

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 26, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.
Prayers

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

Hon. Mr. Swan: — It's my privilege today to introduce to the House a visitor from Ottawa, the Hon. Erik Nielsen, Leader of the Official Opposition, member of the House of Commons for the constituency of the Yukon. He's seated in the back row here and we'd ask him to stand and be recognized. I'd ask all hon. members to welcome him.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Sutor: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have the pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to members of the House, two schools of students visiting us from the constituency of Regina North East this afternoon. The first group, seated in the Speaker's gallery, number 58 grade 4 students from Dr. George Ferguson School, accompanied by their teacher chaperones, Mrs. Quinlan, Mrs. Darroch, Ms. Sagasz and their principal, Mr. Dale Wallenburg. And, in the west gallery, 60 in number grade 4 to 8 students from St. Paul's Community School in Regina, accompanied by Al Jurzyniec, Marcel Dubord, Bernard Beaudry and Dennis Robson. And I would ask all members to join with me this afternoon in welcoming them to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Unemployed Employables on Welfare Rolls

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Social Services. It concerns the startling welfare figures for March which were released from her office this morning, which indicate that the number of unemployed employables on welfare is 14,469. That's up considerably from February and in fact is up from 8,704 at this time last year, which is a 66 per cent increase.

I'd like to remind the minister that this unemployed employable group are the people who are looking for work, would be working if the positions were available.

What I would like to ask the minister is whether or not she believes that spending this amount of money on people who want to work and wish to work, which is more than what is spent on job creation, makes a great deal of sense to her at this time.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the interesting thing when you look at the recent statistics that are out for last month is the fact that the total case-load has only increased 117 since the previous month. If you look at the trend before that, that is a very optimistic figure. The other interesting thing is that the total beneficiaries have gone down by 67, and you neglected to state that. The other interesting thing, particularly in the employable category, is that since March of '82 to March of '83 this

government has put 1,000 people in further training that were on that roll. And I think that is very optimistic, and I would suggest if you look at those figures plus the fact that the job creation program through Social Services is up to approximately 2,000, that that is indeed very optimistic.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the minister can be optimistic about an increase of the unemployed employables from 8,700 last year to 14,400 this year, but you will have a hard time convincing the taxpayers of the province and those who are being forced onto welfare that this is an optimistic role for her to be playing.

What I would like to know is whether or not you still have a study going on on the crisis in welfare which is occurring at this time in Saskatchewan, and if you have received a report from that group who was doing that study?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — The study that was going on was not on the crisis of welfare that you call it. What we did was implemented a study on the systems of the social assistance plan in Saskatchewan. And yes, that is going on, will be completed in June; and yes, I have received an interim report.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister will indicate at this time whether or not the request from many, many groups throughout the province for public hearings will be listened to, and whether or not she intends to hold public hearings throughout the province so people who have ideas on solving this problem – which she says is not a crisis, but when you're paying out 14 million a month in welfare payments, I'm sure that many people consider it that – whether or not you consider making these hearings public throughout the province?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I did not say that a particular situation was not at a crisis level. What I did say was that the study was not on the crisis of the welfare. It was on the systems with the social assistance program. That is what I said. I have not received, as you indicate, many, many requests for public hearings. I have received perhaps two – three at the most.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't asking the minister how many she had received. I would differ with her on that; I've received many more requests than that. But my question was whether or not you're considering in fact making them public? That was the question, and I want an answer to it.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — That final decision will be made when the final report comes in to me from the person that's doing the review.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate how she intends to hold public hearings after the report is completed? Can you just explain the process, how that is going to work?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, I'm sorry I guess I don't quite understand your question. Like, I think it would be foolish to hold it before the report comes in. For instance, suppose the report shows there is no changes or whatever. Would you still go and have public hearings? As I stated, I have not had any pressure to hold these public hearings. I guess it depends on how one identifies public hearing. Are you talking about a royal commission? Are you talking about a task force? I'm not sure.

I have made a commitment to be in touch with those people and those groups that have a first concern with the welfare system, and I still intend to do that. As to the formalization of what you are suggesting, that decision has not been made yet and when it is I will inform you.

