideration by department officials, but if my recollection is correct, their legal judgment is not quite the same as that of the hon. member for Thunder Creek as to the effect of the supreme court decision. I think one might raise it to the level of saying that it has cast some doubts (if I can put it in those terms) as to the federal regulatory powers. But it did not go so far as to destroy it.

We are in the process of examining what the decision does mean. We are in consultation with other provinces and thereafter a course of action will be announced. I presume that it will involve discussions at the political or governmental level if such are deemed necessary.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question to the Attorney General. His departmental experts may very well not agree with my opinion, but perhaps in response the Attorney General could tell me why charges have been dropped against Ontario supermarkets

by the federal government — a supermarket which received a great deal of press about a year ago for mixing pork and beef half-and-half and calling it hamburger, as well as virtually all other charges which have been made under this act — if they do not agree. Now my supplementary question to you, Mr. Attorney General, is this: it would appear at this time, as far as food content and food purity is concerned, nobody is minding the store. Obviously the federal government is not doing so since it is dropping charges which are already there under the act. Therefore, if the provinces are not doing it (and from your initial answer I would assume the provinces are not), what protection does anybody have today as to what is in the food and the purity as previously administered under this act?

MR. ROMANOW: — Again, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the alleged statement with respect to the proposed case which has been dropped in Ontario. I will simply have to get information on that to satisfy myself that it is indeed the case. But I can assure the hon. member that — I shouldn't say it is not correct. It would not be a fair conclusion to assume that from this decision the result is that the consumer is not protected. If that assumption was correct, we surely would have heard about it by now if for no other reason than by the questioning of our friends in opposition in the House of Commons of the federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It simply has not been raised. I say that is the case because my interpretation of the legal decision (the one which I have been provided with at any rate) is more likely to be the proper conclusion. It does not have that degree of legal punch or impact that the hon. member would have the House believe.

MR. THATCHER: — This is the final supplementary to the Attorney General. I light of your answer on the initial two questions, might I get your assurances in this Assembly today and for the people of Saskatchewan that at this point in time somebody is regulating the Food Purity Act and that consumers are getting what they are supposed to be getting? Are you prepared to make an unequivocal statement to this legislature today indicating that they are going to be protected today, tomorrow and till this matter is resolved?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the consumers of Canada and Saskatchewan do have adequate protection under the laws. I do not (as I say again) subscribe to the legal opinion that the hon. member has tendered. Having said all that, I have told you on the very first question that I do not have a copy of the judgment before me. It has been some weeks since I have perused it. I will take it upon myself to go back to get the lawyer's view of this and other appropriate views to satisfy myself that there is no immediate danger.

Advertising re Fire Hazards

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Minister of the Environment since it has been made well aware by you that you are responsible for the outside environment. Mr. Minister, yesterday as a result of some extensive travel throughout the province and of course in the evening as well, it became very evident to me that there were a great number of fires burning out of control in all parts of this province, let alone the fires and devastation that is being caused in northern Saskatchewan. In southern Saskatchewan, we have a great number of fires burning out of control. My question very simply to you is, would you consider, as a government, excluding some of the wasteful advertising (I might suggest like the family of Crown corporations) and replacing that with some meaningful advertising like fire hazard warnings for the people of Saskatchewan so that we don't have any further wasteful

May 6, 1980

losses due to fires running rampant and out of control in the province?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, this is a rather twisted and distorted view of the responsibilities of environment. But I will try to answer as best I can the rather obvious question that is very difficult to answer in any way.

the family of Crown corporations (and I suppose under the CIC (Crown Investments Corporation)) will make the decision with respect to what publicity they wish to embark on with regard to their family of Crown corporations. They will do that, I would suspect, regardless of the forest fire condition and regardless of what the prairie fire situation is.

With regard to publicity with respect to the direct issue — prairie and forest fires — I do believe that the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources . . . My colleague is here. He will be undertaking whatever publicity he feels is necessary and proper in order for the public to be informed with regard to both forest and prairie fires.

Bill No. 65

MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Provincial Secretary. Could you please advise me whether this Bill No. 65, if passed in its present form, is applicable to cemeteries operated for gain and licensed as such by the Provincial Secretary?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I will take the next question.

Cottage Lease Fees

MR. J. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Mr. Minister, I had quite a few calls lately regarding cottage lease fees in the provincial parks. Have you set the new structure for the lease fees for the upcoming year, because these cottages were all appraised last year. If you have set it, what is it set for, and what percentage did it go up?

HON. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resource): — Mr. Speaker, the lease fees for the upcoming year have not been officially set. They are under consideration. I am awaiting a report, and when we have the report it will be tabled and the information will be sent out. It's not available yet.

MR. GARNER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, one of your department officials — and I quote from a letter I received —

However, this department official did state that he knows the rates, and has chosen to wait until the session is over and will establish the new rate structure then through an order in council, so that no one can step on your toes.

Why do we have to wait so long for this rate structure to be brought about, Mr. Minister? The appraisal was done last year. Why can we not have the rate structure right now?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the member earlier, it was under review and the assessment that took place was just completed very recently. I haven't had a full recommendation made to me on what the exact rates will be, and until I've received a recommendation from the department as to what those rates are, we can't make the

decision. So when we have that solid recommendation with the exact rate structure for all the cottages concerned, we will make the recommendation accordingly, but we still haven't the material finished or completed.

MR. GARNER: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, when and how long before we get out of the session? Can you tell us if you can bring that in within a week, within two or three days? Just give us some idea, some guideline. The people of Saskatchewan are quite concerned as to how much it is going to go up — the rent. let's deal with the people of Saskatchewan. When are you going to bring this forward?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member it will be announced in due course, and in due course is not very long. It will be a matter of a couple of weeks, a week to two weeks, and we should have it completed at that time.

FIRST READING

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary) moved first reading of Bill No. 105 — **A Bill to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.**

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 33

Pepper	Gross	Cowley
Allen	Shillington	Tchorzewski
Bowerman	MacMurchy	Koskie
Smishek	Mostoway	Lusney
Romanow	Kaeding	Prebble
Messer	Hammersmith	Johnson
Snyder	Dyck	Thompson
Kramer	Feschuk	Poniatowski
Robbins	Byers	Lingenfelter
Baker	Vickar	White
McArthur	Rolfes	Solomon

NAYS — 02

Collver	Ham
---------	-----

Point of Order

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — As you know, The Legislative Assembly Act and The Executive Council Act at the moment provide that the third party status in the Assembly shall be granted to a party with two or more members of this legislative Chamber. As

May 6, 1980

Mr. Speaker is also aware, over a week ago I spoke to Mr. Speaker about some aspects of that recognition of a party in the legislature, as to what the law is now, and Mr. Speaker agreed to give it consideration. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you on a point of order that consideration in this matter is not possible. The law states that the Unionest Party shall in fact be a recognized party as far as this legislature is concerned, and all matters pertaining to that party including the seating arrangements of this Assembly including the granting of grants shall be carried forward in accordance with the law by the Clerk's office and by Mr. Speaker's office. That is not now the case.

MR. SPEAKER: — At this point I see no conflict between the private conversation I had with the member for Nipawin with regard to the Unionest Party and the legislation which we have just concluded voting on for first reading. I would expect that the legislation that's in effect now with regard to the government, the opposition, and any other parties in the Assembly remains in effect until such time as it is amended or dropped. So, therefore, I don't see that there's any point of order that the member raised and I'm unable to determine what the point of order is because quite clearly if there is a point of order some rule must have been abridged in the House. If the member could briefly specifically tell me what that is then I could deal with it.

MR. COLLVER: — Briefly, Mr. Speaker, as one example and I will only present this in the example — the present seating arrangement of the House. This particular space is reserved for independent members, as Mr. Speaker is aware. The space for a third party is there. Now Mr. Speaker has left us in the independent section. I think that that is just one example of the recognition. Another example is the receiving of grants, and so on which have not yet been received by our party or by my office as leader of that party.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I think the seating of members in the Assembly is something that is decided by the Speaker, and legislation has no bearing on it whatsoever. I'll take the member's comments under advisement about where he should be seated in the Assembly, as members know I always do. With regard to anything else the member has said, I don't believe there is any point of order there.

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I just wanted to perhaps recognize rather than introduce, in the gallery, an individual who has left, the wife of our former premier, Mrs. Thatcher, and I was going to welcome her on behalf of all the members. I do that in her absence in any event.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 671

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern) moved, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead), that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 671 showing:

In the fiscal year 1979-80: (1) the number of permanent staff members of the urban affairs department that are (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on union leave with partial pay; (2) the proportion of their regular salaries now being received.

MR. SPEAKER: — I have a motion from the member for Rosthern, seconded by the member for Arm River. I rule the motion out of order because there is no urban affairs department.

Point of Order

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Provincial Secretary today moved first reading of a bill. It was passed by recorded division. Does the clerk have a copy of that bill tabled at his desk?

MR. ROMANOW: — I can't answer for the clerk but I am advised as House Leader that a printed copy of the bill is available and presumably will be distributed (unless there is some other information) in the normal, usual fashion.

MR. SPEAKER: — It is just a question of getting the number stamped on the bill and delivering it in the Chamber. I think that is all that is holding it up.

MR. COLLVER: — On a point of order though. When a minister reads first reading of a bill, is it not customary to table the bill at that moment in time for first reading? I mean how can you first read the bill if no one can read it, including the Clerk?

MR. SPEAKER: — I believe the Assembly's following the usual practice. As soon as possible after the bill has received first reading in the House, it is distributed to the members. It is not the practice of the Assembly office to stamp the numbers on the bill until such time as it has been read in the House. Therefore, it comes in in the proper order in relation to other bills. That's the reason it's not here yet. I expect it will be here momentarily.

