

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 17, 1982

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Communication

DEPUTY CLERK: — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the standing committee on communication, I present the second report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee has had under consideration the division of the 450 minutes of radio time arranged for the current budget debate. Your committee recommends to the assembly that time be shared as follows: 323 minutes to the government members and 127 minutes to the opposition members for the current debate. Your committee further recommends that the allocation of time to the individual members be arranged through the usual channel.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kindersley, Mr. Andrew:

That the second report of the standing committee on communication be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to introduce to you, and to the members of this Assembly, a grade 8 class from Allan, Saskatchewan. I think they deserve a lot of credit for driving in on the bad highways today. I would just like to say that there are 32 grade 8 students and 6 parents. They are accompanied by their teacher, Ernie Melnyk, Donalda and Bob Eskelby, Ann and John Riehl, Wilf Kaey, and John Ursalman. I welcome you to this Assembly and hope you enjoy your stay here this afternoon and your visit to Regina. I would ask all members to welcome this class.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to welcome the grade 8 class from Allan School who are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Melnyk, and parents. I taught at Allan School for a number of years and lived there for a number of years also. I always found it very enjoyable. It was a pleasant experience teaching there. That is a reflection on the community. I hope you enjoy your stay in Regina this afternoon. May you have a good, safe journey back home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Canadian Union of Public Employees' Strike

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, you will recall that the other day I asked the Minister of Health to use his influence to bring the negotiators in the current strike between CUPE (Canadian Union of Public Employees) and the Saskatchewan Health-Care Association to the table. Obviously, he has done nothing. I notice by the paper that a citizen of this city was discharged from hospital and on the same day died of a heart attack. Goodness only knows what other suffering is going on out there today. Mr. Premier, I ask you, as the Premier of this province, will you use your influence to bring these parties to the table and reach a negotiated settlement?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence that the Minister of Health is using his good offices to get the parties to the table. I do not believe that I would have any more success than he and his officials who are familiar with this particular industrial dispute, and I believe that active steps are being taken to attempt to get this dispute resolved at the bargaining table.

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, I also see that the 3,300 member Service Employees' International Union is presently taking a strike vote. It seems very strange that your government opposite can come to an agreement with some of the unions in Saskatchewan and fail to settle with those involved in medical services. I ask you: when are you going to stop playing politics with the lives of these people? My question is this: Mr. Premier, would you not agree that your failure to settle with these unions is nothing but a charade? It is nothing more than creating a confrontation and then attempting to step in later as the great saviour of medicare and solve that confrontation?

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's statements reflect very considerably, particularly on hospitals and hospital boards throughout this province. The Saskatchewan Health-Care Association is not an emanation of the Government of Saskatchewan. It is not controlled by the Government of Saskatchewan. It is controlled by hospital boards in this province. When this man who sits for Indian Head-Wolseley says that we are using this labour dispute as a basis for forwarding our political interests, he is accusing the hospital boards of this province of doing the same thing. I think that that is a shameful accusation.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplementary question. The other day (and I quote from *Hansard*) you called the Saskatchewan Hospital Association the agent of the employer. Will you deny, Mr. Premier, that your government is the agency that funds the hospitals in this province, and that therefore it is incumbent upon you people to make sure that this serious strike comes to a halt as quickly as it can be negotiated?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, this government funds a great number of agencies throughout this province. It funds, for example, the city of Regina, but we do not sit at the bargaining table when the city of Regina negotiates with CUPE or with the firefighters or any other organization. Indeed, it funds the hospitals; but if the hospitals

spend more than the funds available, they collect from local agencies. Nobody suggests that the Government of Saskatchewan funds hospitals 100 per cent. No one suggests that the hospital boards are mere puppets of the government and I suggest that anyone who does say that simply knows nothing about the operation of hospital boards. The member says that the Indian Head Union Hospital is only a puppet of the Government of Saskatchewan. I say he's wrong. I say that the hospital association, the Saskatchewan Health-Care Association, is a responsible agency representing the hospitals and doing the job for the hospitals at the bargaining table and not the job for the government.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the Premier. You've given every indication in your response that you're washing your hands of this hospital strike and that the government has no obligation to interfere. We ask you on behalf of the people of this province: are you now prepared to, first, at least use your office as Premier to bring both parties back to the bargaining table and resolve this strike immediately and second, if it's a question of funds, to give the immediate commitment to the hospitals of this province that there will be adequate funds to pay these people?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — We are not prepared to dictate either to the union or the health care association as to how this dispute ought to be settled. We do not believe that the dispute is at this stage of the game. We do say that the parties ought to get back to the bargaining table. The Minister of Health has made that perfectly clear. He is using his good offices. The Minister of Labour is using his good offices and I have every confidence that they will discharge their duties in an exemplary way in the future, as they have in the past. There is I think no doubt, for example, that the Attorney General has attempted to bring to the bargaining table the disputants when the police in the city of Regina were in danger of having a work stoppage. There was no suggestion that somehow this made those employees our employees or that we were responsible for the nature of the contract arrived at. In the same way, the Minister of Health will be using his good offices, but we have every confidence that CUPE and the health care association are mindful of their public responsibilities, will discharge them, and will shortly be back at the bargaining table.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to indicate to the House where the government is prepared to spend some money. I have here something that is not particularly new to this House now. It's the 1982-83 capital budget request from the part development branch. My question is to the minister responsible. I wonder when we can expect this request to be implemented. The request is for a fiberglass waterslide in the Qu'Appelle Valley, and I suppose it's winding down the hill, dropping into what is your version of the Red Sea, at a cost of \$1,124,000. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would indicate to this House when that particular request will be implemented.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, the member would be well-advised that the document which he has in his hands should be tabled. He should table it because we don't know what he has in his hands. It would be nice to know if he had a legitimate document or not. In regard to what we will be announcing (it will be announced obviously in due course), the member should be well-advised to wait his turn and the answer will be given at that point.

MR. BERNTSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's one other request for the Qu'Appelle Valley slide. It may be the Red Sea, I don't know. It's called a wave-tech pool and this wave-tech pool (and the Attorney General may want to listen to this because he

may be one of the few people who gets to use it) generates an eight foot wave by the use of compressed air which ripples down to the other end. It's called artificial surf. Now, the advantage of this thing, Mr. Speaker, over a natural ocean is that no undertow is created. Mr. Speaker, this request to treasury board is a request for \$2.5 million to put in a wave-tech pool in the Qu'Appelle Valley. I wonder if the minister will tell us when this particular project will be implemented.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Speaker, I told the member that any announcements would be made in due course in regard to any project. The member refuses to table the document he's referring to, and I can only surmise it's no different than any other planning document around the department. Many planning documents, many ideas have been kicked around and if the member finds a problem with a waterslide or a wave-tech pool, he'd be well-advised to look around the country outside this province where it's taken for granted, as in Medicine Hat, Alberta, where there are the same facilities that he's talking about. So, if he's being critical of that kind of planning, saying that we shouldn't be thinking of these kinds of projects, I think he's out of line. And if he's asking when these announcements are going to be coming forward, he'll have to wait like anybody else. If there is any announcement, it will be made in due course.

Aid for Rural Communities

MR. PICKERING: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Now that the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources has admitted that we're going to have slides, tidal waves and so on, I would like to know, Mr. Premier, what you are going to do for the rural Saskatchewan communities that are burdened with a \$4,000 to \$8,000 per month bill. How do you justify not helping them, and putting in such projects as this?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, there is not one shred of evidence that the government or any minister of the Crown ever agreed with anyone of those proposals. Members opposite very pointedly will not table what they are quoting from. Members opposite are very careful not to give, in anyway, anybody an opportunity to examine the document which they say supports the point of view for which they are arguing. If they believed that they would let someone else see the document. They are, of course, unwilling to do that because when they do that they will find that it is, in fact, not any document which the treasury board has ever agreed to, or any document which cabinet has ever agreed to.

These are the same people who laughed at snow-making equipment a few years ago — the same people who said we shouldn't have snow-making equipment at any ski resort. The member for Qu'Appelle, who has had a difficult time with snow-making equipment and downhill ski resorts in his constituency, is perhaps a little sensitive at this point.

I reply to the member for Milestone that since his question was predicated on the proposition that the minister had agreed to these things, or agreed that they had been adopted by the government, and since that premise is 100 per cent wrong, there is no question to answer.

MR. BERNTSON: — The Premier will know, Mr. Speaker, that the rules of this House (or maybe he doesn't know) do not allow the tabling of documents in question period. Question period yesterday had the same rules as question period today, so I couldn't table them in question period yesterday. But, Mr. Speaker, if it satisfies the Premier, I'll be more than pleased to deliver to his office, after question period today, a copy of the

government priorities in the parks and development branch that include these grandiose schemes . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

Saskatchewan Position on Cruise Missile Tests

MR. PREBBLE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Last week it became public that the Government of Canada proposes to permit the testing of the cruise missile near Cold Lake, Alberta. I was pleased to hear the Premier's announcement this morning that the government does not look favourably on this proposal. My question is what specific representations the Government of Saskatchewan proposes to make to the federal government with respect to this matter, and also whether there were any consultations by the Government of Canada with the Government of Saskatchewan prior to this information becoming public on what Saskatchewan's views with respect to this testing proposal were.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I have not received any representations from the federal government respecting this proposal. So far as I'm able to ascertain, none of my officials in the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs have received similar representations either. I guess, shortly put, that translates to no consultation with the Government of Saskatchewan on this idea or concept or proposal. Indeed, it seems to be a little more than an idea or concept.

I am taking the position of writing to the Minister of External Affairs, the Hon. Mark MacGuigan, expressing to him this government's disappointment, indeed extreme concern, that we were not consulted about this, as well as indicating our concern about the potential for accidents with respect to life and property, with respect to the testing and transport, and anything associated with these missiles. Accordingly, the question started off with "What do we propose to do?" I propose to write, if it has not gone already, this letter to the Hon. Minister of External Affairs, Mark MacGuigan, outlining our opposition to this idea at the present time.

MR. PREBBLE: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My question is that the proposed testing is on the Primrose weapons range, which I understand extends into the province of Saskatchewan. This presumably means that the testing of the cruise missile may very well take place not only in Alberta but in Saskatchewan. My question to the minister is: does he have any information as to whether in fact the testing will take place in Saskatchewan and, secondly, does he know if the testing proposal involves any other kind of nuclear system or rocket system in addition to the cruise missile?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have any specific formal information at hand other than that which I have been able to obtain by way of briefing from the deputy of the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs. The information roughly is that there is (and I don't know how accurate this is) approximately a 30-mile-wide corridor between the Alberta and Saskatchewan borders where this particular missile is supposedly going to be tested. It's launched, I gather, from a B-52 and flies at very low levels of 100 to 200 feet, aiming at the Primrose test range area. The question further from the member opposite was, as I understand it, whether or not there is any nuclear device or other mechanism attached to it. My information is that there is none, but again this is subject to the status of the information which I have already given to the members of this House.

MR. PREBBLE: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This whole issue raises the question of a nuclear weapons-free zone for Canada, which Project Plowshares and many other organizations have been advocating. Apart from the proposed testing of the cruise missile, Litton Industries of Canada has been involved in making components in the guidance system for the cruise missile. My question to the minister is whether the Government of Saskatchewan would be prepared to advocate that the federal government adopt the policy of favouring a nuclear weapons-free zone in this country under which the testing and manufacture of nuclear weapon systems or their components would not take place and under which there would be a halt to the storage of nuclear weapons on Canadian soil and a halt to any proposals for nuclear submarines or nuclear-equipped aircraft to enter Canadian waters or Canadian air space.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can endeavour to answer the hon. member's question in these terms. Obviously this is an area which is the responsibility of the federal government. It does concern itself with nation-to-nation treaties and obligations that pertain thereto. On occasion, the provincial governments are asked to express opinions as they affect national and provincial interest in the arena of, say, the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights and so forth. We support the objectives of the disarmament which have been articulated. I believe, by the United Nations session in 1978 — to which the Canadian federal government was a signatory and was also a supporter. Accordingly, the degree to which the testing of the cruise missiles might be contrary to that foreign policy objective as signed in 1978 is open to each member's individual interpretation. I would at this point make no further comment on the other larger aspect of the member's question.