Staff Cuts in Psychiatric Services

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could interrupt the reading of the Minister of Health for a question. It concerns, Mr. Minister, the flattering comments made by the president of the Saskatchewan mental health association. I would remind you that in a news release he stated that the budget cuts affecting mental health services were a flagrant disregard for the needs of Saskatchewan people which puts the problem at crisis proportions. And he was talking, of course, about the elimination of staff in the psychiatric services branch. Will you, Mr. Minister, consider a further review of these staff cuts in the psychiatric centres across the province and, this time, take a more humanitarian approach to the mentally ill?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, yes, I read Mr. McCorriston's article also, and it seems that 'crisis' is the word today. If there's a crisis out there, I would like to comment on this so-called crisis. As I've told you many times, in the field of psychiatric services the majority of the position deletions were in what I call the ancillary or support services. We have told you previously we're looking at using the moneys in the Health budget where we can apply the best hands-on treatment for people, and I think that if you took a very careful look at this you will see that that's exactly what is taking place.

Mr. Shillington: — This should be a new question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps part of his problem is that he's been listening to some of your comments. And I want to repeat some of your comments to you, in brief form, from a departmental newsletter dated November 1982. This is *Contact*. The minister was asked, 'What's your view of health care?' The minister says:

Well, there are definitely some areas that have to be looked at. The whole field of mental health is perhaps one area that could stand some improvement with some greater services in that field.

Why is it that you took the same position as Mel McCorriston in November, and yet after the budget, when you didn't get your way, you all of a sudden disagree with him and describe your psychiatric health services as perfectly adequate?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I don't know where the disagreement is coming from. From my point of view . . . I want to explain a little more in detail to you, and perhaps, if you just bear with me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay some of the facts out as towards the psychiatric services in the province of Saskatchewan, keeping in mind the hands-on treatment which are the nurses and the people dealing with these people.

And I would just like to point out that the staff reductions in the psych service branch in this budget will not affect the quality of programs and services to the public. Unlike, Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous government, this year's reductions occur almost entirely in ancillary service areas and not in direct services. For example . . . Now, I've said that in this House many times, but obviously you don't believe me, so now we'll go to some of the facts.

In 1976, Mr. Speaker, 43 positions deleted; 30 of which were in nursing – hands-on care. Forty-three deleted; 30 in nursing.

An Hon. Member: — Who did that? Who did that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That was the NDP government of one Allan Blakeney. In 1979, Mr. Speaker, 35 positions deleted; 21 of which were in nursing – hands-on care.

An Hon. Member: — Who did that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The same group. The same group. He always like everything refortified, my colleague here.

And in 1983, 28 positions deleted; four of them in nursing. And who did that? Premier Grant Devine's government, the government that's been in Saskatchewan for one year – and there's a birthday party out there in Saskatchewan today!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, there was no 'disagreeance' in November. Indeed, there was a great deal of agreeance in November between you and Mr. McCorrison if you speak the same language. Mr. Minister, in November you stated that that branch needed strengthening. Is that your idea of the way to strengthen a branch – to cut 35 of the staff?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The hon. member is a reasonable chap most of the time, and I think strengthening a branch is using and keeping the hands-on service. Now, if I can save some money in some other services, because if you remember, at one time there were 2,000 people in Saskatchewan Hospital, North Battleford – there were 2,000. Now there are about 210. Now it would seem logical to me that I don't need the same number of painters and plumbers and so on to maintain that building when I have less people in there. So, if I can save moneys there, and use them in nursing care and not have the savage cuts that you had of 30 or 40 positions – four positions. And at Saskatchewan Hospital base, North Battleford, this year, 17 positions – deleted one. Just one, Mr. Speaker, as a nurse. Now that, I think, is a compassionate government spending the people's dollars where the hands-on service can be, at the bedside of those people who need treatment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. This is an area, Mr. Minister, in which we'd hoped this government would seek to be so much more. Does the minister not realize that with your empty rhetorics on the fashion in which the economy has not suffered, that people are, in fact, facing increasing stress levels and not less, and there are in fact increasing case-loads? Does the minister not agree that this would have been an appropriate year to increase the staff in that area and not to decrease it?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I think the hon. member realizes, and I'm sure he does, that probably this would have been a good year, and last year, and five years hence was a good year to improve many things, but one has to make judgement decisions. One has to use money in certain areas . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and that's correct, where you can have the best care. One hundred and eighty increases in nursing positions in Saskatchewan indicate to me that we're putting the dollars where the sick people are —

\$17 million in cancer indicates to me that we are addressing a problem out there with people that you people for 10 years put your head in the sand and would not address.