Return No. 676

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern) moved, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 676 showing:

In the fiscal year 1979-80: (1) the number of permanent staff members of the Department of Social Services that are (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on union leave with partial pay; (2) the proportion of their regular salaries now being received.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Shillington), with respect to Return No. 676, that all the words after the word 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

During the 1979-80 fiscal years: (1) the number and names of all permanent employees of the Department of Social Services who were (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on union leave with partial pay; (2) the amount of remuneration agreed to by the government and each employee while the employee was on leave.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 677

May 6, 1980

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern) moved, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead), that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 677 showing:

In the fiscal year 1979-80: (1) the number of permanent staff members or the social planning secretariat that are (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on union leave with partial pay; (2) the proportion of their regular salaries now being received.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Shillington), that all the words after the word ‘showing’ be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

During the 1979-80 fiscal year: (1) the number and names of all permanent employees of the social planning secretariat who were (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on union leave with partial pay; (2) the amount of a remuneration agreed to by the government and each employee while the employee was on leave.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 678

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern) moved, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead), that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 678 showing:

In the fiscal year 1979-80: (1) the number of permanent staff members of SaskMedia Corporation that are (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on union leave with partial pay; (2) the proportion of their regular salaries now being received.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I moved, seconded by the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Shillington), that all the words after the word ‘showing’ be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

In the fiscal year ending in 1979: (1) the number of permanent staff members of the SaskMedia Corporation that were (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on leave with partial pay for purposes of union business; (2) the proportion of their regular salaries received while on leave.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 679

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern) moved, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead), that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 679 showing:

In the fiscal year 1979-80: (1) the number of permanent staff members of SaskMedia Authority that are (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on

union leave with partial pay; (2) the proportion of their regular salaries now being received.

MR. ROMANOW: — I moved, seconded by the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Shillington) that all the words after the word 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

During the 1979-80 fiscal year: (1) the number and names of all permanent employees of the SaskMedia Authority who were (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on union leave with partial pay; (2) the amount of remuneration agreed to by the government and each employee while the employee was on leave.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 680

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern) moved, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead), that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 680 showing:

In the fiscal year 1979-80: (1) the number of permanent staff members of the Saskatchewan Securities Commission that are (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on union leave with partial pay; (2) the proportion of their regular salaries now being received.

MR. ROMANOW: — I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture and Youth (Mr. Shillington) that all the words after the word 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

During the 1979-80 fiscal year: (1) the number and names of all permanent employees of the Saskatchewan Securities Commission who are (a) on education leave with partial pay, (b) on union leave with partial pay; (2) the amount of remuneration agreed to by the government and each employee while the employees was on leave.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 17 — Plant Breeders' Rights

MR. D. LINGENFELTER (Shaunavon) moved, seconded by the member for Pelly (Mr. Lusney):

That this Assembly, recognizing the benefits of the public plant breeding system to western farmers and to consumers of western grain around the world, urges the federal government to reconsider the legislation proposed by the previous federal government to grant monopoly privileges to private plant breeders.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to place this motion

May 6, 1980

before the Assembly. I hope that we are able to convince all members of this Assembly to support the motion and thereby represent what I believe are the best interests of the prairie producers.

It is interesting to note that in advancing the case for granting seed patents, and I think that that is the way we should refer to it, W.T. Bradnock of Agriculture Canada says the purpose of the legislation will be 'to stimulate the provision of crop varieties so the Canadian agriculture can produce to the maximum to help feed the hungry.' Surely this is convoluted logic, Mr. Speaker. If it's the hungry world about which we, as Canadians, are concerned, we could do a lot more if we turned things around from the situation where we in Canada are net importers of protein — and beef producers might have a word or two of advice about where we could start. No, Mr. Speaker, if it's the hungry of the world that concerns the federal bureaucrats (and it should be), we should drop the idea of private seed patent legislation in keeping with the model legislation codes drafted by United Nations agencies for use by third world countries, which advise against patent legislation.

There are reasons for suspicion regarding the motives behind patent legislation in Canada. Many people suspect it has little to do with feeding the hungry and quite a bit to do with the fact that Agriculture Canada is losing its battle for research funds with treasury board, and it hopes, through patent legislation, to attract corporate dollars to take up the slack. These suspicions are given credence when we witness the fact that the only real voices supporting the legislation are the major seed companies and chemical company spokesmen. They are anxious to consolidate their enterprises by getting rid of the small seed companies and thereby gaining greater monopoly situations, enabling them to wring greater profits out of the producers — the only place from which profits can come.

Mr. Speaker, in advancing patent legislation they argue that we will achieve better and greater varieties. The experience in such places as in Europe, in the EEC countries, all has been to the contrary. Dr. Erna Bennett, of the crop ecology branch of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, who was in Regina on March 2-0 tells us that the common catalogue approach of the EEC will wipe out three-quarters of Europe's vegetable varieties within a decade after the regulation comes into effect. Dr. Bennett is not alone in her predictions. Professor J.K. Bleasdale, the director of national vegetable research station at Wellsbourne, United Kingdom, describes the common market regulation as a self-inflicted wound. He confirms Dr. Bennett's predictions and describes the attitude of the European plant breeders as one of accepting the inevitability that purely commercial interests will dominate the situation. Many other experts in the field agree. The evidence from experience is stacked against those who would argue that we can expect more and better varieties. The evidence is all the other way.

The evidence is that patent legislation would be a retrograde step for a number of reasons:

1. It does and it will restrict the free exchange of genetic materials.
2. It has and it will continue to do a poor job of preserving, exploring, cataloguing and storing of germ plasm. Less than 2 per cent of the agricultural research dollars are devoted to preservation and genetic wipe-out.
3. It has and it will continue to allow large and private corporations to profit unfairly

from the public sector's financial support of research.

4. It has and it will continue to enable these same companies to increase seed prices — a situation beyond the control of any single government and a situation particularly unfair to third world countries, when you consider that for the most part these countries are the home for most of the nine major and three minor centres of genetic diversity.

5. It has encouraged and will continue to encourage improper promotion of weak and less than best seeds since the motivation of the controlling companies is to make a profit on their variety. They, therefore, must recover research and development costs plus a profit margin regardless of the prospect that better varieties are available. Their dominant position and ability to buy promotion and advertising will enable them to carry this off.

6. Perhaps the most chilling realization of all, it could enable corporations to develop varieties that are dependent on various chemicals for their germination, proper growth and final maturation.

I want to take a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to discuss this last point I have identified so that all members will understand the reason for my concern and the reason for a good deal of the concern expressed by many producers and research people. It would be a fair question, Mr. Speaker, to ask why? Why would anyone suspect or question the motives of these agri-chemical corporations? Or why would anyone be concerned about the vertical integration of chemical companies with seed companies? I will try to deal with both these issues.

The chairman of the Canadian Seed Trade Association's plant breeders' rights committee had this to say about the respective role for public and private efforts in plant breeding and I quote:

Personally, I see research divided into the discovery phase and the exploration phase. I believe that much of the discovery work in plant breeding, such as genetic resistance to disease, that kind of discovery research will continue in the public institutions. Conversely, I believe that the exploitation of research can best be done by private enterprise.

The implications of that statement are reasonably obvious. It suggests that the public, the taxpayers, should continue to fund any real research that will be carried out. This is a costly process in view of the fact that 10 to 15 years of work are required to develop a new variety. The statement suggests that the public should fund the finding and developing of useful germ plasms. The public should have to worry about disease resistance in new varieties and once these things are done, the fruits of that public investment in research should be turned over to private companies for patenting. Public money, it is suggested, will underwrite the licence for private profit. Companies can take the benefit of public financing research and then charge Canadian farmers, the producers, and therefore Canadian consumers commission for the new variety. In effect the public would pay twice, once for the research, and again for the privilege of buying the fruits of their own research. It's ludicrous to say the least.

Let me give you one further sampling of what I consider to be fairly revealing comments in regard to the potential of the so-called plant breeders' rights legislation. I quote from

May 6, 1980

an article which appeared in February 1979 issue of Canadian Business. The article is reporting on the attitude of a research director of a seed operation and it says?

Recently he remarked in a moment of unguarded candor that plant breeders rights legislation would permit companies to advertise and sell anything the suckers (suckers being the farmers) will buy.

That is the attitude, Mr. Speaker, not what's good for the hungry world, much less what products have the best natural resistance or the best nutritional value, but whatever the suckers will buy. And with the power of advertising what they will buy is what is good for the company.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I quoted the chairman of the CSTA's plant breeders' rights committee and the head of the seed house research operation. Whoa re these people who have this obviously warped view of agricultural production and the producers? The chairman referred to Byron Beeler who, when he is not acting as a lobbyist, acts as vice-president of Ciba-Geigy Seeds of Canada, and the research director is George Jones from Steward Seeds of Ailsa Craig, Ontario. Interesting, isn't it, that Ciba-Geigy only last year bought out Steward Seed, lock, stock and barrel?

Next question — who is Ciba-Geigy, Mr. Speaker? Ciba-Geigy ranks number 52 in Fortune's non-U.S. listing of major industrial corporations. It's a pharmaceutical chemical company. Agri-chemical sales accounted for 25 per cent of its more than \$4 billion worth of sales in 1977. Now why would anyone suspect the motives or question the motives of a company wanting to muscle in on the small seed businesses? The answer is pretty obvious, I think, and the attitudes expressed by some of the top Canadian brass I have already put on the record for those who might think the motives in selling chemicals are just fine, outstanding and altruistic. The answer is only too obvious. Ciba-Geigy is only one of a couple of dozen multinational chemical companies which has this more than passing interest in the seed business. The list includes more familiar names like IT&T, Purex, Royal Dutch Shell, Union Carbide (the third largest and one of the most notorious), General Foods and even our old friend, Cargill. And the list goes on.

In England when it was learned that patent legislation was forthcoming, the giant flour miller Rank-Hovis-McDougall bought out 84 small county seed companies in one week and was the proud owner of 100 such family seed firms before they quit buying. Other giants joined in the plunder with less spectacular results but with no less enthusiasm. Mr. Speaker, it's hard to imagine their reasons were altruistic.

In the United States similar actions were sparked by patent legislation in 1970. There was so much activity, in fact, that a meeting of the American Seed Trade Association set aside most of one day to explain to members how to sell their seed companies. It is difficult to imagine that such enthusiasm on the part of the giant agri-chemical companies was altruistic and that they were gobbling up these small family enterprises so they could, in turn, feed a hungry world. With that kind of evidence Mr. Speaker, it is difficult not to suspect and not to question the motives of these oligopolies in wanting patent legislation here in Canada.

Their own spokesmen, whom I have quoted, have told us why. Their interests are in profit and in expansion. The higher the better and the more the better. Whether it's at the expense of the farmers, whom they regard as suckers, is of little concern; whether it's at the expense of publicly funded research is also of little concern; and whether it's

at the expense of the consumer is of no concern at all.

I earlier asked a second question: why should we be concerned about vertical integration of chemical and seed companies? I would like to turn to that question and I will deal with it more briefly, since most of my earlier remarks already provide plenty of reason for concern. Quite apart from the fact that these giants are stepping on countless hundreds of small, privately owned, mostly family enterprises and quite apart from the attitude I described regarding the function of public and private funding — quite apart from these things there is an even more frightening aspect to the consequence of the strangle hold on our food chain being in so few and such suspect hands.