Rental Value of Owner-Occupied Property

MR. LANE: — Question to the Premier. Given the reaction of the government to the last question and the actions taken, I wonder if the Premier would be prepared to table after question period — immediately after question period — the Government of Saskatchewan's representations to the Government of Canada, hopefully in opposition to the proposals to the Government of Canada, to deem as income the rental value of a person's primary residence?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Government of Canada denies, and denies rather vehemently, that they have any proposal for deeming the rental value of owner-occupied property as income for income tax purposes. I have no personal knowledge of this but the press reports indicate that Mr. MacEachan has written to the president of the Dominion Life making that point with some vehemence. It has never been the policy of our government in levying income taxes for provincial purposes or for federal purposes to advocate that the deemed rental value of property be included as income by those persons who own homes and occupy them. That has never been the policy of our government. Insofar as I'm aware, it's not the policy of the federal government.

MR. LANE: — There were no representations made, then?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — We have not made representations because we haven't been aware that it's an issue. I'm not aware of any evidence to suggest that representation would in any way be relevant.

Joint Potash Venture

MR. ANDREW: — A question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, reading from Hansard in the Manitoba legislature, Friday, February 26, 1982, in response to a question from the opposition the Premier of Manitoba indicated, and I quote:

It would be extremely unwise if I did not seize the opportunity to discuss with the Premier of Saskatchewan the possibility of a joint involvement with respect to future potash or any kind of development in so far as Saskatchewan and Manitoba is concerned.

Could the Premier advise the Assembly as to whether or not you in fact have discussed with the Premier of Manitoba the joint venture of building a potash mine in the province of Manitoba using Saskatchewan money from the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund? Further, could you explain to the Assembly why you would spend money in the province of Manitoba at the same time that potash mines are being stopped from developing in Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible) . . .

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Are you going to do it? And now that you are doing it, why? May I say, in answer to the hon. member's question, firstly, and by way of parenthesis, I link back to the question from the member for Qu'Appelle. If the member for Qu'Appelle wants us to make a representation to the federal government, we will assuredly do so. So I don't want him to go about saying we won't make a representation. We think it is in no sense relevant, but if he thinks it is, we will.

To reply to the question from the member for Kindersley, I had a brief discussion with the Premier of Manitoba to see what their proposals were with respect to the development of their potash resource. I was a very preliminary discussion. Subsequent thereto, the Attorney General, the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, has had a conversation with the Hon. Wilson Parasiuk, who is the appropriate minister in the Manitoba government. I am now simply repeating my understanding of the nature of that discussion, that there was an exploratory discussion on what the Government of Manitoba proposed to do with respect to the development of its potash resource. If it is going to develop the potash resource and is determined so to do, it may well be of interest to us to know whether or not that potash resource is developed by the government of the province of Manitoba, by the province of Manitoba in joint venture with a private company, or by the province of Manitoba in some sort of collaboration with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. However, that is a highly, highly speculative question since, so far as I am aware, there are no definite plans for developing the potash resource in Manitoba.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Ombudsman Act (No. 2)

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Ombudsman Act (No. 2).

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 31 — An Act respecting the Handling and Transporting of Dangerous Goods in the Province

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a bill respecting the handling and transporting of dangerous goods in the province be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 32 — An Act to Provide Accessibility to Buildings for Physically Disabled Persons

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a bill to provide accessibility to buildings for physically disabled persons be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

St. Patrick's Day

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, just before the orders of the day, I am sure that all members would want to join with me in extending best wishes on St. Patrick's Day to the Irish community. Mr. Speaker, in these good, rather buoyant times, the Irish love of life comes rather easily, so perhaps in these days we could all feel a little Irish. I think, as well, it would be appropriate if members from the government benches extend a special wish to members in the opposition benches on St. Patrick's Day. I have a feeling that in the months and weeks ahead the opposition will need the luck of the Irish, because that's really all they have going for them. So, I think all members on this side will join with me in extending special wishes to the opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I, too, would like to join with the hon. member in expressing greetings to the Irish community — coming from a direct line of Flannigans, I think I have some affinity with the Irish. The luck of the Irish, Mr. Speaker, is something I don't think we will directly need to make the changes that the people of Saskatchewan want. Certainly the Government of Saskatchewan will need the luck of the Irish to come back with more than a rump group opposite. The good fortune of the Irish will shine upon the people of Saskatchewan and give them a government which has a clarity of vision obviously lacking opposite. That's the wish of all people in Saskatchewan today. I know it is the wish of the Irish community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Crow's Nest Rate

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr.

MacMurphy:

That this Assembly, recognizing the grave social and economic implications of the federal government's attack on the crowrate, rejects the federal government's plan to abolish the statutory crowrate and replace it with a law designed to protect the railroads, and affirms the commitment of this legislature to the crowrate with its fundamental principles of a fixed rate for producers and equal rates for equal distance.

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased with the opposition for once in my life on Monday. They gave me an opportunity to come back and make a few more points which I didn't have time to consider in my speech on Monday night. I was just preparing to wind up my speech that night, but I have a few more points I would like to expand upon and deal with. This is one time I would like to express my thanks to the opposition.

I was dealing with an area well known to me and to the member for Rosetown-Elrose. I was dealing with the town of Dinsmore. I had dealt with the point that with three times the crow, in the town of Dinsmore over \$1 million and over 5.1 jobs per year would be the loss to the community.

But let's consider that same community, Mr. Speaker, with 10 times the crow, and with everything we have studies that is the undoubted target of that waste-ridden federal government — 10 times the crow. Let's consider the loss to the town of Dinsmore that the member for Rosetown-Elrose, the member representing that town, supported by his statement, "Get your head out of the sand." At 10 times the crow there would be an annual loss of over \$5 million to that community, to the farm people in that area and to the people of that town, plus a loss of 23 jobs. That, Mr. Speaker, is what happens when people worship at the altar of this great so-called system of free enterprise — approximately \$5 million and 23 jobs for the Dinsmore area along. That's what is called taking your head out of the sand, PC style.

At 10 times the crow the town of Beechy would annually lose \$4 million per year. And 18.8 jobs would to. That's called progress, Progressive Conservative style — progressively worse and worse and worse.

No wonder the Lyon Progressive Conservative government in Manitoba had a deficit of \$256 million in its last year of office, because that is their style of economic management. No wonder the PCs were turfed out of Manitoba after one short term.

But let's go back to Drinkwater in Thunder Creek and take 10 times the crow there. At 10 times the crow very close to \$2 million per year would be lost to the town of Drinkwater and to the farming community around it, and nine jobs. But by 1990 we have no doubt the Pepin plan (Devine-Pepin plan) is scheduled to charge farmers 20 times the rate of the crow to haul grain. After all what did Devine and Pepin say? They said:

Thus, economic distortions have likely developed as a result of the statutory rate.

And that's from Grant Devine's standing Senate committee on agriculture, March 23, 1977, echoed very nicely by Jean-Luc Pepin in Winnipeg, February 8, 1982. That's one of the reasons, as the Minister of Education so ably pointed out, the people in Ottawa felt they could have lots of support to cut the crow. What did Pepin say?

The economic distortions within the agricultural sector stemming from the statutory rate should be reduced.

What economic distortions do Devine and Pepin refer to? Are the farmers getting too many economic advantages? Not the ones that I know. Are the farmers making too much money? Not the ones that I know. When they talk of economic distortion most likely both Devine and Pepin refer to the 80 per cent of the farmers that Devine said were uneconomic and had to go. So we have no doubt that the PC-Pepin plan has a target of 20 times the crowrate by 1990.

In the town of Central Butte in the constituency of Thunder Creek 20 times the crowrate would mean an annual loss of \$4.5 million or more to the farmers in the town itself, plus 18 jobs. I would ask the absent member for Thunder Creek to go out to Central Butte and tell them honestly that you think their community should have an annual loss of \$4.5 million and that 18 jobs should be cut from their community. If you are honest about what you mean everybody in the Central Butte area would know that the Progressive Conservative Party wants to have 21 or 17 grain delivery points in all of Saskatchewan and 80 per cent fewer farmers than there are now — 80 per cent of our farmers cast into the wilderness. These are the obvious net results of such policies.

And because that would be the result, the Central Buttes and the Drinkwaters of this province would quickly lose their viability at that rate. The farmers would be driven from the land and the small businesses would be forced to close. Certainly that is part of the Devine-Pepin plan. Certainly that's what Devine and the PCs mean when they say, "Thus, economic distortions have likely developed as a direct result of the statutory crowrate." Listen carefully, you farmers, businessmen and workers in the Central Buttes, Drinkwaters, Dinsmores and the Beechys of this province. The PC Party believes that your towns, farms and jobs are economic distortions. That's what they have said in the past in spite of their weak changes now. I would like anybody to tell me what other logical conclusions you can drive from statements such as those. There are none.

Those are the statements that they are trying so desperately to deny now. I guess I'd be trying to deny those statements if I had been so short-sighted, so foolish in considering the economic consequences that my statements were to have on my province and on my people.

Isn't this whole crow debate a sad commentary on Devine and his Progressive Conservatives? Who, in positions of power in Ottawa, would believe your weak protests of support of the crowrate now? Certainly nobody but the deepest dyed-in-the-wool Progressive Conservatives would believe you here in the West. Isn't this whole debate a sad commentary on the Progressive Conservatives? There they were, a party that was in great need of a saviour after the disastrous Collver years. There was the great academic intellectual to lead the Progressive Conservatives out of the wilderness that they knew was going to be their destiny. Here was a man who, in their opinion, had profound knowledge of economics. Here was a man who had expounded to a great extent against the crow and about closing down the farms and about farm size and what have you. So the PCs chose Grant Devine because of his great outpourings on farm economics, agricultural economics.

The members opposite slavishly poured out their kill-the-crow lines, slavishly following Grant Devine. But now, Mr. Speaker, they're not quite so sure. They're not quite so sure, but only because the public opinion polls show that almost 90 per cent of the people of

Saskatchewan are opposed to the killing of the crow. It's not because of their beliefs. Oh no, it's not at all because of their beliefs. I have no doubt at all, because of their pronouncements, that they still believe in the destruction of the crow. I have no doubt at all. Why? Very recently, Grant Devine has said, "Well, I'm going to defend my professorial statements." He said, "Oh yes, what I had said before is what I said as a professor. That was before I was a politician."

The member for Thunder Creek says, "Get rid of the crow. We'll fight an election on this one." Strange outfit. They have great pretences of defence of the crow now when they get their ears to the ground finally.

But there's another one that I'd like to read, too, into the record. It comes from an agricultural conference of four western ministers of agriculture from July 1 to July 5, 1979. I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture would well remember that one. I would like to read a passage from Canadian News Facts dated July 1 to July 15, 1979. It says:

"Ministers Disagree on Freight Rates." Three of four western ministers agreed at a one-day meeting, July 4, to seek fundamental change in the controversial Crow's Nest Pass statutory freight rate for hauling grain.

What do you mean by a fundamental change, Mr. Speaker? A fundamental change means at least 10 times the crow, with it growing to 20 times the crow. That's what it means to me, to be a fundamental change.