And I want to tell you, that true, there were some deletions of staff in ancillary services and support services, but the record of this government with hands-on care is one that I'll put up against you in one year compared to your ten-year record.

Proposed Increase in SPC Rates

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Premier, and it has to do with his government's decision to allow the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to seek rate increases more than three times the current rate of inflation, even though he has forced a good number of people in this province, municipal councils, school boards, and a good number of working people, to accept inflation-minus-one guide-lines. My question to you, sir, is this: if the inflation-minus-one guide-lines are good enough for the school boards, and good enough for municipal councils, and good enough for the employees of municipal councils, school boards, and the Government of Saskatchewan, why aren't they good enough for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the hon. member will recall when I reiterated the telegram from the Prime Minister asking us to participate in 6 and 5. And at that time I believe that the Leader of the Opposition was aware that the Prime Minister said he would like everybody to participate in 6 and 5 to fight inflation and lead to recovery package of 6 and 5 not be applicable to public utilities that would perhaps run deficits and cause people to pay larger and larger amounts of interest rates and interest payments in a public utility. To which the Leader of the Opposition shook his head, and he acknowledged the fact that public utilities should not be allowed to create larger and larger deficits. They should be in a break-even basis.

Now to the extent that we have our own recovery program, and that there's a recovery program across Canada, most jurisdictions have tried to build a recovery package and still recognize that public utilities like Sask Power and Sask Tel should not create larger and larger deficits which would cause people to pay more and more tax dollars towards interest, and we've agreed with that. So we have designed our recovery package of inflation minus one here in the province of Saskatchewan that beats every other province.

We have inherited, Mr. Speaker, the crown corporations. After we opened the books we found out that they'd been robbed. There's nothing there. We're looking at a situation, Mr. Speaker, where the debt-equity ratio in the public utilities in the province of Saskatchewan has been crippled from the former administration. It is now our responsibility to say yes, we'll protect the public utilities in this province, and we will not let them see themselves get into a very, very large deficit position so we have to pay more and more of our tax dollars on interest. And we will subject all our increases to a public utilities review commission so the public can justify the rates.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, new question to the Premier. As I understood the Premier's reply to the last question, he indicated that he felt that it would not be

appropriate to allow crown corporations to run up larger deficits and that for that reason he proposed to permit enormous increases in rates. I want to quote what you said in an interview, Mr. Premier, to the *Leader-Post*, in which you are quoted as saying:

The province is bearing the brunt of the difficult international times rather than imposing it on people by raising taxes to protect a crown corporation or a government department.

So if you are in fact saying that the province is bearing this, how do you justify 20 and higher per cent increases in power rates and natural gas rates?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I'm very glad that the member asked that question, Mr. Speaker. There is a significant difference between this administration's view of crown corporations and the former administration's view on crown corporations — a significant difference.

We were asked by the public of Saskatchewan, when we were elected, to open the books and look at the public utilities and look at the resource crowns and look at the other crowns. The people asked us to run the public utilities, like Sask Power and Sask Tel and SGI, at a break-even basis. That's what they asked for. The other crowns— the resource crowns — they said, 'Don't tax the people to buy more oil companies, to buy more uranium mines, to buy more farms, to buy more anything like that.' We have refused to raise taxes to expand the role of government in the resource crowns. And will continue to refuse to raise taxes to protect the crown corporations in the resource sector because it's the view on this side that those corporations should be paying dividends to the people of Saskatchewan, not used as a vehicle to tax them.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. I'm wondering, in light of the fact that the Minister of Social Services has frozen the Saskatchewan Income Plan for seniors and cut back by about \$1 million in the public assistance to the aged, whether or not you would consider freezing the power rates and gas rates for the senior citizens and exclude them from the 23 and 25 per cent increase which you have announced you are applying to PURC (public utilities review commission) for?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite — I want to make this very, very clear to the public in Saskatchewan. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition can take it back to Ottawa and extend it right across the country. The members opposite — the NDP members opposite — have always fought against the public utilities review commission. They fought against it year after year when we asked for it. We have it in power now, and that's the very role of the public utilities review commission, is to decide if the rates are justified to the public of Saskatchewan. I commend the public utilities review commission for doing that in all the rate applications, and I'm sure they'll make the same common-sense decisions when it comes to power rates.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, if I could indulge the Premier in answering the question, I asked whether or not you would consider freezing power rates and gas rates for senior citizens who have in effect had their Saskatchewan Income Plan and assistance to the aged reduced? Will you not look at freezing the power rates and gas rates for those individuals?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the members opposite that Mrs. Evelyn Sherman . . . Marion Sherman, pardon me, from the city of Prince Albert is a member of the public utilities review commission and she does qualify as a senior citizen. The views of the seniors, the views of the entire consuming public in the province of Saskatchewan are represented for the first time in Saskatchewan's history, on the public utilities review commission, to justify the rates, and that's the guarantee that the public appreciate now in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a short question to the Premier. If he has such confidence in the public utilities review commission to make appropriate judgements about the charges that should be levied by the utilities on the public of Saskatchewan, would he please ask the minister of industry and commerce to stop his war on the public utilities review commission, and stop the litigation at public expense on whether or not the public utilities review commission should be permitted to make the judgements, which the Premier is expressing are so valuable, but the minister of industry and commerce says are so dastardly?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there wouldn't be a public utilities review commission in the country or in the United States that wouldn't have some argument over the product that is being provided, and the service, and the price of the service. So you could ask yourself the question, and we have at several times, 'Is the deductible part of the product or is it part of the price?' And it's a very reasonable question to ask. The public utilities review commission has to have time to review that, and we provided them time to review that. Most people in the province understand that.