I am referring to the prospect of these agri-chemical giants dovetailing their chemicals with their seed research. I want to describe a few cases where evidence already exists. In 1978 the National Academy of Sciences noted that in the 400-500 new varieties brought forward in the United States annually since patent legislation was introduced the improvements actually amounted only to fine tuning of existing varieties. Nothing new was really added. The changes brought about might have increased the harmony with farm mechanization but added nothing to nutritional quality and in fact may have subtracted. In the only consumer acceptance test done in 1977, modern tomatoes, for example, were singled out as being less tasteful and less nutritious — hardly a recommendation for following that route.

An even more graphic example of dovetailing is the classic example of the Walter tomato which requires the gas ethylene to ripen. In the first step the seed has to be purchased from the company which produced it because it is a hybrid, so the seed must be bought each year. Before the fruit can be marketed the same company has to be called on to ripen it and make it marketable. That prospect is frightening enough without considering that chemicals supplied by the same company are probably required by the plant to make it grow.

The third point I want to register in this regard is that the patent rights create the necessary monopoly and liquidity for these companies to make gift-edged investments in developing hybrids. They will have the muscle, scientifically and financially, to force production into these lines. Anyone who doubts this need only look at the hybrid corn production in United States and Ontario. It can only be a matter of time before these firms bring forward a range of hybrid cereal crops.

Good news, you might say. And it is, unless you realize the implications of it. Hybrids, Mr. Speaker, would mean that the farmer would have to return to the company each year for seed. With good planning on the part of the company it means the farmer would have to return to the company for chemicals to make it grow properly and with a bit more good planning another chemical to make it ripen. Far fetched — not a bit. It is already happening.

Imagine it, Mr. Speaker. Thatcher wheat used to be a fairly popular variety of Saskatchewan grown wheat. If we turned it over to the brain trust of Cargill they might be able to tinker with it a bit and come forth with a new-hybrid Thatcher wheat. The members opposite might be interested in this, In a dry year they might still grow a 15-bushel an acre stand of straw, and unless you applied the right chemical you would have a 15-bushel per acres stand of straw of this new hybrid Thatcher wheat, but nothing in the heads. People could be forgiven, Mr. Speaker, if they didn't see switching to the new Thatcher hybrid as progress.

May 6, 1980

There is every reason to be concerned about this vertical integration which is taking place. It is almost getting too late to express our concern. In fact, it is probably too late for most of the members opposite, much to my disappointment. Mr. Speaker, their federal counterparts in Ottawa had a lot to do with promoting the cutback mentality adopted by the Trudeau government in 1978-79, resulting in the cutting of agricultural research funding, in turn resulting in the drive for patent legislation. I earlier drew the connection, Mr. Speaker. In the brief period when the Conservatives were in office in Ottawa, they gave every indication they would follow the Trudeau course. Now, Mr. Trudeau is back again and so is Mr. Whelan. He hasn't had the time yet to do anything to help the hard-pressed farmer but he has had time to indicate that he is back on the course with patent legislation.

I am not surprised that the Tories didn't change the thing when they had a chance. A little over a year ago I attended a meeting at the research station in Swift Current. It was a meeting sponsored by the Cypress Hills Community College and on the subject of plant breeders' rights. In attendance was our member of parliament, Frank Hamilton. When asked for the Conservative position he indicated that his part had given cautious approval to legislation proposed by Whelan; cautious approval, Mr. Speaker, another half pregnant position staked out by the federal Tories — a position, the temptation of which I hope the members opposite resist in the best interests of prairie producers and consumers the world over. I hope it is not too late for the Tories opposite, but I rather suspect it is because of the position taken by their federal counterparts.

I suspect it is too late for yet a third reason, Mr. Speaker. I raise this point because it lends weight and credibility to the theory often advanced that the corporate game plan of agri-business is being carried out with the knowing co-operation of the Liberal and Tory Parties. It is a game plan in which a particular farm organization is acting as the cutting edge for the old Liberal and Tory corporate axe being swung at the family farm in rural Saskatchewan. This seed patenting business is just another example.

One year ago, on March 19 and 20, there was a conference in Regina on this matter of patent legislation. The conference was told by Dr. Harris Gleckmann of the United Nations Center on Transitional Corporations that this debate involves philosophical and ideological questions: that the question of introducing patent privileges and control is a political question. My colleague, the member for Pelly will have a word of two more in this area.

So what else was the conference told, Mr. Speaker,? What can we anticipate being told by the members opposite? I predict that we are going to be told by the members opposite approximately the following: first, they are going to say that our information is half-truths, possibly mistruths, biases trotted out as facts; second, they are going to say that so long as there is strict control, grain producers' rights will be protected. I predict they won't tell us how the Government of Canada is going to control these large multinationals any more than they have in the past, whether it involves nickel or whatever. I predict they will say that. I hope not but I think they will, and they will demonstrate their willingness once more to sell out Saskatchewan.

Thirdly, they will probably say, let us simply discuss plant breeders' rights and leave out the emotional side issues and fears. I predict they won't want to discuss those so-called side issues and fears because these issues get to the real crux of the matter, that being who is going to call the shots in Canadian agriculture? I hope I am wrong, but I suspect I

won't be.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, I predict that the members opposite might even go so far as to say that a lot more farmers are becoming concerned about this issue who are going to hold meetings, and it would be better to stay at home and farm, as if they weren't doing that by finding out about seed patent monopolies.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, members opposite might go that far. I hope not, but you can never tell. Why do I anticipate that response from the members opposite, Mr. Speaker? Well, I already told you about the federal Tory position, the half-pregnant position on this issue, but the Tories opposite are already squeamish about Frank Hamilton, because of the things he said on other issues concerning agriculture — we have already put that on the record last year. So they might not follow him on this one. But they no doubt will say things which I have predicted, or things closely resembling them because those are the things being said by the agricultural committee of the Tory caucus, as the member for Morse dubbed the Palliser organization last years, because those generally are the things which were said to this Regina conference by none other than Bill Heenan of Regina, who is, it just happens, a leading member of the Palliser Wheat Growers. The member for Moosomin pronounces the name right, and he has probably been at the same meetings on a regular basis so he would know him.

If they follow Heenan's lead they will be telling Saskatchewan producers that it's Ciba-Geigy and Cargill and the rest whose brief they carry, and not the prairie producers'.

I hope the points I have tried to register establish the point that granting patenting rights is in the corporate agri-business' best interest and not in the public interest.

I hope I am wrong in my predictions about the members opposite, Mr. Speaker. I hope that in spite of these things, Mr. Speaker, members opposite will join with us in supporting this resolution for the reasons I have given and for the reasons I expect my colleague to add, and in the best interest of Saskatchewan agriculture.

Instead of following the lead of Palliser and the spokesmen of the dominant agri-chemical giant, members should consider views and attitudes more broadly representative of Saskatchewan's agricultural community. For instance, members might consider the view of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Does the SFA take the view, like Palliser, that farmers should quit going to meetings, stay at home and pay attention to their farming? Is that the view of the major farm organization in Saskatchewan? No, Mr. Speaker, not at all, in fact far from it. Here is a sample of what the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture has to say about plant breeders' rights, in the context of a brief outlining their view of farming policy for the 1980s.

First, they say the federal government must maintain absolute control over the licensing of plant varieties. Furthermore, they say no change should be made without fully consulting the agricultural community.

Secondly, they ask for a commitment to ensure increased public funding and plant breeding, and related agricultural research.

Thirdly, they say that royalties from public plant breeding programs should be returned to the public research institutions, not corporate agri-business, as would be the case from granting patent privileges, Mr. Speaker. Furthermore, they call for strengthened

May 6, 1980

competition laws and the use of FIRA (foreign investment review agency) to prevent the concentration of power over plant varieties, and the call for public control over pricing and public banking of plant genetic resources.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with every one of those policies spelled out by the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. In my remarks I hope I have been able to demonstrate the reasons why I believe the federation is on the right track. I hope all members will conclude they are on the right track.

A decision by this Assembly doesn't need to be delayed either, Mr. Speaker. The issues involved have been in the forefront of public discussion for at least two or three years. All members have had ample time and opportunity to consider the facts. They have no legitimate reason for ducking the issue here today, and I hope they won't.

Solid support for the motion may influence federal Agriculture Minister Whelan to reconsider his ill thought out plan, as I hope all members support the motion in the best interest of Saskatchewan agriculture.

I thank members for this opportunity to advance the case for this resolution and I am pleased to so move, seconded by the member for Pelly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. N. LUSNEY (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion, I want to make it clear that I regard the question of whether or not we have plant breeders' rights legislation as extremely important. It is very important to prairie grain growers, to consumers of our cereal grains, both in Canada and in our foreign markets, and it is important to the future of scientific agricultural research all around the world.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the Liberal government is once again advancing the idea of plant breeders' rights. And they are doing so for two reasons. First is because it will permit the federal government to do some more budget trimming, just as they did in so many other worthwhile areas prior to the May, 1979 election. At that time we saw the Trudeau government refuse to go on funding cost-shared programs in health, social services, post-secondary education and highways. Now we see them ready to cut back on money for proper agricultural research. It may save money for Ottawa, some money in the short run, but I say in the long run we will be very sorry if our public plant breeding system at our research stations and universities do not get the financial support the past federal governments have seen fit to extend.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on this point I think the Blakeney government should get some credit for setting up the Saskatchewan Agricultural Research Fund to attempt to take over some of the federal responsibilities is yet another area that the federal Liberals are leaving high and dry financially.

The second reason for the federal government's support of plant breeders' rights legislation is that it will help the corporate friends of the two old line parties, help them to make money — millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. That's why federal Liberal and Conservative members of parliament have endorsed the idea of plant breeding right. It means millions of dollars for their corporate friends.

Mr. Speaker, plant breeders' rights will permit the company to patent new seed

varieties and charge the farmers for each bushel of seed he buys. Since many of the new varieties will be hybrids, the farmer will have to return to the market each year for seed and each year the company will get a cut on the seed he must have to remain in business. And, Mr. Speaker, the companies involved are the giants of the international corporate elite.