To continue to quote, the dissenting voice came from where? The Minister of Agriculture from Manitoba? Not the PC minister, no siree. From the PC minister of Alberta? No siree. Or from the ultra-PC from British Columbia? No siree.

The dissenting voice came from Agriculture Minister Gordon MacMurchy of Saskatchewan, who favoured retention of the crow with compensation paid to the railways for losses caused by low rates.

One sole voice in the wilderness, Mr. Speaker. To continue the quote:

But the ministers from British Columbia, Alberta and Manitoba said they wanted the crow benefit retained.

Now they don't say what the crow benefit is. They never really outlined that fully. And to continue the quote:

... paid directly to the 150,000 farmers through a formula to be worked out by the federal government.

Nice business, but again, when a government like the present government in Ottawa is short of money, it only takes a quick dash of a pencil to change that so the whole load is laid on the backs of the farmers once again.

No wonder the federal government feels that the Devine-Pepin plan can go ahead. Kill the crow; they've got support from the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association. Kill the crow, but three out of the four western premiers at that time supported it. The Progressive Conservatives supported it solidly. It was supported by the offshoot from the Progressive Conservative Party, the Western Canada Concept. And why?

The Progressive Conservative Party in the West has great corporate friends in the CPR who line the political pockets of the Progressive Conservatives, and in turn the PCs will allow the CPR to dig deep into western Canadian pockets and every one of us in this province will lose. We in the West all stand with our pockets empty because of the PC's pouring into the coffers of that great needy organization and supporter of the PC Party, the Canadian Pacific Railway.

But one thing the CPR, Pepin, and the Progressive Conservative Party of the West and of all of Canada, and the little offshoot, the Western Canada Concept Party, didn't count on was the fighting spirit of western farmers and western people. They didn't count on the leadership of the Hon. Gordon MacMurchy, the Minister of Agriculture, and on his plan to mount a militant campaign against the destruction of that crow. They didn't count on the small businessmen and the workers of the West who could understand what would happen to them if the crow were destroyed, what would happen to our whole province and our whole western economy if that crowrate were destroyed.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, when I was at the point of winding up on Monday night, the people of Saskatchewan were waiting to cast their judgment on you, the members opposite, who push this Devine-Pepin plan to destroy the crowrate of Saskatchewan and so to virtually destroy the whole province and the whole economy of western Canada. To those western Canadians who haven't thought about it, beware of the Progressive Conservative Party and its great corporate friends in the Canadian Pacific Railway; both want to dig deep into your pockets, so deep they'll tear the bottoms out of them. Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be supporting the motion but I will violently oppose the flip-flops of the PCs that have rendered their votes, their voices and their actions useless in this battle to save the crowrate for western Canada.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I had waited to see whether or not any member of the opposition might wish to join the debate at this time, but I take it that they would prefer not to get too definitive about their views on the crowrate.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the debate and the purpose of this resolution is to condemn the federal government's proposal to act unilaterally to destroy the crowrate. I say that as the crowrate goes, so goes very much of the economic and social fibre of rural Saskatchewan. We either keep the crow and keep rural Saskatchewan as we have known it — yes, changing and changing its face along with progress — or we have the crow going and with it a wholesale change in the face of rural Saskatchewan.

On this issue, there's really no middle ground. You're either with the federal government's plan — the Pepin plan — or you are against it and wholeheartedly against it. You are either with Mr. Pepin and the railway companies or you are with the farmers in the prairie provinces and the farmers in Saskatchewan. There is no question that our government is in favour of retaining the statutory crowrate. We are in favour of retaining it in 1982 and we were in favour of retaining it in 1981 and 1980 and 1979, and certainly no members opposite can make those statements.

The Pepin plan guarantees three things. First, it guarantees that producers will pay more for the transport of their grain. Now, Mr. Pepin in his speeches to the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) attempts to suggest that they're going to pay 50 per cent more, but none of his material in any way supports that proposition — none of it. If he would put a guarantee on that we would be mightily surprised. His proposal, in fact, is that farmers will pay more and a great deal more.

Secondly, the plan guarantees that producers will never again have a fixed rate for the movement of their grain. Never again will they be able to pick up the statute and read how much the price is to ship their grain. And thirdly, the plan guarantees that the railways will receive "adequate compensation for the movement of their grain."

Those are set out in Mr. Pepin's statement of last February, of last month. Clearly the only things that are guaranteed so far as money is concerned is that the farmers will pay more and the railways will be guaranteed in law adequate compensation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The two fundamental principles of the crowrate will be missing, and I invite anyone to read Mr. Pepin's statement and see whether they can find there any guarantee of either one of those statements: the guarantee of a statutory rate and the guarantee of equal rate for equal distance.

Now in 1925 the farmers needed protection from the railway companies because the railway companies were in a monopoly position and they needed railways to move their grain to port. I see Mr. Pepin saying, "Ah, but that was the Model T period." Well, I don't care whether it's a Model T truck or a 1982 Ford truck. You still can't in any economical sense move grain from Dinsmore, Saskatchewan to Vancouver by either one of those trucks. You still need the railway. The railways were in a monopoly position in 1925 and the railways are in a monopoly position in 1982.

Most Saskatchewan delivery points are 1,100, 1,200 miles from port . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I suggest that anyone who suggests even inferentially that trucking grain to Thunder Bay or trucking grain to Vancouver is in any way sensible has not done his sums. Protection for the farmer to get reasonable rates for transporting his grain to port is as valuable today as it was in 1925.

Eastern press calls the crow an anachronism. They are the same people who would call family farms an anachronism. They are the same people who would call small-town Saskatchewan an anachronism, because they are of the view that bigger is always better, that a large farm will always be more economical than a small farm, and that a large town is always a better place in which to live than a small one, and this is why they suggest that the crowrate and small towns and family farms are anachronisms that should be swept away. I suppose if you are in a glass tower in Montreal, as most of the CPR officials are and most of the CNR officials are, that's how it looks from there. But this government thinks that the crowrate and family farms and small-town Saskatchewan aren't just things of the past, but they're things of the present and even more important they're things of the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The Pepin plan has intertwined with it a series of myths — myths on which it is built. It's time, I think, that we looked at some of these myths and pointed out the fact that they have no basis in reality.

One of them is — and note what the defenders of the Pepin position say — we must pay more. Otherwise we will not get improvements to our rail system and we desperately need improvements to our rail system.

Well, with respect to that latter opposition I agree with them. We do need

improvements to our rail system. We've got a pretty good rail system, but obviously it is going to have to be expanded if we are to meet the challenges of the future. I do not think it's going to have to be expanded to the extent now stated because I don't think all of those increases in potash and lumber and coal and grain will take place as predicted but a large number of them will, and I am the first to admit, indeed to fully endorse the proposition that we need an upgraded rail system, particularly from the Prairies to the West Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — the argument is that we cannot have this unless we change the crow. The members opposite say, "Who should pay for it?" Well, I say that 15 years ago these same members opposite were saying, "Unless we change the crowrate, we can never get our branch lines upgraded."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, the terminal touters were wrong. We are getting our branch lines fixed and the crow is still there. Three or four years ago, it was another story; the crow must go or else we'll get no hopper cars. There will be no cars. Either the crow goes or we do not move our grain. It will be all in piles at every siding in Saskatchewan. That's what the terminal touters were saying then.

I say to you that the crow is still there and we have hopper cars. Some of them were bought by the Alberta Heritage Fund and I compliment them on that. Some were bought by our government and I compliment this government on that. Some were bought by farmers themselves through the Canadian Wheat Board and I compliment the wheat board on that. So those terminal touters were wrong again. At least those arguments had some basis of reality because the branch lines carry about 90 per cent grain and the hopper cars carry approximately 100 per cent grain.

Now the same terminal touters are saying, "We need new main lines across the mountains and therefore the crow must go." That's the weakest argument of all. Of all the freight that moves across the mountains to Vancouver and Prince Rupert, perhaps 25 per cent is grain. It's confidently predicted that that will go down to 12 per cent perhaps or even 10 per cent. If it doesn't go down to that, we don't need the mainline upgrading because if it doesn't go down to that it will mean that we're not shipping the coal, potash, and sulphur that we think we're going to ship. So, I think, on the railroad's own figures, it's only going to be perhaps 15 per cent of the freight 10 years from now.

Yet the terminal touters and the railway companies are saying, "Yes, we're going to make a good dollar on 85 per cent of the freight we ship across those mountains. Yes, we're going to make a good dollar on potash, sulphur, lumber, and coal, but unless we get more money on the 15 per cent we're not going to build the lines." Well, I don't think that even the most dedicated terminal touter can state that argument without just a little bit of skepticism in his voice. Nobody, I think, can possibly argue that the railway

companies are not going to improve their lines in order to make more money on sulphur and more on potash, coal, and rapeseed oil simply because they think they're not making enough money on 15 per cent of the freight. Nobody, I think, believes that argument. That is the weakest myth of all.

The second myth that is put forward is that somehow the crowrate is an unfair transportation subsidy and that in the name of fairness the crow must go. I have seen some absolutely remarkable arguments based upon that proposition. Okay, let's ask ourselves: what subsidies are paid by the federal government and how much of it goes to grain producers? Let's see whether this is an unfair subsidy compared with other citizens of Canada. Then let's ask ourselves what other governments do for their grain producers and see if it's unfair compared with what other governments do for their producers.

First let's look at the Government of Canada. It pays transportation subsidies in the order of \$2.4 billion a year. Of that amount, less than \$300 million is associated with the movement of prairie grain. So it's \$300 million on \$2.4 billion of subsidies. So it's not all that much money. Mr. Pepin claims that the subsidy is now \$800 million a year, because the federal government has committed itself to spending more than \$3 billion on the western rail system by 1986. Now, I invite anyone to read some of his statements. That's the little operation. "We are going to spend \$3 billion on the rail system and that's \$800 million a year." And that is all attributed to grain, but of course 80 or 85 per cent goes to the benefit of somebody else. But never mind; we're arguing against the crow now, so we have to say that this whole \$3 billion is attributable to grain. It's a very, very interesting argument, but it bears no relevance to the real facts. His claim is \$800 million a year; \$277 million or \$300 million is a much, much better figure.

I had a chance to look at the paper of Monday of this week, and I saw "Bottlenecks Forecast unless Great Lakes Waterway Upgraded." And it goes through the entire argument for saying that the St. Lawrence Seaway is going to have to be upgraded and that the Welland Canal is going to have to be (inaudible). The argument throughout is that the federal government must do this, and there's no suggestion that the shippers should pay more. I don't know why it is appropriate for the shippers on the St. Lawrence Seaway to look to the federal government for 100 per cent of the costs of upgrading and not for farmers on the Prairies to look to the federal government for the cost of upgrading across the Rocky Mountains.

We are seeing a double standard being applied. And when we talk about the fairness of transportation subsidies, let's look at whether or not other people are getting substantial transportation subsidies in this country.

Now let's look at what other countries do for their grain producers. Argentina, which is a fairly major shipper of grain into world markets, recently removed all transportation tolls for the moving of grain to the seaboard. So that's crow with a vengeance. That's free transportation.

Australia has a state-owned railway system which is subsidized very substantially to see that those producers, who are relatively close to seaboard in any case, get their crops to seaboard.

In the United States the producers and the great bulk of grain producers have access to the Mississippi River system, which is by and large a publicly built and publicly

subsidized system in the United States.

So we say, when we're asking what is fair and what is unfair, let us test what other Canadians get by way of transportation subsidies. Let us test what other grain producers get elsewhere in the world, and we will see it is a myth that somehow the Canadian grain producers are on the world's greatest gravy train, as is sometimes suggested by Mr. Pepin and the terminal touters, who are calling for some sort of efficiency. That will simply not bear analysis.