I would point that you mentioned the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. I would point out, in the *Leader-Post* today, that there is close to 10,000 more people employed in the province of Saskatchewan over the last couple of months because of economic development and activities. That is something that is leading all other provinces, so I'm quite happy with the kinds of economic activity that the minister and his colleagues are bringing to the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a short question to the premier. Since he insists on talking about everything but the questions I ask, I'll try one more. This has to do with the public utilities review commission, and I ask the Premier: why is it necessary to have one set of lawyers employed by the public utilities review commission, another set of lawyers employed by your colleague, the minister in charge of SGI, and yet a third set of lawyers employed by your colleague, the Minister of Justice, to sort out just what your desires are with respect to the public utilities review commission? Is it not possible for the three of you to get together and decide that, without having three sets of lawyers, all no doubt firm supporters of the Progressive Conservative Party, sorting that out at great public expense?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member may be disappointed that he is not involved as a lawyer in these discussions. There may have been many colleagues that he could have recommended. I'll give the hon. member this promise: that if he wants to recommend some good legal advice, I'm sure we'd take it under advisement and be prepared to look at the whole problem with some of his advice.

Amendments to Labour Legislation

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Labour, and I would remind the minister, by way of background, the legislation which we passed in January or February was flawed in that not all of the recipients got all of the benefits which we thought they were going to get. When is the minister going to come forward with the appropriate amendment to cure that flaw?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, that legislation is in getting drafted right now and we're expecting it momentarily.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, that's a different way of phrasing it. I want to remind the minister of what you said on April 6th, Mr. Minister, exactly 20 days ago. I asked you what has prevented you from bringing these amendments before this Assembly, and why the delay, and you said, 'The amendment is on my desk right now. It's going through the session as soon as we get back.' I assume, Mr. Minister, you haven't been back to your desk since April 6th. That's the only conceivable explanation.

My question to the Minister of Labour is: when are you going back to your desk?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, I'll remind the member opposite that I'm at my desk every day. It is getting drafted right now. It's retroactive. No one will lose any dollars whatsoever in the delay, but we'll be bringing it forward very, very shortly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to deal with what is, in my opinion, a misleading impression left by the hon. member from Shaunavon, to do with what this government is doing to senior citizens, as he had indicated in his preamble to the Premier on a question that this government had made drastic cuts to senior citizens, particularly in the area of the supplement income plan. And that is totally not true. There have been no cuts in that area. Those people that qualify, the policy stays the same. And I maintain that it is deliberately misleading, particularly to those senior citizens that are out there in the public.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that it would be very difficult to rule from the Chair that one member or the other has all the facts. And as I listen to the statements going from one side to the other, the facts seem to differ on all occasions. And I don't believe that your point of order is well taken in this . . . (inaudible) . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS **Custom Combiners and U.S. Immigration**

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I rise under ministerial statements, and I wish to inform this House of a major development of particular significance to the many Saskatchewan residents who participate in custom combining in the United States.