Royal Dutch Shell now has the biggest single share of the seed breeding business in the world, having purchased North American Plant Breeders' and Agripro Incorporated . International Telephone and Telegraph recently purchased O.M. Scott and Sons. That will be good news for the Third World, Mr. Speaker, to know that friendly companies like IT&T are now in the seed business.

The huge multinational Sandoz recently purchased Northrup King, the biggest seed company in the United States. Monsanto now owns Farmers' Hybrid Company. Union Carbide owns Keystone Seed Company. I know this will warm the hearts of the member for Moosomin, who stepped out of the House, Mr. Speaker, because last year he expressed his warm affection for Cargill; Cargill Grain recently purchased Dorman Seeds, PAG and Kroeker Seeds.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that the federal government seems intent on allowing these huge transnational corporations to have their tentacles in the pockets of Saskatchewan farmers but the implications are much more widespread than that.

The large chemical companies and conglomerates that now own the seed companies have been pushing their products into the Third World. The new high-yielding varieties are too good to pass up for the farmers in third world countries. This is where a very real danger begins to loom. Almost everything grown for food in Canada, with the exception of a few wild berries, has its genetic origins in the Third World. In parts of Asia, Africa and Latin American, subsistence farmers grow crops, which due to diverse topography and 10,000 years of agricultural activity, have fantastic variety. These areas of extreme genetic diversity are called Vavilov centres after their discoverer.

It is this very diversity of the crops in the fields of many third world countries that has allowed agriculture to be viable at all. Disease, drought or some insect pest could not successfully attack all the different varieties in the fields at once, and thus diversity meant some portion of the crops would always survive.

The hundreds of different strains of seeds in the Vavilov centres have also been important to us here in North America. Our public plant breeders have repeatedly used the parent plant material from Turkey, Peru and North Africa to develop plants suitable for this part of the country. Even today our new plant varieties can, in many cases, not be duplicated without the parent stock in the Vavilov centres of extreme diversity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, the Vavilov centres are being threatened by the huge seed companies that are arms of the multinational corporations. The seeds which the third world farmers have used to put in their crop for thousands of years now have competition from the new hybrids and miracle varieties promoted by the likes of Monsanto, Sandoz, Union Carbide and Cargill.

You cannot blame the farmers of the Third World, Mr. Speaker. They need the increased yields of the new varieties. But we can blame the large global corporations and their seed companies for brining the centres of extreme genetic diversity to the edge of extinction with no apparent concern about the future if disease happens to strike our

May 6, 1980

relatively few modern seed varieties.

Mr. Speaker, many noted experts have predicted grave consequences should the plants of the Vavilov centres be lost for all time. Three-quarters of our bread wheat grown in Canada comes from four varieties; 92 per cent of our flax comes from four varieties; 64 per cent of our barley comes from three varieties; and 96 per cent of our rapeseed production is accounted for by four varieties. Without the genetic diversity available to plant breeders in the Vavilov centres, our North American agriculture is in a very vulnerable position should disease or pestilence strike.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of whether or not to implement plant breeders' rights legislation has generated a fair amount of discussion throughout Canada. As usual we see the Conservatives and the Palliser spokesmen aligning themselves with their corporate friends in support of the legislation, as they have with rail line abandonment, as they have with the move into western Canada of Cargill and as they have in their attack on the open market system.

Plant breeders' rights legislation would only encourage the private breeders to concentrate on varieties which would bring the most profit, leaving the public breeders to develop the non-profitable varieties which may be required in different areas of the country. Mr. Speaker, plant breeders' rights may benefit the Atlantic provinces, B.C. and Ontario, where varieties imported from other parts of the world could be of importance because of greater variations in climate and soil conditions along with the advantages of better production. However, we also have some disadvantages. On the Prairies we have problems right now with the separation and shipment for the various categories of grain varieties. This would probably increase with the introduction of a multitude of mediocre varieties by the private breeders.

Mr. Speaker, a proliferation of new varieties combined with an extensive advertising campaign would make it very difficult for an average grain farmer to make a wise choice in selecting the kinds of seeds best suited for his area. The result would of course be a sizable financial loss to the farmer if he should make the wrong choice.

We have a public plant breeding system which guarantees high quality and performance of plant varieties suitable to western Canada and provides us with unbiased information regarding many of these varieties. At present in Saskatchewan we rely on research stations and university plant breeding institutions for the information.

With the introduction of new varieties from private breeders, the provincial governments would then have to provide staff, facilities and funds to evaluate and gather information on different varieties which would be required for the production to make a choice on the variety best suited for his area.

Mr. Speaker, in a speech delivered over a year ago in Saskatoon by the Minister of Agriculture, Eugene Whelan, he seemed to indicate that involvement of multinational companies in plant breeding would bring nothing but benefits to farmers of Canada. But when you look at the companies which, in anticipation of this legislation, are buying up small seed companies, it would be rather naive of the federal Minister of Agriculture to believe and to suggest that the interests of Monsanto, Union Carbide or many of the other companies would be in developing a better seed variety for the producers.

What is more likely is that we would see these companies developing hybrid varieties which would respond only to certain chemicals produced by those companies. As a result producers would be forced to purchase seed in conjunction with the necessary chemicals in order to be able to produce a crop and to produce food for this country.

We in Canada should not allow the powerful corporate giants of the world to reach into the pockets of our grain growers so they can finance the ultimate destruction of the genetic parent stock of our agriculture produce. Canada is no doubt viewed as a rich market for many companies like Shell, Union Carbide, Monsanto, IT&T and Cargill. They would dearly love to further expand the hold they now have on the seed business around the world.

But we have to say no to them and to plant breeders' rights. We must say no because our farmers do not need another hand reaching into their wallets. We must say no because the horrible results of wiping out the diverse genetic stock in the third world countries is something we should play no part in financing. Finally, we must say no to plant breeders' rights legislation because there is something highly immoral about paying money to a corporate patent holder before you are allowed to produce food in a starving world.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain many of the concerned members in this House will be very pleased to support the motion put forward by the member for Shaunavon because it is in the best interests of the province and of the farmers of Saskatchewan.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on the motion put before the Assembly by the member for Shaunavon. I want to say firstly there is no way in the member's wildest dreams that he could foresee the opposition's position on this motion or anything for that matter. Just absolutely no possibility.

Mr. Speaker, I have to reflect very briefly on the motion itself, where it in the first part recognizes the benefits of this proposed legislation, the plant breeders' rights. And then in the latter part of the motion it asks members of this Assembly to urge members of parliament to defeat the legislation. So it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Shaunavon (I would suspect speaking on behalf of the government) is attempting to play both sides of the issue. Now, Mr. Speaker, an issue of this nature is not one that one should attempt to play both sides of. It is a matter that is, I would suspect, a very strong concern of our agricultural sector and not an issue which members should be attempting to gain support on from both camps, if you like.

Of course the arguments he furthered were in opposition to the legislation, not mentioning what benefits may or may not be derived from it for the producers and subsequently the consumers. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the member's observations as he discussed his motion were not (as he attempted to lead the House) in terms of facts, but again back to the old philosophical argument of those terrible multinationals which are there lurking in the dark to damn us all sooner or later. I don't think from my point of view at least, Mr. Speaker, that that is a reasonable viewpoint to take, for any member of the Assembly to use a kind of a scare tactic, if you like, to promote support for a particular concept or motion or legislation or whatever.

We can't help but reflect on the old medicare scare the government used in the last election. It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Shaunavon is using more or less the same kinds of arguments, and so to a lesser degree, I might add, is the member for Pelly. In his remarks the member for Pelly put his case more adequately and more

May 6, 1980

precisely and kept his arguments more to the facts, although he ranged a bit from time to time to that philosophical scare of the multinationals.

Now let's get back to where it all began. Let's be clear on one thing; it all began with the Liberals and it happens to be that the Liberals and the NDP are a lot closer than a lot of people would have them, but not maybe as close as I know them to be. Certainly, Mr. Broadbent's and Mr. Trudeau's meetings and suggestions that the two parties should get together clearly indicates the Liberals are no different than the NDP, only they move a little faster I might suggest. For any of those who are opposed to the NDP and associate it with socialism, I suggest that the Liberals have you beaten.

Mr. Speaker, when you reflect on that legislation you say, all right, the first thing to concern ourselves with is that the Liberals brought it in. Then the member for Shaunavon proceeds to paint the scenario that in six short months the Progressive Conservative government of Joe Clark did not change that legislation and throw it out. There were many things that the Joe Clark government did not get to do, but not nearly as many as the things that it did do. Mr. Speaker, surely in that short space of time they were able to make many gains in transportation in the agricultural sector in particular.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the point which needs to be made at this juncture is that it was the NDP federally, Broadbent and his boys, if I may refer to them as that, who brought on the election with a motion of non-confidence which ultimately saw the Liberals and the NDP gain back together to defeat the Joe Clark government. If you are concerned about plant breeders' rights legislation, I might ask you what is the difference between 16 cents a gallon excise tax and 18 cents a gallon excise tax? Certainly the point in the matter is that your Liberal government, which you brought into power by putting the vote of non-confidence before the House of Commons, did achieve nothing in terms of anything constructive. But one thing it did achieve was that it put your party, federally out of any perspective of power or influence on the House of Commons in any matter.

Had the House of Commons remained the same and Joe Clark's government remained in power, your party federally might well have had some influence in working with both the major parties, the Liberal Party and of course the Progressive Conservative Party in bringing about the necessary changes as you see them in the legislation. So, the bottom line on all of this is that the legislation is now back on the books and being forced by our agricultural minister because of the actions of your federal party, Broadbent and his boys. They brought this on and in so doing gave up the only power your party had federally to fight any legislation that it deemed not in the best interests of Canadians at large.

As far as the multinationals having a finger in all of this (or a thumb, or whatever may be the case) and producing only chemicals which would affect the particular breeds of plants that were promoted by their group (if you like), that is a pretty far-out scenario to be painting here in the legislature. Surely that would be a matter I would want to see some substantiation of, to charge that these companies are going to do such a thing. I don't know how there could be any examples since the legislation is not in place. I don't know how you could cite any situations where that has happened. It is purely hypothetical here in this country and that is what we are talking about. I just fail to see how they can stretch this issue, Mr. Speaker, so far as to bring Cargill into the argument again.

I think what we have to do, certainly, is to look at the plant breeders' rights legislation and say, now look, if there is an opportunity to improve the breeds of plants that we

have, to ultimately increase the production for our producers — not just here in Saskatchewan, but throughout our country — and following that be able to provide to the consumers of our country produce at a reasonable price during times of inflation, then I think the benefits of such legislation should be brought in. If, on the other hand, the case is well made that those benefits will not be available to the producers, and those benefits would not be available to the consumers, and such legislation wouldn't be in the best interests of those two commodity groups, then certainly the legislation would have to be passed by.