I invite anyone to look at some of the arguments which are used, particularly with respect to air travel. Note that Mr. Pepin is setting up his subsidy figures on the basis of the combined capital and operating costs of the rail system. Indeed, his whole \$800 million figure is based upon the proposition that the federal government is going to have to spend a lot of capital dollars to get VIA Rail lines across the mountains upgraded. Then when those same people argue, "Oh, we're not really spending very much on airports," they quote you the figure for the construction of airports. Oh my, no, that figure won't work out. They tell how much it costs to operate the airports and the subsidy they pay for operating the airports but not the subsidy they pay for building the airports. So they're applying to air transit a proposition that the airport shall be paid for out of public funds and it's only the operation which is a subsidy. When they get over to rail transit, they want to count as a subsidy all costs paid for — both capital and operating. And what do you know? They can show that rail subsidies are fairly large on that basis. What do you know? Since you compare apples and oranges, it's not difficult to prove whatever you want to prove.

I could take the same figures and say we will assume that capital is paid for out of the public purse, whether it be on seaways or railways or airways, and then when it comes to operating we'll ask them to pay all the operating costs. I think farmers would buy that proposition. I think that in any case, this is not what is offered by Mr. Pepin. Mr. Pepin is making clear, very clear, that he proposes to count as a subsidy all capital costs paid by the federal government for the construction of roadbeds.

Well, now let's go on to myth number three — that the crowrate is an obstacle to increasing livestock production and secondary processing on the prairies. And that's a favourite one, a favourite one for the terminal touters — that somehow, if the crowrate went, there would be lots more money for livestock producers. Everyone wants more livestock production on the prairies, but is the crowrate the obstacle? Can anyone believe that the crowrate is the obstacle to livestock production on the prairies? Why isn't there more livestock production on the prairies?

The answer to why there isn't more livestock production on the Prairies is that ... (inaudible interjection) ... We are now hearing that it is because of the socialist government. I'm sure that the livestock industry in Alberta is having no difficulty whatever because they obviously don't have a socialist government over there but, in case that should be wrong, I suggest to hon. members that they look at a fairly simple proposition, and it's this — that the market price for livestock is not enough to pay the cost of production. That is very simple, and the crowrate will not change that one iota. If that's what's wrong with the livestock industry, the crowrate will in no way fix it and, accordingly, those people who say, "Sweep away the crow and the livestock industry will be in better shape," are simply talking nonsense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — It may well be that somebody may argue the reason why the prices are so low is that those people in Ontario are raising cattle cheaply and they're raising cattle cheaply because of the crowrate. Now I hear that argument. I ask whether anyone believes that the livestock producers in Ontario are making a good dollar. If they are, they're disguising it very well as they go bankrupt. They're disguising it very well. So even there it is not doing them any good. But suppose for a moment that you accept that proposition, which has no basis in fact. Then you have to assume that livestock production on the Prairies is going to expand greatly at the expense of livestock production in Ontario and Quebec, and you have to assume that the governments at Ottawa and Quebec City and Toronto will sit supinely by and watch the livestock industry move from Quebec and Ontario out to western Canada without any action on their part. You can believe that if you like, but I don't.

I don't think that any change in the crowrate is going to get that livestock industry back here on the Prairies. It's not that simple.

Now, let's talk about secondary processing. Somehow we do away with the crowrate and we're going to have a great upsurge of secondary processing here in the Prairies. Well, my colleague, the member for Regina Lakeview, the Minister of Education, dealt with part of that the other night. He pointed out that flour moves at the crowrate, so there is no impediment to the processing of grain into flour here on the Prairies. None whatever. And yet there is virtually no increase in the flour milling industry on the Prairies. In fact, there has been a steady decrease in the flour milling industry on the Prairies and this processing that all these people are talking about, even though there is no crowrate penalty. Look at the act if you like and you will see that flour is on the crowrate schedule. But it still doesn't get us any processing for flour, because there are other considerations.

They say, "Oh, do away with the crowrate and we'll have a great rapeseed crushing industry here, and we'll sell that rapeseed oil to Japan." I wonder if any of you have ever tried to sell rapeseed oil in Japan. Well, I have. I have been over there saying, "Why won't you buy our rapeseed oil? Why are you insisting on buying our rapeseed? The answer is very short and simple. They want the employment in Japan, and they are going to use their government to see that employment is in Japan. If we don't want to sell our rapeseed to them they will get it from somewhere else, because they are going to keep their crushing industry.

Now, you may think this is hardball on the part of the Japanese, and I think it is hardball on the part of the Japanese. They have a tariff of \$90 per tonne on rapeseed oil. But if anyone thinks that if we do away with the crow somehow the Japanese are going to remove their tariff and they are going to be nice guys and say, "Yes, yes, ship us the oil," then you can believe that, but I don't.

Mr. Pepin can make those arguments, but I don't believe they have a scintilla of validity, not a bit. So all of this extra processing . . . Where is this product going to be sold?

No one, I think, can deny the fact that we might get marginally more processing; I would be glad if we did and it might be (who knows) a \$5 million or \$10 million benefit to our province. But are we asked to pay three times crow — an extra \$140 million per year — out of one group of farmers to put \$10 million back in the pockets of another group of farmers?

This is the argument for the burgeoning development here on the Prairies? I think that's a myth and I think that's myth number three used in support of the Pepin plan.

Now we will go to this myth number four: that adequate compensation is going to be guaranteed to the railway company. And that is really all we are talking about — fair and reasonable compensation. Who can argue against that? Well, I don't suppose anyone can argue about that, but we can surely argue about what is fair and reasonable. Mr. Snavelly has his ideas of when they are fair and reasonable. He thinks that the CPR ought to be financed to more than one-half in equity (I forget the figures), about 55 or 60 per cent equity, on the other balance in debt capital. His idea of fair is that this equity, this 55 or 60 per cent of the total investment in the railroad company, should earn a measly, sniveling little 35 per cent per year before tax. Now, that's fair? I imagine a lot of farmers would accept rather willingly a 35 per cent return on the capital employed. And that is supposed to be fair?

AN HON. MEMBER: — I would have to take a cut but I would accept that.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, I am glad to know that the member for Thunder Creek's ideas are relatively expansive in the financial area. Even he admits that 35 per cent per year on capital employed is not a bad return.

But that's not all. Mr. Snavelly says there are all those branch lines out there and they're valuable. Yes, they're there; they're valuable. A lot of public money has gone into those and they have to be paid for. Well, he says that, after all, the railway owns the land. That's true. It's true that the federal government paid for the upgrading, but never mind, they're valuable lines now owned by the CPR so it is going to give them a 25 per cent return on the lines which have been built by the federal government. Now, that's adequate compensation. I think that is adequate all right. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Snavelly goes on. I won't go on for any analysis of this Snavelly report. I am just saying that when it comes to calculating adequate compensation, I wish that my return for my annual compensation was calculated by Mr. Snavelly. He is the very fellow I want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I invite anyone to look at this Pepin plan. Look at all the figures which are laced through it about the alleged losses of the railway company, all of them based upon this rather handsome level of accounting by Mr. Snavelly. Then we will know that the alleged subsidies to prairie farmers are much higher than the actual subsidies because nobody expects to get that kind of a return before tax. Nobody expects to be compensated for railway lines that somebody else built. Only Mr. Snavelly would figure out that that was necessary in order to show that the subsidy is huge. Now let's get back to a few realities around here as opposed to the myths that are being perpetrated in defence of the Pepin plan.

I have seen suggestions that the amount that farmers are going to pay is only the crowrate plus 50 per cent. And out of that they say that it's only \$750 a year for a farmer. Who says that can break a farmer? Well, perhaps if it were the crowrate plus 50 per cent, and perhaps if it were that the federal government would guarantee that it won't be more, then some other arguments might be germane. But clearly there is not a shred of assurance that we or any Saskatchewan farmer has that the crowrate, if removed, will not be replaced by a rate which will be 5 times crow or 10 times crow. The hon. member for Last Mountain-Touchwood has figured out, in his booklet which he

has published, that potential costs for farmers, based upon the data which Mr. Pepin gave in his own speech (inaudible) and in his own statement in Winnipeg, there is no question that even if you give the federal government the benefit of every doubt, even if you make the assumption that the subsidy it promises is going to go on in perpetuity (and any federal government promise that is good for more than one year is pretty surprising, but to suggest that it is good in perpetuity, I think is overly optimistic), it still comes out to 10 times crow by 1990. Mr. Speaker, 10 times crow will mean that the Saskatchewan economy will lose \$1.5 billion a year. Any way you slice that, that is a huge amount of pull out of the Saskatchewan economy.

The argument is that in exchange for this you will get yourself a top-rate rail system. Well, will you? One can go down to the United States and see that their rails which carry grain to market at rates which are four or five or six times crow, and their rail system is not a bit better than the one we have, which carries grain at crow.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's not as good.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The member on my left says that it's not as good. I remember when, a couple or three years ago, I was at the Saskatchewan Hotel having a conversation with Mr. George McGovern, then Senator George McGovern. He is from South Dakota. We were talking about getting grain to market. I was saying that we were certainly working on the upgrading of those branch lines, but some of them were in desperate shape around here. I said to him that some of the branch lines in Saskatchewan are so bad that the trains have to go at 15 or 20 miles an hour, and if they go any faster than that the cars will fall off the track. He said, "What are you complaining about? Down in South Dakota there is a branch line close to my home where a railway car fell off the track when the car was standing still."

Mr. Speaker, that is the great new and shiny rail line you will get if you pay four or five or six times crow, as American farmers are paying.

I noticed a well-known Conservative in this province, one Arnold Tusa, who has contested the Last Mountain-Touchwood constituency two or three times. What did he say at a public meeting? I was interested in his comments, because he was saying that the argument about the crowrate is an attempt by the New Democratic Party to divert attention from pocketbook issues. This Mr. Tusa must be one of the last of the big-time spenders, if he thinks that an issue which involved \$1.5 billion out of this economy is not a pocketbook issue. If that is loose change to Mr. Tusa, then he is one of the last of the big-time spenders.

I want now to touch on one other item which, I think, is absolutely key in this argument, and that is the issue of equal rate for equal distance. This is something which is of particular interest to the terminal touters who very much resent the whole idea of equal rate for equal distance because they say it interferes with the economics of the system. We all know that the current crowrate guarantees equal rate for equal distance. That means that any farmer can deliver to any elevator he likes, and knows that he will pay the same amount to get his grain to market that anyone else pays who lives an equal distance from the port.

The member for Moosomin says, "That makes sense." For once I agree with the member for Moosomin. But unfortunately to Mr. Pepin it does not make sense. Mr. Pepin does not think it makes sense. I know that some say, "Oh well, there is nothing in the Pepin plan that absolutely prohibits equal rate for equal distance." True, he doesn't prohibit it.

But in view of the fact that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool made that a precondition before they would negotiate, and in view of the fact that in the face of that position by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool which handles more grain than any other grain handling system in Canada in spite of which Mr. Pepin would not put that guarantee in his plan, it seems to be pretty clear that he is thinking of doing away with equal rate for equal distance. He is thinking of variable rates. He is denying the wheat pool precondition of non-variable rates.