As this House is aware from questions raised here last week, United States authorities have moved to prohibit the continued entry into that country of Canadian custom

combiners. The action was taken, among other things, as a result of pressure from U.S. custom combiners who believe that as a result of their government's decision to take grain land out of production the continued entry of Canadian custom combiners would result in the loss of work and jobs to U.S. combiners.

I revealed to this House last week that upon learning of the U.S. government decision, the Saskatchewan government both directly and indirectly and at the official and unofficial level has been making overtures to the U.S. government to rescind that prohibition. I am now pleased to inform this House that this morning Mr. Gerald Coyl, district director of the United States immigration service in St. Paul, Minnesota, was in contact with my office to inform that Washington has approved an 80-day parole or grace period under which the newly imposed restriction on the entry of Canadian custom combiners into the United States will be lifted.

During this 80-day period in which Canadian custom combiners will be able to continue to fulfil work or contract obligations they have in the United States, the United States Department of Labour will determine both the need for Canadian custom combiners in that country and the impact on U.S. custom combiners that the Canadian combiners will have with regard to the new situation.

The one restriction on the entry of Canadian custom combiners into the United States during this 80-day period will be that they will have to demonstrate to the U.S. authorities that they do indeed have U.S. customers requiring their service. Throughout this 80-day period the United States Department of Labor and Immigration will be prepared to receive petitions from Canada on behalf of Canadian custom combiners. Our government is already making representations to Ottawa on behalf of the Canadian custom combiners.

We would anticipate that throughout the 80-day period both the Saskatchewan government and the federal government would be able to convince United States authorities of the continued need for Canadian custom combiners in the United States.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the Minister of Agriculture's statement, and I congratulate him on bringing this message to the House today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Also I would like to congratulate him on sticking to the facts, because as the question that I asked the other day in the House and the Premier responded by saying it was because of some flag-burning incident and the United States which has actually nothing to do with the case. I would further like to say, Mr. Speaker, that farmers anticipating on going down to the border, I've been told this morning, will need to indicate that they do have a job or a contract. Those that haven't got it in writing and are prepared to spend money on a phone call, can inform the customs officer of a contract or job they have, and if the customs officer assures himself of that, they will have that.

As far as the 80 days are concerned, there's still some discussion going on and possibly that will be extended.

The other thing is this. As far as the following year is concerned, U.S. farmers who want

Canadians back will have to file a petition for work permits with the U.S. Department of Labor, and get approval for combining in 1984. And I think this 80-day permit will not apply next year, as far as my information is concerned.

So to the farmers that have some questions about going combining, two things apply: one, they were not denied access to the United States because of some alleged incident in Manitoba. I think that was a very regrettable story that the Premier fabricated and made up. And I've had phone calls . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order please. The member is allowed to reply to the ministerial statement and there was nothing about this subject raised in the ministerial statement.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the many farmers that have phoned our office, and we have contacted the U.S. Department of Immigration in Washington, and they were assuring us as to what state it is and it's still in a state of flux, as far as will that 80-day thing be reviewed, because some farmers expect to go down there longer than for 80-days. And I'm hoping that in the future the Premier will not resort to those kind of scare and McCarthy-type tactics to scare the farmers of Saskatchewan about going combining in the United States. That has nothing to do with the situation that's before us.

There are about 80 different issues that affect farmers and affect immigration and I think these should be dealt with according to what is at stake, not according to some prefabricated rumour.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 22 – An Act to amend The Highways Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly and I move that a bill to amend The Highways Act 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. 23 – An Act to amend The Human Tissue Gift Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Human Tissue Gift Act.

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

Bill No. 24 – An Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act.

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

Bill No. 25 – An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

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

Bill No. 26 – An Act to amend The Change of Name Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of the bill to amend The Change of Name Act.

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

Bill No. 27 – An Act to amend The Wakamow Valley Authority Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Wakamow Valley Authority Act.

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

Bill No. 28 – An Act to amend The Wascana Centre Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Wascana Centre Act.

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

Bill No. 29 – An Act to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act.