The member refers to the comments made by Frank Hamilton that it would maybe gain cautious support from the Conservatives. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest at this time that the legislation is under review, not only in the House of Commons and now before the members of this Assembly, but certainly commodity groups are making their arguments and making them well. It is certainly a matter of federal jurisdiction. I feel somewhat strange in saying that, as the Minister of Agriculture refers to it so often — well, that isn't our problem, that's a federal matter. Clearly, in this case, it is a matter of federal jurisdiction, certainly affecting the people of Saskatchewan. I suppose one could draw in indirectly the members of our legislature. Whether or not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the House will be able to support this particular motion put by the member for Shaunavon, will not be evident to members at this time. Our critic for the agriculture department will be wanting to put his case as it relates to this particular motion. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 20 — Emergency Telephone Number

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current) moved, seconded by the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver):

That this Assembly urges Sask Tel to immediately implement 911 as the emergency telephone number in the province of Saskatchewan recognizing the need for a three digit emergency telephone number since fire chiefs and police chiefs in the province of Saskatchewan have been calling for 911 as the emergency telephone number.

He said: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been, until this day, a pleasure for this member to rise in this legislature to speak in debate and on motions and resolutions. Today it is not. I think it is not recognized by members of this legislature, we have seen the roots of democracy being torn at today. I only have one further statement before I speak on the resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that is what in blazes are you people afraid of?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the control and use of fire, like the ability to reason and walk upright is a characteristic peculiar to human beings. Man has had fire as a companion and servant since long before the dawn of recorded history. Yet today his mastery is far from perfect and his understanding limited. There is today scarcely any aspect of our lives to which fire is not a contributing element. Far beyond the human needs for cooked food and heated shelter, fire is essential to a developed society based on technology. As man's environment expanded from the cave (and I wonder how far from the cave that was after witnessing those amendments today), so did his application of

May 6, 1980

fire and so did his need to understand and master the phenomenon. I thought we were mastering democracy in this legislature, but apparently we are not.

Fire continues to extract an enormous and dreadful toll on society; a toll measured in pain, suffering and death; a toll which is also measured in wasteful destruction of property. Not sparing historical or cultural treasures, fire has economic costs which tend always to depress the standard of living.

Man's understanding of fire, imperfect though it is, has been sufficient to enable him to develop the technology of control to a reasonably advanced state. Indeed, our failure to minimize the fire threat to life and property lies not in the lack of technology or available means, but rather in social attitudes, in business, economics and practical politics.

Fire is not perceived by most people as a significant personal threat to themselves though they acknowledge the existence of the danger of fire. (And I didn't acknowledge any danger with the existence of democracy until today). It is rarely personalized and the only in relation to others. For most persons fire is too remote a possibility to invoke an action response. The resulting apathetic attitude subverts fire prevention education and obstructs practical application of fire prevention knowledge.

For the past number of years the fire chiefs of this province, both those of major cities as well as chiefs from smaller centres, involving volunteer and part volunteer department, have expressed a real concern for the loss of life and property resulting from delays in response to fire calls. Hence the need for an emergency fire number such as 911.

To give you some history on the status of 911, the following: 911 is a three-digit telephone number designated for public use throughout the United States in reporting an emergency and requesting emergency assistance. It is intended as a nation-wide telephone number giving the public direct access to an emergency answering centre. The concept of a nation-wide telephone number was first realized in Great Britain more than 30 years ago with the country's establishment of 999 on a national scale. Other countries in Europe and elsewhere have since provided their citizens with a similar uniform emergency telephone number.

In the United States (incidentally first in the North American continent) official impetus for the development of a nation-wide telephone number was provided by the 1967 recommendation of the president's commission of law enforcement and administration of justice, that a single number should be established for reporting police emergencies. Other federal governments and agencies of various government officials supplied a further stimulus. In 1968 the American Telephone and Telegraph Company announced that it would make the digits 911 available for national implementation.

The intense interest in the concept itself can be attributed primarily to the recognition of several relevant characteristics for modern society — increased incident of crimes, accidents, medical emergencies, inadequacy of existing emergency reporting methods, and the continued growth and mobility of population. In March of 1973 the office of telecommunications policy, executive office of the president, issued a national policy statement which recognized the benefits of number 911; encouraged the nation-wide adoption of 911; and provided for the establishment of a federal information centre on 911. Over three hundred 911 systems representing communities of all sizes and serving total populations of over 22 million are currently in operation. The overwhelming majority of communities which have provided 911 report

positive experiences and consider 911 an important component of their total emergency response capability.

A single number, both easy to remember and possessing a short dialling tone, in event of fire is more vital than an emergency number for any other situation, where immediate help is required because of the confusion and excitement that occurs as a result of the rapid increase of the dangers to life as the fire progresses. A trapped victim's possibility of survival under uncontrolled fire conditions is reduced drastically within the pursuing minutes of the discovery of a fire, unlike many other emergency situations. In the past we find that many wrong numbers have and are being dialled under fire conditions, causing a delay in response of fire suppression equipment.

The seven digits required in many areas of the province increases both the time in dialling and the possibility of dialling the wrong number. (I was hoping, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier would be here today to hear some of this and I wonder where he is today?) Looking for a number in the directory is time consuming, and in some instances an impossibility because of a lack of power for light, or smoke conditions in the building. In some instances a delay results because the dialler reverts to the only alternative, and that is dialling the telephone operator, which presents two problems. Firstly, you often wait a period of from 6 to 8 rings before the busy operator answers. Secondly, when the message is passed on to the fire department it often lacks important and vital information for the dispatcher.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd now like to list the reasons why 911 is of benefit to the public and the communities of Saskatchewan. Only one number to remember — an individual needing to summon emergency aid or report a crime, fire, or medical emergency is often severely emotional and perhaps, under physical stress. He may not know or may forget the proper seven-digit number to call. If a local directory is available he may be confronted with a confusing array of telephone numbers. If he is a stranger in the community, his plight is intensified because he may not even know the political jurisdiction in which he is located. (I'm questioning today as to whether I'm in a democratic society or not myself, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You people may be next. It may happen to you someday so I wouldn't be too critical. You shouldn't sleep at night as a matter of fact, Mr. Health Minister.) It's an easy number to remember. In times of stress even a simple well-known seven digit number can quickly be forgotten or confused and the numbers transposed.

As the use of 911 in this country increases, so will the familiarity with the number increase until dialling 911 becomes a nearly automatic response in the event of an emergency. An easy number to dial, faster access to emergency services; the position of the numbers 911 on both the dial and touch-tone telephones, can be easily located by most persons. The possibility of misdialling is somewhat remote. Dialling a three digit number is obviously easier and faster than dialling a seven digit number.

I should interject here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with some interest I was able to find out today that the lone NDP member in the Alberta legislature receives in excess of \$75,000 a year in the form of grants and assistance. Nothing to do with it at all. This is supposed to be a democratic institution.

The increased ease of reporting emergencies through 911, together with the communities' interest in providing the public with a service, appears to have created greater awareness and acceptance of public agencies and a heightened sense of citizen responsibility.

May 6, 1980

It would be of special benefit to travellers and new residents. Travellers are unfamiliar in surroundings they're not acquainted with and therefore are in particularly vulnerable positions should they need emergency assistance. By providing 911 service, communities not only assist their citizens but many others, such as tourists and business people on whom their economy may depend.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 911 answering centre personnel are trained in the techniques of obtaining complete information from person who may be unable to adequately communicate their request for assistance.

Use of 911 has the potential of providing public safety and other agencies with a number of further benefits, potential reduction in the total or true response time, as measured from the time of detection of the incident to the time of notification to an agency (the second stage during this part of the response cycle can be critical in many emergency situations); better co-ordination between emergency services, and especially vulnerable capability when multiple services are required to handle a single incident.

Another benefit is immediate identification of an emergency and thus priority calls. Other benefits are further potential for improving data collection and analysis procedures, opportunity for identifying necessary improvements and modifications because proper planning for 911 requires review of current methods and capabilities of handling emergencies, increased public confidence in the ability of emergency resources to respond to the need.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are but a few concerns in relation to my resolution. I would encourage all members of the legislature to bring our province into line with most other Canadian provinces with respect to 911.

One further note, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I should add to the record for the information of all concerned, statistics in Saskatchewan have indicated that deaths by fire in our province in 1974 were 42 and in the subsequent years to 1979 went 26, 31, 39 (in 1978) and 49 (in 1979). Accidents have increased substantially from fires in Saskatchewan through years 1974-75-76 from a low of 18 in 1974, to 28 in 1975, and 48 in 1976.

I encourage all members of the legislature to seriously consider this. I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for a government which is oriented to national control of everything, to a planned state — within every department we've heard bills come through the legislature. Since I have been involved (since 1975) it has been the attitude of the government to make things efficient, to make them provincially wide and make them available to all citizens of Saskatchewan. Therefore, with that attitude, I think it is incumbent that the Minister of Telephones and the Government of Saskatchewan seriously consider implementing 911, not as has been suggested in the past (at least those who choose shall have) but make it available through subsidies by the government in order to save the citizens of Saskatchewan from harm and potential death.

MR. J.L. SOLOMON (Regina North-West): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a number of things I would like to say about 911 service. I wanted to draw to the attention of the House one very significant aspect of 911 and it is this. The service itself is the function and the responsibility of the community. In other words, the main answering location or

answering bureau is situated in a location, Mr. Speaker, chosen by the municipal authority. In addition, the municipality is also responsible for the staffing of the answering bureau. The staff must be fully trained and knowledgeable in all aspects of each participating safety agency. It is essential therefore, Mr. Speaker, that there be agreement between municipalities within the telephone exchange served by 911 and between the safety agencies within the municipalities.

Our government through Sask Tel is prepared to work with municipal authorities who express an interest in 911 service. I understand that Sask Tel is prepared to provide any service and assistance which municipalities and safety agencies may require in establishing an emergency-call arrangement which effectively meets the needs of safety agencies organized to handle emergencies on a community basis from a common answering bureau.