Now I think that the people of this province better have a long and hard look at what variable rates will mean. Because if variable rates come into play, and if in fact the railway companies can set different rates from different shipping points as is certainly implied by variable rates, they will lose no time in setting higher rates for the low volume points — lose no time at all. They will then select which branch lines they wish to get rid of, which ones they wish to keep. They will adjust the rates so farmers living along the doomed branch lines must haul to some other delivery point on another line, and that will be the end of that branch line and every elevator on it. And that will be the end of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool's elevators along that branch line, and that will be the end, in due time, of many of the towns and villages along that branch line. That will be the effect.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather cruel that in the minds of some people in this House a proposal that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool might determine where elevators are in Saskatchewan and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company might determine where elevators are in Saskatchewan amounts to the same thing, that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool would not be any more sensitive to the needs of rural Saskatchewan than would be the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Well that may be the view of the member for Thunder Creek but there is no evidence in Saskatchewan history to justify that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, it is very clear in my mind that if the railway companies can set rates then they will determine what rail lines live and what rail lines die, what towns live and what towns die. This was the battle fought at the time of rail line abandonment. This was the battle fought. And I think there is no question that this is a real fear of clear and present danger to the structure of rural Saskatchewan.

It is not only a question of having your towns continue to survive. It is a question of what roads would need to be built if a number of villages and towns got the axe from the CPR (and I tell you the figure is very large — the number of new roads which would need to be built). We did some work some years ago on this, when the threat was not variable rates but wholesale branch line abandonment, and it was perfectly clear to us that we would not be able to maintain, over any period of time, oil roads in this province. We will have either paved roads or gravel roads, since we couldn't devise an oil road which would stand consistent heavy trucking. And the cost of having all paved roads was prohibitive. It was several billions of dollars. I know that was a figure calculated a fair number of years ago, and I suppose we can add perhaps a few billion dollars more to that. That's a simple social cost which the railways would be moving from themselves to Saskatchewan citizens. There are other costs as well. We all know it's not possible to maintain school and hospital systems in this province if we don't have towns and villages out there, around which a group of school students can be marshalled, or around which a hospital can be built.

Members opposite wish to deny that the wholesale rail line abandonment will have a serious impact upon rural Saskatchewan. I tell you that they are wrong and we are right. Those rail lines should be defended and we intend to defend them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — How far might this centralization go? I can tell you the terminal centres have their idea of how far this . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I'll try and squeeze in the member for Arm River as soon as the Premier is finished.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think members in this House ought to look at just how far the proposal for centralizing our grain handling system would go if it were left in the hands of those people who have been, in their minds, redesigning the grain handling system of Saskatchewan for fully 20 years. "Grain Handling and Transportation Costs in Canada" is a report prepared by the Grains Group. Now some people may remember the Grains Group. That was one of Otto Lang's little proposals; that was when the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Thunder Creek were arguing adherence to Mr. Lang's proposals, and were strong supporters of his party.

Let me just point out a couple of things which were said in this report. There were three kinds of proposals. There was one designed for 22 inland terminals and 356 elevators across the Prairies. That would be perhaps 200 elevators in Saskatchewan — 200 delivery points, and one elevator at each delivery point. That was the disperse system. They had another one which had just 22 terminal elevators across the Prairies. Supposedly no one had to haul more than 55 or 60 miles. They had another one for 80 inland terminals across the Prairies. These were proposals which were worked on by people who believed that this was in the best interest of prairie farmers. There is no doubt that the railway companies were fully supporting and fully funding these types of activities, because this would be a great system for railway companies — all very neat, all very efficient. I forget what Mr. Pepin's words are but efficient, and effective . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . economy and efficiency, and Mr. Pepin, from his days as an associate of the current major shareholders or largest shareholders of the CPR, will have his understanding of what efficiency means. I think that we know that that type of system based upon economy and efficiency for the railway company will spell trouble with a capital T for Saskatchewan. I think we know that this cannot be stopped unless we have firm guarantees. And we need those guarantees in law.

Now, Mr. Pepin says, "Please do not expect that the railway companies will be able to do what they like. We will have clear guarantees in law requiring them to perform. You don't need to worry. We're going to put things in law which the railway companies will have to obey." All I can say is, I don't have any confidence that anything in the law will apply to the railway companies. It doesn't now and I don't know why it will start to apply to them later on.

There are laws now which supposedly govern the railway companies. We have a Railway Act on the books of the Parliament of Canada; it's here for those who can read. It will show that the railway companies now have a statutory obligation to:

furnish at the place of starting, adequate suitable accommodation for the receiving and loading of all traffic offered for carriage upon the railway

without delay, and with due care and diligence receive, carry, and deliver such traffic.

It's all here. Do they do it? Of course they don't do it. Do they feel any obligation to do it? Of course they don't. Does anyone make them do it? Well, of course they don't.

Such traffic shall be taken, carried to and from and delivered at the places aforesaid on the due payment of the toll lawfully payable therefore.

That's the shipper's obligation — to lawfully pay the toll. And what do we hear the railway companies saying? "We won't carry the grain because we don't like the lawful toll. We don't care what the Railway Act says. Sure we have a legal obligation but we will not carry that grain no matter what you put in the law. The Parliament of Canada has set the rate but until that Parliament of Canada smartens up, we won't obey their railway law." That's what the railway companies have been saying and it's bad enough for the CPR to be saying that, but the CNR has been saying that. They have a clear obligation in law to carry that grain and to do it expeditiously. They have a clear obligation to marshal the capital which allows them to do that.

I say that when Crown corporations and major companies like CPR say they will not obey the law of Canada because they can't make enough money obeying the law, it's time that somebody said that they ought to obey the law. And I think it's pretty clear that any further committing to the law of requirements that the railway companies perform, as Mr. Pepin says, will do no more than it has done in the past. Mr. Pepin has the obligation to enforce this law. He has allowed the railway companies to ignore their obligations.

There's a further provision in here which says that shippers who suffer because the railway companies do not perform their obligations have a right to sue, and we know what happened when some farmers said, "We are going to sue you." The courts said, "Ah, but it's not your grain. It's legally the property of the Canadian Wheat Board and it won't sue you." So the railway companies got off scot-free because the Canadian Wheat Board, which owned the grain, wouldn't join with farmers in forcing the railway companies to obey the law. We have the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board and the minister in charge of the Department of Transport coming out and saying, "We are going to put things in law, and then the railway companies will have to obey the law." What protection is that? It was never a protection in the past. The minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board made good and sure it wasn't protection because he wouldn't join with farmers in enforcing the crowrate and enforcing shipment as required by the Railway Act.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's rather clear that if we are to have long-term assurance we need two things: we need the crowrate continued to be enshrined in law and we need the public ownership of the railway system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I know that the public ownership of the railway system will not answer all our problems so long as we have the present government in Ottawa, but I think that will not last forever because I think that there is a welling across Canada of people who feel that other things ought to be done by the government in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — We propose sound alternatives at this time. We propose that the crowrate be retained. We propose that the investment required by our rail system be provided by public funds. We would like to think that the federal government would do it all. If the federal government will not do it all, our government is prepared to take a stand as we did with hopper cars, a stand which was opposed by member's opposite but one which I think has done a good job for farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — It's not our choice to put provincial money in railways. It's not our choice at all, but if we need to do that to preserve the crowrate, as we had to put money in hopper cars to preserve the crowrate, then we think it's a good investment and this will be a realistic approach. It's no good to simply say the federal government must, unless we can force them to do it. So we say, "Yes, the federal government has the clear obligation. Yes, the federal government should take over the ownership of the CPR. Yes, the federal government should put up the money needed to take those lines across the mountains." But if the federal government will only do the CNR and we have to put in some of the money to the CPR for hopper cars, branch lines or some other equity investment, we'd be prepared to look at that, but we would want equity, equity, equity!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — We would want Canadian people to start owning the railway company they've been paying for a hundred years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — But it's pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, that the issue in this debate is whether or not we retain the crowrate or whether we go to the Pepin plan which will spell the doom of the crowrate. I say that our government is clear on this. I say, again, our government is clear on this year and last year and the year before that. We have consistently supported the crowrate. We have consistently said that it was necessary for the preservation not only of the economic health of prairie agriculture, but also of the health of the social structure of Saskatchewan.

I am pleased that we are going to speak with a united voice on this resolution. I hope the support of the members opposite for the crowrate is real. I hope they've seen the errors of their ways, particularly those who have been touting terminals all these years. I hope they will support us in supporting the crowrate, in supporting the principle of a statutory rate, in supporting equal rates for equal distance. The people of Saskatchewan are going to be the judge of this, and in a short number of weeks the people of Saskatchewan are going to be called upon — weeks or months — to judge who they think best can speak for them on this vital issue for rural Saskatchewan.

I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am delighted that finally some life has

been injected into what was a very humdrum debate the other day. I am delighted that after being thoroughly bored with the array of ministers and MLAs who are in deep, deep trouble at the polls, we finally heard from a member who may not be in quite so much trouble at the polls in his own riding, and who perhaps did inject some life into this debate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I must be doing fairly well: it sure took you a long time to find somebody to run against me.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is fair to ask: why is this debate taking place in the first place. The answer to that, I suppose, goes back really a couple of years. It goes back to when Pierre Elliott Trudeau decided he was going to alter our constitution. It goes back to the time when Pierre Elliott Trudeau faced a solid block of opposition from western Canada. It goes back to the time when Pierre Elliott Trudeau would never have dared to proceed on the constitution with that solid block of western opposition. That's where it goes back to.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year it's pretty obvious what went on. The NDP government's own polls (as the member for Biggar could show you repeatedly on computer printouts you take periodically and often) were telling you how far you had slipped. You considered going to the polls in October and you got cold feet. And earlier this year you came to the shocking realization of just how quickly you were slipping. You came to the realization of just how volatile the mood was, and you came to the realization that the identical conditions that swept you to power in '71 were there and could potentially sweep you out of power.

Mr. Speaker, the call went out to Ottawa and payment was demanded from Ottawa for the role of Judas in the constitutional talks. "It was all right Pierre. I gave you the shot in the arm, and now you've got to bail me out. I played Judas for you and now I'm hanging there." So Pierre Elliott Trudeau established the second half of the Blakeney-Trudeau axis, an axis which is about as infamous as the Hitler-Stalin axis. You know how that one went. As far as western Canada farmers are concerned, Pierre said, "All right, I will give you the issue that will be the smoke screen that will maybe put some of your difficulties on the back burner." He said, "I'll change the crowrate."

Then to throw a little more salt in the wounds of Albertans and Saskatchewan people, to really hoist that red flag, he sent somebody from Quebec to do the dirty work. He had to send somebody from Quebec. Now can you imagine waving a red flag out here that would be any redder than that?

Hazen Argue, who was the best that the Liberals could put forward to look after the western Canada grain farmer, was very conveniently and subtly shoved into the corner and told to stay out of sight. When you come to think of it, has anybody seen or heard of Hazen in the last month? Has anybody seen or heard of Hazen of late? Hazen has vanished off the scene, and a very fine gentleman from Quebec, one of the more able people in Ottawa, has been made the scapegoat to western Canada. Mr. Speaker, Jean-Luc Pepin is a very fine, class individual, and regrettably I think some of the personal aspersions that have been made against him by some people in western Canada are grossly unfair. He is doing a very, very, dirty, rotten job. He's out here trying to re-elect an NDP government.

I think it is unfortunate that matters have come to this stage. Mr. Speaker, long ago Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the Liberal Party wrote off western Canada. Do you think Pierre Elliott Trudeau ever expects to elect one Liberal in Saskatchewan in the

foreseeable future? Not a change. Do you think Pierre Elliott Trudeau — and whatever you want to say about him, he is a very realistic and capable politician — ever expects to elect a Liberal member in Alberta? No chance. Do you think Pierre Elliott Trudeau wants a Conservative government in Saskatchewan? Heavens, no. Pierre Elliott Trudeau cares only about Quebec and Ontario, because that's where he is elected or rejected, and as long as he has central Canada he could give a rat's nest about anything west of Ontario. He has written it off, and it serves Pierre Elliott Trudeau's interests. It serves the interests of the Liberal Party for there to be a New Democratic government in Saskatchewan. If he could deliver it, he would do the same thing for Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago the people of Canada elected a new government. For the second time in Canadian history — I believe I'm correct on this — we had a prime minister from western Canada. I believe that I'm correct; I believe that he was only the second. How often does that happen? How often are we in western Canada ever going to have a prime minister with the roots in western Canada?