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

Bill No. 30 – An Act to amend An Act to provide a Superannuation Allowance to a Certain Former Member of the Legislative Assembly

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly. I move that a bill to amend An Act to provide a Superannuation Allowance to a Certain Former Member of the Legislative Assembly now be introduced and read a first time.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 7 – Research Staff: Federal Department of Agriculture

Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure today to introduce this resolution to the Assembly for their consideration. It's a pleasure to introduce the motion to this legislature, but I'm dismayed at what is behind the motion. I'm dismayed that we do find ourselves in a position where, as the motion points out, we are having to urge the federal government to keep the Department of Agriculture's complement of research staff at full or increased strength in western Canada. And I will introduce that motion more formally at the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

It's no surprise to anyone in this legislature that agriculture is the backbone of the Saskatchewan economy, and in fact is the backbone of the Canadian economy. And I think that's been amply demonstrated over the past years, and specifically over the past weeks as the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, many other ministers and MLA's have been throughout Saskatchewan, and in fact across Canada, pointing out to all of Canada and especially central Canada how important agriculture is. And I think only of the debates that have been going on in this House as it relates to the Pepin plan, wherein, I think, central Canada has realized that in western Canada, where grain output by itself accounts for some \$6 billion in the Canadian economy as it relates to trade dollars, that it can only be assumed by all that agriculture is very important to all. And hence agricultural research would be important to all.

And so once again, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we're being selfish in suggesting that the federal government should, in fact, be increasing research in western Canada as well as in all of Canada, because it's for the good of all Canada. And as our advertising campaign has pointed out as it related to the Pepin plan, the ads running in the leading newspapers across Canada, the headline pointed out: 'We're all in this together.' As Canadians we always thought we were in this together. And this is another issue where I think we are in this together.

And as well, Mr. Speaker, one must realize that with research one is looking at some fairly substantive lead times. That is to say, moneys expended on research today and the technology that may result therefrom can have some significant time-lag between that project's undertaking and in fact, that technology being put forth in usable form to the farmers, or industry itself. So I think you can see, Mr. Speaker, that I do rise today to speaker on an issue, to raise an issue in this Assembly, that is of great importance to western Canada, and to all of Canada, and especially of course to its farmers.

And not only is it an issue that we recognize as important, but it's been particularly encouraging to myself, Mr. Speaker, to have this issue raised with me personally by so many segments of society. Many, many farmers at the various and many farm meeting I've attended in the last month or two, across this province and in fact across Canada, have come up to me pointing out the fact that we do need to see more research dollars being spent on some of the very timely problems facing them. And I think of things like soil conservation, salinity, and disease control, whether it relates to plants or animals.

And so I've been particularly encouraged by the number of farmers, first of all, who have made a point of telling me, as part of a government caucus that, 'Yes, we would very much support our tax dollars going into research as it relates to agriculture.' I've been particularly encouraged as well by agribusiness who supports very much the need for more and more research work and funding in that area. People from research centres, the farm groups themselves, not just the individual farmers within the farm groups, but the farm groups on many occasions, have presented resolutions and petitions to the government, briefs to the government, pointing out the necessity for continued and in fact expanded research funds or facilities. The professionals working at these research

institutions have made a point of bringing to our attention the great importance that research must continue to play in agricultural enterprise in Saskatchewan, and in fact all of Canada.

So it's not just from one area, Mr. Speaker, that we're receiving the inquiries as it relates to research. But we're receiving the encouragement right across the spectrum. It was an issue that was raised at the Agricultural Opportunities Conference held earlier this year in Saskatoon, and I can only once again congratulate the Minister of Agriculture and his department for putting on an excellent conference. The theme of the conference was, 'Agriculture – A Growth Industry. Can You Make It Happen?' And one of the common themes that emerged from that conference where 600 of Saskatchewan's brightest farmers as appointed by their farm groups, the cream of the crop you might say, in agriculture . . . One of the themes that seemed to emerge from their discussions and their comments in the papers presented there was that we must have in place a program of expanded research and development coupled with extension.

They recognized very much the role that research has played in reducing some of their input costs and they appreciate just what the economic benefit can be for them, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that is why they whole-heartedly support government spending the taxpayers' dollars in research endeavours. And the bottom line at that meeting, at least one of the bottom lines seemed to me, was that government should be involved in funding more and more research, not less and less, and that his was not a time for cutbacks but rather a time for increases.

And it was not a time for headlines, Mr. Speaker, which in fact announced what has become the basis for the motion that I am proposing today. It is not a time for headlines such as those, and I'll review a few of them with you, Mr. Speaker, and I think of ones dated back to the 12th month of 1982, 22nd of December in the *Star-Phoenix*, and the headline read, 'Agriculture Research in the West to Lose Staff as Jobs Move East.' This is not the kind of headline we want announcing cut-backs in agricultural research, cut-backs in staff, Mr. Speaker. And the article went on to point out that federal agricultural research stations in western Canada have been told to substantially cut staff levels while jobs are transferred to Quebec, a federal official said Tuesday.