I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, before I continue, that the 911 answering service has been under investigation by Sask Tel. I would like to add further comments but at this time I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 32 — Rail Safety

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North) moved, seconded by the member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon):

That this Assembly urges the federal Minister of Transport to expand the public inquiry into the Mississauga accident to all major CNR and CP Rail terminals in Canada in order to determine whether proper safety and maintenance is being practised in the Canadian railway operation.

He said: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the resolution this afternoon it would appear to me this is one that could gain unanimous support on both sides of the House because all of us recognize the serious problems evident over the last number of years insofar as derailments are concerned on the various railroads and also the dangerous situation that's quite evident.

The motion calls and urges the federal Minister of Transport to expand the public inquiry into the Mississauga accident to all major CNR and CP Rail terminals in Canada in order to determine whether proper safety and maintenance is being practised in the Canadian railway operation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to go back just a few years and explain what has happened in the past and that has to do with what has been asked for and what has been requested by various groups in Canada — various organizations, the many brotherhoods of both CN and CP Rails, various public bodies — in order to try to bring about inquiry into the total railway industry as it may pertain to mishaps. I refer very briefly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to September 4, 1969, when a bulletin was put out to all of the . . . I'm having quite a time trying . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. I wonder if we could have a little bit of order in the House. If the Attorney General and the Leader of the Opposition would like to chat maybe they could go behind the bar. We are having a little trouble hearing the hon. member for Moose Jaw North.

May 6, 1980

MR. SKOBERG: — It's a fact that there is some very serious discussion going on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I take that into consideration.

On September 4, 1969, there was a bulletin issued to all of the roadmasters on the Canadian National Railway system and it reads this way:

As you are no doubt aware the increasing number of derailments on account of track conditions is a matter of grave concern throughout the railway industry as a whole. This concern is becoming more apparent, not only in the United States but in Canada as well.

That went out to all the roadmasters in order for them to try and have more surveillance out, particularly the switches involved at that particular time with a sharp increase of derailments in those years.

Again in 1969 a letter was directed. At that time I was in another House in this country. I was proud to be a member of parliament for Moose Jaw, proud to be a credited representative representing the people who elected me. At that time a letter was addressed to the then minister of transportation, Mr. Bryce Mackasey, and it had to do with track inspection.

My words to him really asked him whether or not track maintenance came within the Railway Act or just exactly where the jurisdiction did lie. His response at that time, Mr. Speaker, was that the subject of track inspection would come under the Railway Act and the Canadian Transport Commission was responsible for administering the Railway Act. Again, we entered into the field that track inspection referred to the inspection of track and structures in regard to safety, for those opposite who may not be familiar with railway terminology.

I might suggest at that time back in 1969 and 1970 we ran into a situation where the Canadian Transport Commission decided there should be some investigation. I make brief reference again to a letter in 1970 addressed to the president of the Canadian Transport Commission, Mr. Pickersgill, over the signature of the assistant Canadian labor representative, Mr. McDuffe of the United Transportation Union. I quote a portion of that letter, Mr. Speaker, addressed to Mr. Pickersgill:

As you are aware, the major railway companies in Canada have been systematically slaughtering their track and equipment maintenance and inspection forces. The process of reduction has developed to the point that it is fair to say that they are almost non-existent at some points and inadequate nearly everywhere. Operating crews literally fear for their lives and the number of recent train accidents which have occurred across the country support their contention that something is drastically wrong.

Your commission recently announced they would hold a special public inquiry into the causes and circumstances connected with three recent rail accidents. We congratulate you on your action however, belated as it may be. We most strongly urge that you expand your inquiry to include all those which have recently occurred anywhere in the country. We further urge that your investigation include a very close examination of the maintenance and inspection services provided by the railways to determine to what degree they were a contributing factor to the accidents and whether or not they can

be considered inadequate or adequate.

Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous amount of correspondence available over the years indicating very clearly that the railway brotherhoods were vitally concerned at that time and previous to that time with the maintenance and safety of operation in the railway industry. It is quite apparent that even though there was possibly some action taken, the fact of the matter remained that there were not enough inspectors put on staff to try to do something about it.

I believe the public has a right to know the reasons and causes of the railway mishaps just the same as they learn the causes of air and sea accidents through public inquiries. It may be ironic but the railway mishaps were one of the few types of public mishaps that may occur throughout the country which do not have a public inquiry. The sea and air did have public inquiries. I strongly opposed at that particular time any general order or act which gives the commission the power to declare the extent to which information concerning the accidents, given by the railways, may be privileged. Mr. Speaker, that is still the case in most instances at this time in our history. There appears to be no justification for a veil of secrecy provided in legislation or regulations in keeping the public ignorant as to the cause of railway mishaps.

I ask those opposite and I ask any members of the House this afternoon, after they read in the newspaper or hear on the air of rail mishaps, whether they ever hear of the real cause of those particular mishaps, and I believe the answer is usually no. Privileged information can only be justified when matters affecting our national security are concerned. It cannot be said that our national security is in jeopardy in so far as making public the cause of and the responsibility for railway mishaps.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the National Transportation Safety Board that was created by the transportation act in 1966, in the United States, came about as a result of such thinking and similar conditions to ours existed in that country at that time. The safety board as set up in the United States that that time determined the cause of accidents through direct investigations, public hearings. Although structurally located in the Department of Transportation, it was an autonomous agency. I do believe that still exists at this time in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, accidents or mishaps are caused in many cases by mechanical breakdowns or defects. I don't suppose that is an outstanding statement at this time in our history. But naturally, one way to prevent mishaps attributable to mechanical failures is a preventive medicine type of approach — in other words, proper main terminal and intermediate terminal car and train inspection. Mr. Speaker, the information of car inspection staff at many terminals on both the CN and CP systems in my opinion contribute tremendously to the mishaps we are seeing today.

We have to admit that with the advent of roller bearing equipment, the burnt-off journals may be as prevalent as when dope was used in the journal boxes. For those not familiar with railway terminology, the roller bearings which we all understand but a pad of dope with oil mixed into it that rotated about the journal on the cars. Even the member opposite might recognize that.

However, the question must be asked as to how many cars are roller bearing equipped

May 6, 1980

and being used in high-speed freight service at this time. I believe the answer today, Mr. Speaker, is that the majority of them are. But the other question has to be asked how many roller bearing cars have been found to be defective when mishaps do occur?

I believe the entire structure of the cars must be considered when one is determining mishaps. As evidence indicates, some cars have a tendency to rock and sway much more than others, resulting in possible derailments. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has seen the movement of cars, particularly the potash cars, understand complete what that circumstance is all about.

Under the Canada Labour Code, certain regulations are prescribed for the safety and health of persons employed upon or in connection with the operation of any federal work. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that safety is a concern of both employees, employers, and the travelling public. Implementation and interpretation of all legislation and regulations is not the sole prerogative of management as some in management would like to presume.

Conditions of roadbeds and possibly the sun kinds that occur in hot weather, the broken rails and turnover rails are all of concern to us. There's no question mechanical improvements have resulted proportionately with a maintenance and operating efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, one can refer not too far back when section crews were responsible for a section of track, usually about 10 miles. They assumed a direct responsibility for a section of track and were in the main fully familiar with the soft spots, potential washout hazards such as beaver dams that build up, underground springs and the layouts of the roadbed generally. With the change to extended sections and shortage of time to patrol the track, this familiarity came to an end. Track patrols are not able to detect any appreciable change in conditions along the back from the right of way, with a resulting hazard of washouts and cave-ins.

I'll refer to one situation that occurred a number of years ago west of Moose Jaw — an incident where a CPR freight plunged into a body of water at mileage 20.5 in the Swift Current subdivision. For those who may now know where that is, it's just around Besant Park. At that time it plunged into the ditch and the crew was submerged in water. In fact, there was one fellow riding on another diesel engine who was fortunate to get out of it because it was completely buried in the mud and water. The evidence indicated the track had been undermined by the water at that particular time in the spring. The crew had absolutely no warning of the impending derailment and while the diesel units and a number of cars ended up in the water, fortunately there were no fatalities in that incident.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if there had been section men, who I maintain are the backbone of any railway industry, that would not have happened because they would have been familiar with the back up of the water and the undermining of the roadbed.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of referring to this incident (and we could refer to many of them) is to indicate what can and does happen when maintenance or track patrol is reduced. I feel confident that the railway transport committee, the Canadian Transport Commission investigators are aware of the mishaps and of this one in particular. They are aware of many mishaps but the problem is there isn't enough manpower to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of reduced track maintenance, one can refer to practically any subdivision in Saskatchewan or throughout Canada. I can assure you that when we look back a goodly number of years when we did have those section men, we did not have the type of derailments we are having today. It's my opinion, such as it is, those are some of the real problems that are still the real concerns of the operating brotherhoods and the operating men and the railway companies in the particular instance.

Mr. Speaker, in order to bring about some type of recognition of the real problems, back in the years of '70-'71 and upward, there was an effort made by many parliamentarians, by the brotherhoods and other concerned groups in the communities to try to get the railway transport committee to have a public inquiry. Finally, on November 24, 1970, there was a railway transport committee to have a public inquiry of rail mishaps. Some of those terms of reference I'll refer to very briefly, included such things as the maintenance and inspection of roller bearings and solid bearing rolling stock; the location of maintenance inspection staff, the rolling stock inspection procedure at major terminals and intermediate points en route, standards and procedure at major terminals and intermediate points en route, standard and procedures of maintenance of track instructors, allocation of staff, materials and equipment for adequate inspection of maintenance of track structures and signals, standards and procedures of maintenance and operation of all types of railway signalling installations, track motor operation with centralized traffic control; instruction given to train crews; and a procedural follow-up by railway companies when accidents occur, including accidents involving dangerous commodities.

Mr. Speaker, these were some of the terms of reference and they go on to include about 14 terms. Following that, there were public hearings and a good amount of public input. There were reports issued by the railway transport committee concerning this situation. I'll refer to one paragraph which was preamble to the initial report of the railway safety inquiry. I quote:

Between 1967 and 1970, the committee (and that's the railway transport committee) had watched with growing concern an increase in the number of serious accidents on Canadian railways. This gave cause for anxiety, anxiety not solely in absolute terms, but also because accidents involving modern, heavier tonnage trains were correspondingly of greater magnitude than had been the case in the past.

Another factor of grave concern was a rapidly increasing involvement in railway accidents of cars carrying a wide variety of dangerous commodities whose cargo, if accidentally released, could pose a serious hazard not only to railway employees but also the lives and property of the public.