He appointed as minister of transport an individual whom I think was respected on both sides of the House of Commons by the name of Don Mazankowski. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you today — in fact, I'll state categorically to you today — if Joe Clark were the prime minister of Canada, if Don Mazankowski were in charge of the Ministry of Transport, this debate would not be taking place today, and the crowrate would not be remotely in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to look back. Why isn't Joe Clark the prime minister? Why isn't Don Mazankowski — an individual, I think, who has earned the respect of even the federal New Democratic members — in charge of the Ministry of Transport? You know, there's a very simple reason. It's because that government brought in a budget to Ottawa, and do you know what they dared say? They dared say something like, "We are going to make mortgage deductions legal on your income tax." That was two years ago. They said, "We're going to let you deduct a portion of your mortgage interest from your income tax." Do you remember that one? They said that in that budget. Wasn't it shocking that people who were facing 20 per cent to 22 per cent mortgage rates at that time could deduct a portion of that from their income tax? Absolutely disgusting.

They said something else. They said (the worst sin of all), "The price of gas must go up." John Crosbie said, "I'm going to put the price of gas up 18 cents over the next 18 months." Sinful. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, in the infinite wisdom of the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party, that government had to go. Those horrible people who would make mortgage interest deductible and who would let an ordinary home-owner deduct a portion of his mortgage interest from his income tax had to go. But the most shocking of all, someone who would dare suggest that the price of gas go up 18 cents, had to go, too.

Mr. Speaker, every member of the New Democratic Party stood up to oppose that budget. Every member of the New Democratic Party from Saskatchewan stood up to oppose that. Every member of the federal New Democratic Party stood up to oppose that Conservative budget. Every single one. And you defeated only the second western prime minister. Your government defeated a prime minister from western Canada. You defeated a minister of transport from western Canada. And do you know who did that, Mr. Speaker? Les Benjamin stood up to vote against that western Canadian government. Simon de Jong stood up to vote against that government. Stan Hovdebo stood up to vote against that government. Lorne Nystrom and Father Ogle from Saskatoon stood up to vote against that.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, if that government had survived, this would not be taking place today. If our grain transportation situation is in jeopardy as just outlined by the Premier, it is in jeopardy solely because of the Liberal-new Democratic Party alliance, and for no other reason.

There is no way Don Mazankowski would have allowed this situation to ever happen. I invite you to cite anything from Don Mazankowski that would have led to this debate.

Mr. Speaker, with a Conservative government, our grain handling and transportation system would have been in the hands of western Canadians. It would not have been in the hands of Quebec and Ontario. And Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, the New Democratic Party has prostituted itself on behalf of the federal Liberal Party and on behalf of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. And these two people have wielded one of the most unholy alliances because, Mr. Speaker, this debate that we have had here today is a sham. It's a sham because nobody is more opposed to the piecemeal changing of our system than is the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, I state categorically the reason that many of these changes, many of the problems as outlined by the Premier, are presently happening is solely because of that unholy alliance.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Premier one would perhaps draw the conclusion that in Canada we have a faultless and perfect grain-handling system. One would assume that we have some sort of utopia, that we have absolute perfection and speedy, speedy movement of grain to the ports and their terminals, and consequently to the ships. Mr. Speaker, certain things are indisputable. Anybody in the know in the grain trade will tell you categorically Canada has a reputation in international grain circles as being highly unreliable, unstable, volatile, totally unreliable in the grain trade. Anyone who knows anything about the grain business will tell you that. Ask the people in charge of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in Ottawa. They'll tell you that. Even the wheat board people will tell you Canada has a reputation as an unreliable supplier.

Mr. Speaker, I pose a question to this Assembly, and I suppose to anyone in the grain trade. Does anybody really know what the cost is to a farmer of selling a bushel of grain? Now we on this side of the House say "a bushel of grain." Members opposite, I know, say "a tonne of grain." Being old fashioned, we're still in bushels. Does anybody know the true cost — once the farmer has taken that grain to the elevator, what is it costing him to sell that bushel? Does anybody know? I don't. I don't think the Premier does. Does anybody really know?

AN HON. MEMBER: —Yes.

MR. THATCHER: — Then I invite you to tell me. I invite you to set yourself up as a self-styled expert because nobody else does. What is it? Mr. Speaker, therein lies much of our problem.

Mr. Speaker, we have a system for moving grain to which we should really take our hat off. It really came into play as far back as 1915 and 1920 and the fact that it has done as well as it has is incredible; in some respects it's a tribute to the people involved in setting up this country many years ago. This is 1982, Mr. Speaker, things have changed dramatically, not only here but all over the world. Instead of proceeding with a constant program for upgrading year by year, we have simply repaired that old system going back to 1915. The money invested at that time has served us well, has certainly paid off its investment many times over. But we have confounded that system by subsidies to

the railroads, by governments becoming involved in buying cars and throwing in so much red tape, subsidizing elevator companies. Mr. Speaker, we have absolutely made a total mishmash out of our system to the point where nobody, other than a very few people, know what the true cost is to a farmer of selling a bushel of grain.

You know what our system is. The farmer hauls his grain to the elevator and gets an initial payment. Mr. Speaker, 16 to 18 months later he gets a cheque from the wheat board for the balance. Now, in the meantime, what has happened? The farmer has hauled his grain to the elevator and he gets a certain amount of dockage. That is deducted right off his initial price. The farmer then pays the freight on that dockage, in the vast majority of cases, to the terminal at either Thunder Bay or Vancouver. He pays the freight on that dockage. Then the elevator company which docked him for it takes over the screenings. It sells the screenings. In other words, the farmer gave the dockage to the company, the screenings, and it sells them at those terminals. Mr. Speaker, does that make sense to you.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, that grain company has deducted about 18 cents off that initial price. Somewhere along the line the farmer also gets assessed a cleaning charge. But then if the elevator company doesn't get that grain loaded on a ship in a hurry, he is charged storage, or the wheat board is charged storage. Then if the ship is waiting, and the terminal can't load it, there is a little thing called demurrage. In short, Mr. Speaker, the farmer waits for about 16 to 18 months to find out what it costs him to sell grain.

You know, he never does find out. Imagine how ecstatic those durum producers must have been with their 2-cent payment this year. Was it 2 cents or 1 cent? One-point-some cents. Most of them spent it by going for a haircut.

Did anybody ever tell that farmer where his money went? No chance. Did he ever find out why he got 1.5 cents? Does anybody want to tell him? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . So that's all it was worth according to the member from Hodgeville. Isn't that interesting! Tell that to the durum producers.

Mr. Speaker, last year we experienced a year in which grain probably moved as fast as it is ever going to. It was literally in the elevator and the markets were there to get it out. I don't think we will ever see our grain move a heck of a lot faster than what we saw it move last year. Mr. Speaker, do you know that in the last crop year our elevator companies received \$125 million storage fees? Can you believe it? That is incredible.

I am pleased to note that the member for Morse, who is on his way to political oblivion, thinks that is good. He thinks that it's fine for the grain companies to rip our farmers off for \$125 million for storing what?

Mr. Speaker, our overall system leads to inefficiency. There is simply no incentive for our elevator companies to take that grain and run it through the system, get it on the ship and get it out of there. It is the entire system.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that by taking piecemeal approaches to a system which is laden with inefficiency is not the answer.

Mr. Speaker, those that would suggest dismantling the crowrate is the sole answer are grossly mistaken. Mr. Speaker, there are many, many things wrong with our grain

handling and transportation system. Chief Justice Emmett Hall has outlined many of them.

No one distrusts railways any more than we do on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of neighbours. One of my neighbours is the CPR and let me tell you that the CPR has killed far more of my cows than any of my other neighbours have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Certainly their donations would be gratefully accepted. I have heard the railways referred to in a pretty villainous fashion in this session and basically I can't disagree with a great deal of it. But, Mr. Speaker, there are far more villains in the grain trade than the railways. The railway may be the biggest ones, but let me tell you that when it comes to handling grain, when it comes to taking a cut out of a bushel of grain, let me assure you that the elevator companies are right in line with the railways. To alter one portion of the system without going into the other is a gross mistake on anyone's part.

Mr. Speaker, history shows us very clearly that the crowrate was part of a bargain. It was part of a bargain that brought the western Canadian provinces into confederation, part of a deal that caused western Canada to accept "made in Canada," to accept tariffs to protect the industries of central Canada in exchange for a preferred rate on shipping grain. This was part of the deal.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure members of this Assembly do not cotton very easily to the prospect of that privilege being bargained away, particularly when the crowrate is only one portion of the overall grain-handling system. Regrettably the entire hysteria that the people opposite have caused by their publications, their meetings, their lack of rationalization on this whole thing has clouded perhaps the overall issue and that is that we need changes in our grain handling system.

Rightly or wrongly, Pierre Elliott Trudeau appears to have decided to change the grain handling system with the crowrate. I suggest to you that the action of the members across the way, of the Department of Agriculture, have actually probably helped Pierre Elliott Trudeau's hand in central Canada. I suggest to you that by the hysteria you have attempted to create you have really strengthened his hand and you have weakened those who would protect the interests of western Canada from the Trudeau government. Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense to me when the Minister of Agriculture, the moment that he hears that the crowrate may be discussed, announces that he may pull the hopper cars off the tracks. It makes no sense to me for some wild-eyed socialist radicals to start yelling, "Let's buy the CPR." Now that's been a reaction of many of you over there. "Let's buy the CPR."

On the opening day of this debate I listened to some members openly make reference to the possibility of buying the CPR. Mr. Speaker, I have to think that has to be about the looniest thing you've done since you went into the potash business. Yes, you bet it was looney . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I am interested and intrigued to hear from the member for Morse, who has probably given his last speech in this legislature and who is probably the only member here who is more politically dead than the member for Regina Wascana and who is already past tense. I suppose he is occupying his last few days in this Assembly by chirping from his seat. Now, he was on his feet the other day. He didn't give a very good speech. I listened very courteously while he talked. Perhaps the member for Morse, in his declining few days in this legislature, could hold it down just a trifle.

Mr. Speaker, this crowrate debate is a non-debate. I know nobody in this Assembly

suggests that the crowrate be altered at this point in time. Mr. Speaker, I make no question that any farmer right now who is hit by interest rates, rising cost of production, and declining grain prices is prepared today to pay more. This lends all the more credibility, I believe, to the argument that Pierre Elliott Trudeau is passing back some sort of help or aid to Premier Allan Blakeney for his role of Judas in the constitutional crisis.

It amuses me when members opposite suggest that we are the ones who can best negotiate with Ottawa or we are the ones who can best handle Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Well, you sure did a fine job the last time. You did a great job in that constitution. You didn't even get a farmer the right to private ownership of land in our constitution. You are just wonderful negotiators. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that any time this government has negotiated with Ottawa its performance has been very sub par and you let them take the tough stand. After they made their agreement, you came in behind them and pretended that you had done it yourself. Nonsense. Alberta carried the ball for you.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that some action is going to be taken in grain-handling and transportation policy. I suggest to this Assembly that this province does not have the luxury of a government that says, "We're not going anywhere near it; it's this way or else, and we're not taking any part in any discussions." Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that Pierre Elliott Trudeau could care less about what anyone in Saskatchewan thinks. There is no doubt in my mind. Even a unanimous motion from this Assembly is not going to sway Pierre Elliott Trudeau in what he is going to do. They are going to do it. And when they are negotiating away something, taking away something that belongs to you, and they are saying that they will talk to you about it, whether you agree with what they are doing or not, you should at least be there. Mr. Speaker, I don't know much about Professor Gilson, but Professor Gilson is the one who carries an awful lot of clout right now. You know it is very interesting. It is quite possible, as the Minister of Health brings up, that had Grant Devine stayed at his capacity in Saskatoon, it may very well be that the government would have turned to a professor of his stature, someone with his knowledge of economics. He may very well have been the one that they asked to investigate the matter. Professor Gilson, I understand, has excellent credentials. I don't know. But none the less, he does carry a lot of clout.

Mr. Speaker, this government is simply not taking a realistic approach on the part of Saskatchewan farmers by saying, "I'm not going to be there." He better be down there making the best deal that we can get. What is this entire debate about? Mr. Speaker, nobody in this Assembly, and I think very few in this province, are saying that crow should go right now. That's a non-debate: it's a non-issue.

Let me tell you what the issues are in this province. The Issue right now is the performance of this government in the economy. What is at issue? This government that says we speak for the farmers. Well, let me tell you, under your agricultural policy there are 15,000 fewer farmers today than there were when you took office. Where did they go?

This government that speaks for the farmers — let's see what it does in the livestock industry. Cattlemen have just had the blazes kicked out of them this winter. They have had horrible prices for the past year. They have had a savage winter. In many cases they had a drought last year and went in with very poor hay supplies. You know what the weather is like out there today. Three days ago you cancelled the feed freight

assistance, at a time when they needed it most. And the attitude of this government is why didn't you bring it in before? I'll tell you why they didn't bring it in before. They were hoping to blazes they weren't going to have to borrow the money to buy the hay. They didn't want to buy it if they didn't need it. And now winter drags on and on. What does this government say to the livestock people? "Tough, you should have brought it in before." That's the New Democratic Party.

The issue is going to be the NDP record — the NDP record for 10 years. And it is not going to get submerged in a non-debate, which is what you've attempted to create. You know you don't give people credit for very much. Tomorrow you are going to virtually sell the farm. But you know, you are not going to buy yourselves back into office this time. You've left it too long.

I note with interest that tomorrow you are going to make tax-free gas, purple gas, legal in tandem trucks. That one just kills me. In question period, since I've been a member, I've asked the Minister of Agriculture three or four times a session: are you now going to let us use purple gas in tandem trucks? And you know the answer I get? "We are not going to support inland terminals. We're not going to support the destruction of the family farm. We're not going to create the abandonment of country elevators. We're not going to help the big farmer." And tomorrow you are going to allow them to put tax-free gas in their tandem trucks. I'm delighted, but talk about eating crow — I think the Minister of Agriculture must be choking on his tonight.

Do you know why you are doing it? The only reason you are doing it is because you know the bulk of your rural members are about to be wiped out. Laugh. There is an easy way to settle it — call it. Get the Premier back in here and call it. Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the past tenses around here. The member for Estevan, gone. The member for Morse, gone. Those are rural members. Well, brother, they're not here anyway, they are gone.

Mr. Speaker, we see a government there which is in deep, deep trouble. Everything that you have done in the past 10 years is now in trouble. Your resource policy has crumbled around your ears. The uranium industry is gone for the next 20 years. Investment is backing out. The oil industry — I don't have to tell you about that.

Everything you touch, such as your agricultural policy, has come crumbling down on top of you. Fifteen thousand farmers are gone. You've inflated the price of land through your land bank. You've outbid many of the local farmers in some of these areas where the crops aren't all that great. Your land bank owns the land now. Your agricultural policy is in ruin; 15,000 farmers no longer exist. That's your agricultural policy.

You're counting on the crowrate to somehow put a smoke screen over the mismanagement and difficulties that your incompetence has created. You know, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that this government has done by its tactics in this crowrate is to prevent a rational discussion over what may be transforming in the grain industry. It is now time that changes come in the grain industry. Most groups say that Sask Wheat Pool says there has to be change. Almost any farm group say that there has to be modernization. But the hysteria that you have created, by the use of taxpayers' money has prevented any form of a normal, rational discussion.

But you know, people aren't as dumb as you give them credit for being. You're not going to get your performance shoved onto the back burner. You're not going to spend 28

days using the crowrate as an issue that will re-elect you, because people won't buy it. People aren't going to buy your giveaways tomorrow because you've had 10 years to do these goodies that you're going to do for them tomorrow. People aren't going to buy your mortgage assistance thing tomorrow. Where were you when the rates were 21 per cent and 22 per cent? Where were you then? You weren't out there. You'll be there tomorrow because you need them. You're going to give them \$2,500 or whatever because now that the rates are down to 14 per cent or 14.5 per cent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The subject before the House is a resolution which I can read if the members require it. I've been listening to the member for Thunder Creek very carefully for awhile now and I'm unable to connect what he's saying to the crowrate which is the subject of the resolution. I wonder if the member for Thunder Creek would either relate his remarks to the crowrate or get onto the subject of the resolution.

MR. THATCHER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing, we don't have to go into a contest with you people as to who is more interested in the interests of the farmer. We don't have to go into a contest with you. We don't have to go into a contest with many of the teachers and the people who wouldn't know a permit book from a load of hay.

Mr. Speaker, we're basically a rural-based party over here. We have far better rapport with the farmers than you have. We don't need to have our credentials checked with the farming community in a race with you at all. So call your election.

We have nothing to fear. If you want to take Premier Designate Devine's remarks out of context on the crowrate, go ahead. We can play the same game with Allan Blakeney. Let me just read you one of Allan Blakeney's remarks on the crow. This is May 20, 1977:

We think, under certain circumstances and at some future time, the case might be made for increasing the level of crow, provided that it was the same statutory protection.

Can you believe that — negotiating the crow?

Well, I don't want to be quoted as saying I'm happy to see crow increase. That's not so, but I am realistic enough to know that as time goes on and costs go on, I think farmers are realistic enough to say that at some time they would look at increasing crow, provided they would receive the same legislated statutory protection they now have for the crowrate.

Mr. Speaker, that's one Allan Blakeney, May 20, CBC interview, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, let me just give you another one. And this is playing your stupid game of taking Grant Devine's comments out of context. I'm going to read you another one just to demonstrate how stupid a game it is.

Whether they should get compensation from other sources, Canadian Pacific Railways, which they got as part of the bargain, or whether they should get it from the Government of Canada or whether they should get it from the shippers or some combination thereof is perhaps what the bargaining is all about.

That's one Allan Blakeney in *Business Life* magazine, January 1982. That's not an old quote going back many, many years; that's January 1982. That's taken out of context; it's a stupid quote, taken out of context as stupidly and asininely as your researchers have taken Grant Devine . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Nonsense.

MR. THATCHER: — Well, now listen to the member for Saskatoon Riversdale. Listen to that man who every day reconfirms that you don't have to be a lawyer to be Attorney General. Listen to him saying, "Nonsense."

Mr. Speaker, what does the NDP candidate for Kindersley say? The NDP candidate in Kindersley says, "We are willing to negotiate with the government and the railroads." Mr. Speaker, that quote is from the Kindersley Clarion, February 17, 1982. That's an NDP candidate. I'll grant you he doesn't have much chance of being elected — he's running against our House Leader. None the less that's what NDP candidates are saying.

Mr. Speaker, there's another little gem here — taken out of context, as you have done and as stupidly out of context as yours. "Saskatchewan is prepared to be flexible on the issue." Now who said that, I wonder? Gordon MacMurchy in Canadian Press, Ottawa, February 14, 1981 — the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, it's a stupid game, and I only read these quotes to say that if you want to play that game, we can go with you, stroke for stroke. And nobody's going to buy it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I listen. I listen to the member for Saskatoon Riversdale with some trepidation because one of my great theories is that if this does get down to serious bargaining, serious dealing with the federal government, my fear is that he may be the negotiator. My fear is that he may do the same lousy job on behalf of Saskatchewan farmers that he did on behalf of Saskatchewan residents on the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, we are ready to go into an election. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about this. And I say to the government across the way: call your election tomorrow. We'll tackle you on any issue you want. Crow is a non-issue. Let me tell you what we're going to tackle you on. We're going to tackle you on SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). We're going to tackle you on SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation). We're going to tackle you on 10 years of lousy government. We're going to tackle you on the disappearance of 15,000 farmers. And do you know what made me even more amused when I listened to members opposite? It is the pathetic way that you have hung your hat on the fact that you think the Western Canada Concept might split the vote enough for you to get back in. If that's the straw you are hanging onto, goodbye.

Mr. Speaker, this may well be the last time I'm on my feet in this session of the legislature, if the Premier should perhaps screw up his courage. And I've spent the last couple of days selecting, or picking out the seat that I would most like over there. There are several seats over there, and I think that after the election there are more than enough desks to accommodate you.

I want to thank you for the offices that we are presently using — the ones that you have remodelled. I hope after the next election that you will enjoy them. I have a very nice one there and I recommend, for those of you who are left, that you try to get my old office. It's a very nice one.

Mr. Speaker, we are ready, willing and able to face this government in an election. I sincerely hope that right after your budget tomorrow you call it. We're prepared to get at it, and let me tell you we don't have to take a back seat to anyone on our position on agriculture. We will face the farmers with our position. Farmers are going to be far, far better off with a Conservative government negotiating these very key issues. We'll tackle you on any issue; we're ready to go, and I can only say, call it. Call it tomorrow; call it today; get the Premier back in and let's get at it.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, what I have heard in this House on Monday and today in debating the crow really bothers me. I heard the Premier speak this afternoon and I thought he had a good speech, but he said it in the wrong place. He shouldn't have said it in Saskatchewan; he should have said it in Ottawa.

The Minister of Agriculture and the Premier and his buddies have been going around this province asking farmers' opinions. Since when has this government ever asked a farmer's opinion? You knew before you started, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, exactly where the farmers stood on the crow. Why didn't you spend the kind of money that you spent going around to these meetings to go down to Ottawa and get the message out there?

Mr. Speaker, I went to two of his meetings, at Vanguard and at Southey, and I just want to say a few words about the inconsistency of the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture put on a real show down in Vanguard, along with the few people he had there with him . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — A travelling road show.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Yes, a travelling road show, with all the staged questions.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture was a very pleased man when the majority of the people at the meeting that night stood up and said, "Down with those rotten multinational railways; down with them." And they voted on it. No money to the railways, nothing.

What else did he do? Misrepresent the people there. What he said in principle may have been correct, but it was how he put it, Mr. Speaker. You would think that he was the supreme being himself the way he was analyzing the future. He had a map on the wall, "This branch line is gone; that branch line is gone. This railway line is gone." Why didn't you say, "Perhaps when the Liberals get through it in Ottawa, when Trudeau gets through it in Ottawa, they'll all be gone?" But, oh no, you told the people in Herbert and Vanguard, "This branch line right here will be gone and that branch line right there, and it's going to cost X amount of dollars for you, the farmer."

But, something happened over the weekend, Mr. Speaker. The Premier spoke in Davidson at a nominating meeting. And the Premier, Mr. Speaker, double-crossed the Minister of Agriculture. He double-crossed him. He came out on behalf of these multinational railways. He says in Business Life magazine that he agreed with Business Life that the railways lost \$300 million to \$400 million hauling grain in 1980. He agreed. But he didn't know that it was going to get out to the public and get into this legislature and get out to the people of Saskatchewan when in Davidson he said that the railroads made \$80 million profit in 1981. Why did he say that and then agree with Business Life that they lost \$300 million to \$400 million? That's where the Premier is

losing his credibility — inconsistency. That's where he lost his credibility, right there.