Mr. Speaker, this inquiry came about with this type of preamble and came about with some recommendations. One of them in particular, which all of us are concerned about, is the handling of dangerous commodities. I might say that at that time they went into an in-depth study of the handling of dangerous commodities on rail and came up with some suggestions. It was suggested here that these accidents raised certain urgent and critical questions for the inquiry. Were dangerous commodities creating such hazards that the regulatory authority in Canada was being confronted with a new dimension in destructiveness and danger to life and limb? The answer to this question certainly appears to be in the affirmative. If so, what were the reasons for this, other than the obvious factor that modern industrial technology is producing larger quantities of dangerous material and having a greater destructive potential per ton or per car than ever before. They asked various questions, Mr. Speaker, such as: is new

May 6, 1980

railway technology increasing the hazards? Are railway practices and rules for dangerous commodities, many of which date back 20 or 30 years, adequate to meet the increased hazards? Are these possibly now inadequate rules at least being properly applied by railway personnel? Is there sufficient enforcement? How much research in the causes of and the prevention of such destruction is being done?

They also proposed that a task force on the carriage by rail of dangerous commodities be created. This was immediately and enthusiastically seconded by the railways. The proposal was accepted and the committee addressed itself to its implementation. Mr. Speaker, that task force was created in those years. They spent many years going into the dangerous commodity situation and the dangerous situation of handling that type of commodity. The task force consisted of the committee, the CNR, CP Rail and the Canadian Railway Labour Association, which was made up of all railway brotherhoods. Its terms of reference are simple; to review the hazards attendant on the carrying of dangerous commodities by rail, and to recommend to the committee such measures as will achieve the highest level of safety compatible with the economy of operation, and the expeditious movement of goods.

Mr. Speaker, a number of other reports were made from that first report from the railway transport committee safety inquiry. The committee concluded that it should, as soon as staff resources permit, form an accident investigation team at its headquarters in Ottawa, responsible for the conduct of investigations. I might suggest again, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there has been adequate staff resources provided for that accident investigation team. As suggested here, the team would be composed of senior officers with professional or technical staff appropriate to the needs of individual accidents who would give direction to the field staff and the conduct of investigation. It would also deal directly at the accident scene, participate in the investigation in concert with the field staff, conduct its investigations later at the local level by interviewing railway employees, officers, and others, including witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, I've been involved with the railway industry since 1944. To date I have yet to see a railway transport committee of the Canadian Transport Commission come to the railway employees affected to try to determine whether or not, or what they consider to be the uses of any accidents. I believe someone is forgetting what the first report said back in the year it was originally issued. Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas that we could deal with in so far as the entire railway safety inquiry is concerned.

Again, on January 4, 1974 the third report on the safety inquiry was conducted. I might just say here again the conclusion of that particular report from the Canadian Transport Commission stated that the number of derailments by track conditions on Canadian National and Canadian Pacific in 1972 were three times that of 1959, and nearly double that in 1969. Because of this continuing increase in derailment to date, it must be concluded that in the foreseeable future the number of derailments on account of track conditions will continue to increase with a continuing increase in the number of injuries and deaths as a result unless immediate action is taken. Mr. Speaker, again that third report was issued in 1974. It encompassed about a two-year span of hearings and investigation.

Certain other areas were involved at that time. They talked about another conclusion the derailments because of broken rail. It may be of interest to those in the House at this time, Mr. Speaker, to realize now on the main lines of both Canadian Pacific and Canadian National we have what we call ribbon rail which is brand new steel put in most

recently. There were as many broken rails with the ribbon rail as there were with the conventional type of steel. The conclusion of the committee back in '74 states that if some of the best type of testing equipment, the ultrasonic, or some other sources were made available, and more frequently operated on the Canadian railways, there would be an appreciable increase in the number of defects, particularly vertical split heads and defects in rail joints, detected and removed from the track before they could possibly cause derailment. It would appear the suggested increase in testing of rail would reduce costly derailment and the savings thus affected could offset the cost of more frequent testings; in other words, increase safety of trains operating at no additional cost.

Mr. Speaker, this third report referred to other causes of derailment, if more staff, material and equipment were available, more prompt action could be taken to correct these conditions including Sundays on all mainline tracks and important branchline tracks was needed, establishment of links of each section of track to be respected so it could be careful and adequately inspected within a normal eight-hour day.

These are some of the things, Mr. Speaker, that were suggested under the third report of that railway transport commission safety inquiry. But in effect I am not too sure what really has happened.

May 6, 1980

I might now turn to something more recent. All of us are well aware of the Mississauga mishap and what happened in that incident. The public inquiry is going on. We are also well aware of the MacGregor mishap. We know what happened in that situation. It is very ironic that the very people who were transporting or responsible for the movement of the dangerous commodity advised the press — advised the CBC that morning — that there was no danger whatsoever. When the CBC reports arrived on the scene (and other reporters), what did they find? The only person wearing a gas mask was the person from the area in control of that particular dangerous commodity. I think this is a clear indication that there is not the type of surveillance that should be involved when you are handling dangerous commodities, whether they be on the rail, on the road or wherever they possibly may be.

I would like to refer very briefly, Mr. Speaker, to some of the somewhat recent occurrences. There has been every effort made to try to expand the Mississauga public inquiry into all of Canada, at the major terminals in particular. It is my opinion (and the opinion of many people who have a practical knowledge in the industry) that if public inquiries are conducted in the main terminals across Canada on both the CN and CPR, you will have input and you will have briefs and you will have statistics which affect that particular terminal. What I am frightened of is that they will have one public inquiry of MacGregor and the other one at Mississauga (which is going on now); they will have the main representation made there which will then curtail that inquiry and the report will be made.

In view of the fact that the bill on dangerous commodities has now passed the House of Commons most recently (I believe last Friday) and is now referred to the standing committee on transportation and communication, we are trying to get them to expand that inquiry into the main terminals across the country. Letters have been written to the United Transportation Union and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, the maintenance workers and all the main brotherhoods affected.

In doing some research, which I have kept track of over the last couple of years, it is very significant the number of derailments which are occurring on CP and the similar experience is evident in the Canadian National — which I will leave to someone else. On the CP (and there is one here in particular which the hon. member for Indian Head Wolseley will recognize as he has raised it in the House and justifiably so) we go back to the major wrecks in Saskatchewan, which I kept track of, from 1978 up to April 3, 1980: on February 6, 1978 at Balgonie, 29 cars and 2 units derailed — very, very fortunate no one was killed in that one; March 1, 1978 at Rouleau, 1 car derailed — there again, very fortunate; another one at Caron, May 31, 1978 — just 1 car; November 27, 1978 at Grand Coulee, 23 cars derailed; December 20, 1978 at Roche Percee, 40 cars derailed — not counting the one that happened here less than a week ago when the truck hit the diesel engine at the public crossing (that was protected by the way); December 31, 1978 at Parkbeg, 16 cars; January 15 at Wolseley, 43 cars, 2 units — cause indicated was a broken rail.

Mr. Speaker, that one at Wolseley could have been as serious, if not more serious, than the one at MacGregor. MacGregor was out in the country; the populated area was not surrounding the derailment. The one at Wolseley was within the town limits and was practically downtown opposite the main street. Beside the derailment, as the hon.

member opposite will realize and know, many people live in that area. If there had been an explosion there could have been a catastrophe there which would have made Mississauga look pretty sick, and I think it is something we have to recognize.

Again on February 4, 1979, Milestone, 22 cars; again at Red Jacket, Saskatchewan, February 18, 1978, 21 cars; July 21, 1979, Secretan, 15 cars; September 12, less than 9 days later at Meyronne, 16 cars; at Rouleau on January 9, 1980, 18 cars; April 3, 1980, Regina, right down here, 12 cars. Mr. Speaker, that is not including in the same period of time, another 50 derailments in Saskatchewan just on the Canadian Pacific Railway alone, which I have access to, or have been able to keep count of.

What I'm really saying, Mr. Speaker, is we have to be serious about what is going on in so far as the transportation of dangerous commodities is concerned. We have to be serious in trying to bring pressure to bear on the Canadian Transport Commission, bring pressure to bear on the minister in charge of transportation federally (and I know he is concerned). We have to bring pressure to bear and try to expand the hearings across Canada. Somewhere along the line someone has to be answerable for what is going on.

Many people may suggest from what I have been saying, I am very critical of the railway companies, but for those who are here this afternoon, we have what we call general operating instructions for handling explosives and other dangerous commodities, which tell exactly where these cars are supposed to be placed, and are placed in so far as the consist of a train is concerned. Bulletins are put out each month over the signature of the superintendent of the respective division giving instructions pertaining to the handling of the cars, and the locating of the cars within the consist of a train. It is also recognized in our part of the country that the railways have done a magnificent job of trying to detect the mishaps before they occur.

On the main lines out of Moose Jaw — Moose Jaw to Broadview and east, Moose Jaw to Swift Current and west — they do have what they call the hotbox detector signals which will indicate when there is any defect on the running gear of the trains which pass over those hotbox detectors. They can tell whether or not there are any heated journals in such a way that the crews on the head end get an indication — a detector indication advising of the problem in such a way that they can stop.

All of us realize that at Mississauga, the hotbox detectors were not installed at that time, and it is an ongoing process throughout the system.

What I'm really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I hope there will be support for this resolution, mainly so that the standing committee of transport and communication, federally, at this time who are sitting on this issue can at least have our support here at the provincial level, in urging the federal Minister of Transport to expand the public inquiry across Canada.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I so move.

MR. J.L. SOLOMON (Regina North-West): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to expand the motion this afternoon ably presented by the member for Moose Jaw North. Because of his long railway career, the member for Moose Jaw North has a very special interest in ensuring that proper safety and maintenance is being practised in Canadian railway operations.

May 6, 1980

Mr. Speaker, I, too, have had a special interest in proper safety and maintenance procedures (and still do) in railway operation. As a former brakeman of the CNR I share the concern of railway workers for safe working conditions. As the MLA for Regina North-West, I share the concern of my constituents who live on or next to the southern boundary of my constituency where the CN yards are located in Regina. As an urban MLA, I share the concern of all families who reside in urban areas who have a railway track located in their community; a concern that proper safety and maintenance procedures are being adhered to, to allow for the safe transport of dangerous chemicals and goods.

I would like to inform the members in the Assembly this afternoon that I am wearing a lapel pin which was given to me by the union I was a member of for eight years, the United Transportation Union. I feel because of my experiences with the railway and with the union that very frequently the safety precautions taken are not necessarily safe enough to ensure injuries are minimized.

I would like to point out to the members opposite as well and to hon. member of the House that the maximum speed CN trains travel through the yards located in Regina is 15 miles an hour. That is one of the safety precautions the railway does take but that doesn't necessarily mean there will not be any accidents due to transportation of hazardous chemicals or goods.

I strongly support this motion because I believe the recommendations which will result from the Mississauga inquiry should expand to all constituencies where hazardous chemicals are transported. I support the right of railway workers to safe working conditions and view with pride the achievements of my former fellow workers of CNR and all workers on Canadian railways.

Between 1956 and 1975, Canadian railways workers increased the amount of freight they handled by 86.8 per cent, Mr. Speaker. During the same period person-hours or man-hours, as some people refer to them, have decreased by 39.5 per cent. This type of increased productivity is responsible for a profit of \$208 million by CNR during 1979. The profit is up from \$136 million in 1978 and once again proves the economic viability of government ownership, economic viability, coupled with the necessary and important transportation services provided through a Crown corporation, created to serve its owners, the people of Canada.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that railways must operate safely as well as profitably. The need for increased safety standards for railways has been demonstrated to the public by the two recent incidents at Mississauga, Ontario and MacGregor, Manitoba, as the member for Moose Jaw North has pointed out.

I am concerned the passing of a bill to prevent disasters in the transportation of hazardous goods by rail, truck, ship or air, which was passed in principle last Friday in the House of Commons, will lull the public into a false sense of security.

The bill itself, aside from a few minor points, is basically a good one. It is similar to legislation introduced by the former Clark government in November, soon after the Mississauga accident. The Liberal bill is intended to create a single legislative authority on the transportation of dangerous goods. It provides uniform safety standards for the shipment of dangerous materials, ranging from toxic chemicals to explosives. All parties in the House of Commons agreed it is a bill that will provide badly needed

protection.

But, what hasn't been pointed out is that the Canadian Transport Commission (CTC) already has all the power they need to enforce safe rail traffic. There is no reason to believe the CTC will be able to do better now under new amalgamated legislation than they did before.

The problem is that while federal Tory and Liberal governments pay lip service to the idea of safe rail traffic, they are unwilling to make the financial commitment to make this possible. To be fair to the CTC, the chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission indicated last fall that the CTC budget was insufficient. About the same time, the CTC received a directive from treasury board to reduce staff by 100 persons. Not all of those people would be involved with safety inspections, but some of them inevitably would.

Mr. Speaker, the number of persons at the CTC involved with rail safety were cut back on a consistent basis in the past two years. Between 1979-80, safety inspectors were reduced from 107 to 105. That number is to be reduced further from 105 to 100 by the end of the fiscal year 1981 — reduction of five safety inspectors over the next year.

It is my belief that what they should be doing is increasing the number of safety inspectors and hiring inspectors from industry who have had experience with rail and other transport facilities, rather than people from outside the industry with an axe to grind with the particular agency involved, whether it be the railways of the transports, ship or air. These reductions are being implemented despite the fact that, at the present time, there are not enough rail inspectors for properly carrying out the responsibility of the CTC for rail safety in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, these cutbacks were first implemented under the Liberal government. They were continued under a Tory government and they are still continuing under the re-elected Liberal government. It is yet another case where the two old line parties are indistinguishable in their political opportunism and their lack of concern for the working people of Canada.

Other components necessary for safe rail transportation have also been cut back. The railways themselves have eliminated 60,000 jobs between 1957 and 1977. Of these 60,000 jobs, 31,000 were involved with road and equipment maintenance. Both the Mississauga and MacGregor derailments were caused by faulty equipment. The car responsible for the Mississauga incident was supposedly overhauled just three months earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I have the March 1980 edition of the United Transportation Union News Canada newspaper, and it is a fairly comprehensive report of the Mississauga railway accident inquiry. I would like for the benefit of the members present today, to read into the record some of the observations they make in this article. I quote:

The derailment of the rail cars containing dangerous chemicals that resulted in the mass evacuation of Mississauga, Ontario last November could have been prevented according to the brief being presented on behalf of the United Transportation Union before the Mississauga railway accident inquiry. The brief being delivered by the Canadian Railway Labour Association contended that inadequate standards of safety and the handling of dangerous commodities caused the derailment and might not have happened if the Canadian Pacific as well as other railroads were required to adopt safety practices that are desirable and technologically possible, (such

as the hotbox detectors which the member for Moose Jaw North referred to in his remarks).

The brief said that rail safety is now dictated more by cost factors than by consideration for the public safety. Canadian Railway Labour Association executive secretary, Mr. Abbott, speaking on behalf of the 15 unions representing Canadian railway workers, also strongly criticized the railway transport committee of the Canadian Transport Commission for what he described as the abdication of its responsibilities to the public. He said that the committee instead of rigidly enforcing railway safety measures in the interests of the public and railway workers simply permits the railways to police their own operations and write their own rules. Abbott recalled a safety inquiry conducted by the CTC's railway committee in 1970, had revealed several crucial areas in which Canadian railway companies were operating below an acceptable level of safety. Unfortunately, he said the CTC did not act affirmatively to correct these inadequacies. The union chief cited several specific safety flaws in the railway's operations, including the failure to install sufficient hotbox detectors and to convert unsafe friction bearings in boxcars to safer roller bearings. Both the railroads and the CTC were aware in 1970 of the need for hotbox detectors to prevent derailment, Abbott said.

And yet 10 years later we have a potentially disastrous derailment that could have been avoided if technology known and perfected in the 1960s had been installed. Abbott said the 1970 inquiry had also clearly established the increased margin of safety provided by converting from friction bearing to roller bearing wheels. But again the CTC has not put pressure on the companies to convert to the safe type of wheel bearing.

(I continue, Mr. Speaker.) The level of safety at which Canadian railways have been allowed to operate, said Abbott, has been dictated not by what is needed and is technologically feasible but solely by the economics of the individual companies. The union brief continued that if the railways could prove that safety levels now required by society are beyond the company's financial capability, it may be necessary to provide government subsidies to ensure the public is not subjected to the dangers of railway accidents. The most urgently needed reform, however, the brief stressed, is a much stricter enforcement of existing safety regulations by the CTC's railway committee.

The CTC has a duty to regulate the railway system too ensure the maximum level of safety possible. Safety must override the company's balance sheet approach to their operations. The CTC has the responsibility to make sure that is the case. The union brief criticized the CTC's shortage of inspection staff and its tendency to allow the railways to set their own levels of safety, especially in the transportation of toxic materials.

The Mississauga derailment was entirely predictable, Abbott said, in light of the findings of the CTC's 1970 inquiry. The only question left unanswered in 1970, where regulatory action was not taken by the CTC's railway committee, were simply when and where the derailment would occur and how bad it would be. The union official hastened to add that the safest method of transporting bulk commodities, including dangerous chemicals, is by rail. Any attempt to ship the transportation of dangerous goods from rail

to road transport on the assumption that it would be safer would be suicidal. Our highways are already dangerous avenues for such transportation and hundreds of additional tank trucks would multiply the risk of major accidents a thousand times.

The only feasible answer to the Mississauga derailment, he added, is to take the steps we have recommended to ensure that rail safety is raised and kept to a level that will reduce the chance of another such accident to a minimum.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope the members took that article to heart and would consider it in their decision to support this motion. I think we must also recognize that no matter how good our safety practices are, some accidents are unavoidable, as the member opposite commented. Wherever possible dangerous goods should be rerouted around residential areas. A long-term solution must be to reduce the volume of dangerous goods we transport. We cannot risk another Mississauga in my opinion. Evacuation of 225,000 people alone cost the country millions of dollars for emergency relief and lost productivity. If the derailment had resulted in an explosion, many lives would have been lost and the costs increased many times. It is false economy to balance budget cutbacks in the area of rail safety against potential disaster.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to summarize my three main concerns. First, federal government cutbacks have reduced enforcement of rail safety regulations. Second, the railways themselves have drastically reduced the number of staff whose jobs directly affect safety. Examples were provided by the member for Moose Jaw North in his remarks. Third, only by increased safety precautions combined with a reduction in the volume of dangerous goods transported can we hope to avoid an increasing number of incidents like Mississauga in the future.

I am in support of having hearings held in major terminals across Canada so that experienced workers and those who have been involved with derailments in other rail disasters can present briefs to ensure that the movement of hazardous goods is much safer than it already is.

The Canadian public must be informed of the real dangers that railway workers are all too well aware of. For that reason and for those put forward by the member for Moose Jaw North I believe all members will want to support this resolution and I am pleased to second it and urge those opposite to bring it to a speedy and affirmative vote. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of remarks I would like to make on this topic. I see the hour is getting close to 5 o'clock so I wonder if I might be able to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre) moved second reading of Bill No. 01 — **An Act to repeal An Act to Incorporate Consumers' Co-operative Refineries Limited.**

Motion for second reading agreed and bill referred to the select standing committee on

May 6, 1980

private bills.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre) moved second reading of Bill No. 02 — **An Act to repeal An Act respecting Federated Co-operatives Limited, being an Act to amend and consolidate An Act to Incorporate Saskatchewan Co-operative Wholesale Society Limited.**

Motion for second reading agreed and bill referred to the select standing committee on private bills.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre) moved second reading of Bill No. 04 — **An Act to amend and consolidate An Act respecting Co-operative Superannuation Society.**

Motion for second reading agreed and bill referred to the select standing committee on private bills.

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont) moved second reading of Bill No. 05 — **An Act to provide for exemption from taxation of Property of The Canadian Red Cross Society Saskatchewan Division.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this particular bill deals with the exemption from taxation for the Canadian Red Cross Society. Members will recall, the last couple of sessions we have had similar types of bills. The agreement, I think, of the committee was to stick with the rule that this Assembly had set some years ago that we would require that people proposing these bills have the written authority of the local municipality involved. I informed a solicitor for the group of this rule of the Assembly. At this time there is one municipality which is involved and has given this written assurance. There are two that have not. So it will be my intention to move amendments in the private bills committee to exclude those two communities which have not. I thought I should give the members notice of that.

With those few remarks I move that Bill No. 05 be now read a second time and referred to the select standing committee on private bills.

Motion for second reading agreed and bill referred to the select standing committee on private bills.

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North) moved second reading of Bill No. 06 — **An Act to Incorporate St. Anthony's Home of Moose Jaw.**

Motion for second reading agreed and bill referred to the select standing committee on private bills.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.