When he was speaking at a nomination in Davidson, he said to the people. "You've lost \$80 million and you poor farmers cannot afford to pay one penny to those railways." Now, I agree with what the Premier said, that the farmers can't afford it, but why did he make a different statement and why at Southey on Monday did the Minister of Agriculture change his whole story, Mr. Speaker? Why did he change his story? I'll tell you why he changed his story. Because the Premier double-crossed him about the rotten multinational railways.

When the Minister of Agriculture was asked at Southey who is going to pay for this improved transportation system he was talking about, he finally had to say, "You, the taxpayers." But down at Vanguard he couldn't say that. He said, "No one can afford it; not one prairie farmer can afford a dollar, not one dollar." But by the time he gets to Southey, to his own constituency, he had to change his story. He said, "You, the taxpayer, will have to pay."

When you get up, Mr. Minister, at these meetings, why do you say to the people that it's going to be 10 times crow at one meeting and the next time that it's going to cost you 20 times crow? Why don't you just say that you don't know what it's going to cost? It's going to cost plenty and the farmers can't afford it. Don't try to put figures in their mouths.

And why did you make a great big issue, Mr. Minister, in Southey about the member from Govan, the wonderful Farmer-Labour man who went down to Ottawa in 1925 and saved the crow? I want it on the record that the Minister of Agriculture said in Southey that he wanted it on the record that the Farmer-Labour representative from Govan saved the crow in 1925 and the NDP will save it in 1982. Now, I want it on the record that that man was not elected until several months after the crow was in place. The minister knows that.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked quite a few times in this legislature when I rose to speak, "Why don't you say a few words about land bank?" So I have a few words to say about land bank as it relates to crow. Anyone who has land bank land will suffer if the crowrate is removed. My remarks are about a constituent in Arm River. I have a constituent who purchased X amount of acres for approximately \$90,000. He had to meet the land bank appraisal to purchase the land. This was in 1975 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Morse is the man who has always been wanting a land bank speech from me. If he had the courtesy to keep his mouth shut until I finish, he might learn something. This farmer had to meet the land bank appraisal to purchase the land. In 1980, he advertised the land for sale. He listed it, advertised it in the Western Producer. The bids came in. This land is close to where I won land. I put in a bid which I thought was a reasonable offer of \$200,000 for this land. I was outbid by a neighbour who bid \$265,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did he get it?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — No, he did not get it, Mr. Speaker. Another buyer offered to pay land bank appraisal price. The constituent applied to land bank to sell. For a \$300 appraisal fee, the offer was made. The offer was so ridiculously high that this constituent had to consider selling to the land bank. The man who said he would go by the appraisal fee laughed when he saw the figure. Not wanting to sell the land to the land bank, the constituent again advertised for someone to meet the land bank offer. Mr. Speaker, the land bank offer was nearly \$400,000. The closest bid was the neighbour who outbid me at \$265,000. The difference being well over \$100,000, the constituent had no choice but to sell to the land bank, especially when they offered a leaseback of \$1,220 per quarter. Land across the road was renting for \$4,000 a quarter.

Let's take this figure, Mr. Speaker: \$400,000 at 15 per cent interest is \$60,000 a year. There is a rental of \$10,700 for the entire package. The government over here lost \$50,000 on interest alone. That's why you have people who, against their wishes, sell to the land bank. That's what is going on in my constituency right now. They put land up for sale. The highest bid was \$600 an acre, and the land bank is buying it for \$820 today.

What would happen if the NDP ever brought legislation in to restrict farm size? They would soon have to start selling land, because they are the largest landowners in North America. Mr. Speaker, I said that remarks about land bank were very important because it is very important to those people who have land bank land, plus every other farmer in this province — very important that they save the crow.

Mr. Speaker, I sat here Monday afternoon and Monday evening. I've seen all the backbenchers of this government opposite who are about to lose their seats get up and give speeches in this House; what they were doing is giving 10 speeches to take back home to their constituents. They didn't say one thing relevant to what really happened here that day. They contradicted the member for Rosetown. They contradicted the member for Souris-Cannington. They said that they didn't even make their position clear. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to make my position very clear, and I mean very, very clear.

Mr. Speaker, I'm ashamed of anyone over there opposite who tries to put in my mind and in my heart what I am saying. When you people over there stand up and say you believe in statutory rates and saving the crow, I believe you. And I think you should have the integrity to believe us. You should have the integrity to believe us. All 61 of us are elected members, and we are well respected back in our homes areas; people believe us. These government members opposite have no right to attack personalities as they do. They take our leader and take a little quote here and a little quote there, something he said years ago. Do you want to hear some quotes from the Premier back in 1952 when he got involved in commercial cemeteries and lost this province \$1 million. I'll bring you some quotes, I'll tell you. I'm more interested in what the Premier said in February in Davidson. That's what I'm interested in, because he's the Premier of this province and his statements contradict what you people are out trying to sell — completely contradict.

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely sure as I stand here that each and every man over there on February 26, when the Premier spoke in Davidson and when one of the press columns came out contradicting what the Minister of Agriculture said, would have liked . . . I imagine you had a caucus all weekend. I imagine you would like to have choked that little Premier for double-crossing you out there. The Premier stood in this House this afternoon and condemned something he has always stood up for — the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Canadian Wheat Board and the ranchers in the South. Wait till we pull Hansard and put it into those areas. Bye, bye, Reggie, I'll tell you. Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more that I would like to say, but I think it's time we brought this to a vote. I don't think the people opposite want a vote on this. I challenge them to a vote, right now, before 5 o'clock.

Before I sit down, I'm going to give you my position on the crow, and it will only take one moment.

Mr. Speaker, I want it on record — my position on the crow. It is as follows: that the crowrate must remain. Farmers cannot afford higher rates. I believe in an improved transportation system. The position of the NDP is similar except, quoting from the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier that we must have an improved transportation system with the western provinces paying their share. They say they are willing to provide the railways with \$2.1 billion in additional capital funding over the next four years. Also, under the NDP proposal, participating governments would gain equity in the privately-owned CP Rail. My stand is that the federal government should subsidize all the costs. The Trudeau government can give millions to Chrysler and Ford and Massey Ferguson; why not the Saskatchewan farmers? Now this is where we differ from you people, Mr. Speaker. We say in principle the same thing but we say the federal government pays all. You want to put the tax burden on the farmers and all the citizens in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, let's bring this to a vote. I'm voting for the motion. Thank you.

MR. BANDA: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to enter into this debate on behalf of farmers, the businessmen and the people in the constituency of Redberry. I'm pleased to take part in this debate because I think it's an important bread-and-butter issue for all of us in Saskatchewan, and for the future of agriculture and the Saskatchewan way of life.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday we heard some very excellent speeches, in my mind, made by my colleagues on this side of the House, and today again by a man who's a leader in this House. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues who have participated have demonstrated very convincingly their support and commitment to this important resolution.

I can't help but make some comments on the last two speakers. It's hard for me to do that, but I just have to. The member for Arm River who just sat down wants to have the vote. I guess we all want to have the vote. But why do they want to have the vote right now? We haven't heard from the members for Kindersley, Moosomin and Maple Creek. They don't want to be on record as to where they stand on this one. They don't want to be. We just finished listening to the member for Thunder Creek tell us, first of all, that he wanted to negotiate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He just said that he wanted to negotiate. He also made the statement, Mr. Speaker, that the crow should not be changed right now. Now, what does that mean? To me that means that his party is willing to negotiate the crow in the future, but because of economics and because of rising cost, not right now. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there's another reason they don't want to change it right now. Somehow they figure that maybe they're going to be going to the polls in the next few months and they wouldn't want to be on record as wanting to change the crow right now.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Thunder Creek made it quite clear and accused the federal members of the NDP of voting against the Clark government, saying that's why we're in this debate. Well, I can't help but go back to some of the quotes that we dug out on all of this crow debate, and ask the member whether he has been talking to his colleagues in the last little while. I read a quote here from the *Calgary Herald* dated February 13, 1982, and that's not long ago. It says this:

The conventional wisdom is that Vegreville MP, Don Mazankowski, who was

the Clark transport minister at that time, would have proceeded along the lines very similar to the course Pepin has struck.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Saskatchewan NDP members of parliament at Ottawa voted against the Clark government because of this, I am proud of them and I support them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, that's not the only one. Let's look at the *Winnipeg Free Press*, dated February 12, 1982, and I quote:

Horner, who held Alberta cabinet portfolios in agriculture, transportation, and economic development before serving as grain transport co-ordinator under the Clark and Trudeau governments, condemned grain producers who insist on sticking with the Crow's Nest rate for shipping grain by rail to export points. "That's not the solution," he said.

Now Mr. Speaker, how can members opposite stand up and say we are misquoting them when here is one of their members, in 1982 — not long ago — saying he doesn't agree with it?

Let's look at the *Star-Phoenix*, dated January 8, 1981. We'll go a little further back here.

On November 15, 1979, the federal NDP members of parliament demanded in parliament that either Prime Minister Joe Clark or his transport minister, Don Mazankowski, commit the PC government to keeping the crowrate in effect for farmers. Both Clark and Mazankowski refused.

Both Clark and Mazankowski refused., Mr. Speaker. Well, I say if the members of parliament of the New Democratic Party in Ottawa voted against them, hurray for them because they know what they stand for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — They know what they stand for, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the member for Rosetown-Elrose on Monday. First of all, I look in *Hansard*, on page 531 of March 15, 1982. The hon. member said this, and I quote:

The statutory crowrate has been with us for a long time and I'd like to raise the fact that it was introduced by a Conservative government. That crowrate was introduced by a Conservative government in the beginning, and it was accepted. Without that original move by a Conservative government in Ottawa, it is doubtful if we could ever have settled the West without that crowrate being in place.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we did a little research. The crowrate was lost in 1896 when the Tories were in power. In 1897, the Laurier government was in power when the crowrate was introduced. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the opposite to what the member for Rosetown-Elrose has stated.

AN HON. MEMBER: — When did he say this? Say it again, please.

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, the member in front of me wants me to . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — What are you quoting from?

MR. BANDA: — I am quoting from *Hansard* of March 15, 1982. He is talking about the crowrate being introduced by a Conservative government. With a little research we find that it was lost in 1896 when it was under the Tories and it was brought back in 1897 under the Laurier government, which is hardly a Tory government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Maybe I can assist the member for Redberry more than his colleagues and ask them to be quiet while the member for Redberry continues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, also in the debate on Monday, the member for Rosetown-Elrose made the statement claiming that his leader helped to write the Hall commission report. That's in *Hansard* of March 15, 1982, page 532. We've made a call to Justice Emmett Hall but unfortunately we couldn't get an answer. But I have here "Grain and Rail in Western Canada: Report of the Grain Handling and Transportation Commission." I have gone through the pages here on the inquiry process, which state who the commissioners, researchers and helpers were who counselled the administration. Nowhere can I find Professor Devine's name. Nowhere . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No "Dr." Devine . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No "Mr." Devine either. Maybe he made a comment somewhere but I don't see it in here. In fact, I don't think it would be in here, Mr. Speaker. Where is the credibility and where is the leadership over there on this whole issue? Mr. Speaker, I have a lot to say on this topic. I see that time is running by so I beg leave to adjourn debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

MOTION

Regulations

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood, by leave of the Assembly:

That the by-laws of the professional associations and amendments thereto be referred as tabled to the special committee on regulations.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:02 p.m.