That is not the kind of thing our farmers in Saskatchewan wanted to hear, Mr. Speaker. The article further went on to say that the western region would lose 26 positions, Quebec would gain 33, and went on to say that the job transfers reflect a shift in priorities as more research is concentrated in food processing and retailing in Quebec.

And once again, Mr. Speaker, we had a case of what appears to be the federal government speaking out of both sides of their mouths. As I understand it, it was the same federal government that's making this cut-back and making the shift who was out here telling us that yes, you in western Canada, you farmers in western Canada, as a province in western Canada interested in economic development you should be prepared to look at changes to the Crow because it will, in fact, promote increases in processing of some of our basic commodities. And yet on the other hand what are they doing? They're cutting back staff and shipping them to Quebec and to central Canada, because they say that is where the emphasis and concentration on food processing is going to be. Another case of double-talk from the mouths of our federal Liberal government.

It was headlines like this one here in December once again, I think *Star-Phoenix* as well,

where the federal government was attempting to justify the shift in positions to Quebec, and that headline went on to say, 'Agricultural Spokesman Justifies Shift to Quebec.' And then a further article: 'Whelan Defends Cuts to Research Staff.' These are all very scary news for our farmers who looks to research to decrease their input costs, rather than a government down there who seems bent on increasing farmers' input costs.

An editorial, Mr. Speaker, also referred to the same kind of thing. 'Agricultural Research Threatened' was the headline on the editorial. I think it bears repeating, a few of the comments made in that editorial, and I quote, 'A potential shortage of agricultural research represents a serious long-term threat to the health of Saskatchewan's economy.'

By making this cut-back, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the federal government seems to be pursuing an economic policy of trying to come up with some dollars, cutting back on budgets, and yet we all know for their short-term gain, they will inflict some very long-term pain on the Canadian economy. This same editorial went on to say that the detrimental effect of the ability of Canadian farmers to improve productivity and remain competitive hinges on research, and as well pointed out the extensive lead time required for the benefits of the costs that research accrues to show themselves at the farm gate.

And another headline that's scared . . . I think the number of headlines on this particular topic, Mr. Speaker, only go to show how important an issue this was out here – how very much this issue was on the minds, obviously, of the farmers, and as well, that was noted by the press in the fact that there were many, many stories carried in the various newspapers and news media and in the farm papers as it related to this vicious attack on agricultural research positions in western Canada. And this headline went, and it was one in the *Leader-Post*, 'Whelan Defends Transfer of Jobs.' And it went on to say that, and this is particularly interesting, Mr. Speaker, 'Whelan wants Canadian farm production to expand by two-thirds by the end of the century.' And yet it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if you're going to have that kind of expansion in agricultural output, that one of the things that must come before it is research and development, and technology development.

Once again, he seems to be going in two directions at the same time. How can you be expecting us to increase our output by two-thirds and yet take away all the tools so vital to increasing that output?

As well, he went onto say that his blueprint for the next two decades included a soil and water research centre to study the increasingly serious problem of soil salinity, which now reduces production on about 10 per cent of prairie farmland, but the federal government hasn't announced details for such a facility yet. That seems to be so often the case; we're always waiting for details of facilities. And I say, Mr. Speaker, enough of delay, enough of vacillation, enough of cuts, enough of waiting for details of important capital construction projects like a soil and water research centre. I say the federal government should be getting on with it. The budgets may be tight but I think everyone would agree that research, and especially as it relates to soil and water, should receive increasing attention.

And just one final one. This is a very recent one, Mr. Speaker, in the *Leader-Post*, April 16th, '83 headlined: 'Money Drying Up For Grain Research.' And this one here referred particularly to the Brandon research station, and the Brandon research station is one that has been very much in the forefront as it relates to plant breeding and strains in

barley crops. And I think one of the doctors there went on to say that it was in fact a danger that the demand of the industry will exceed the knowledge of barley breeders.

So I think you can see, Mr. Speaker, the basis for my motion is the fact that we do have a very serious situation here. It is one that has not gone unnoticed by Saskatchewan farmers, and in fact Saskatchewan farmers are very, very much behind spending taxpayers' dollars for research because they know the whole country benefits from increased agricultural production.

To point out the benefits as it relates to the cost and benefit that the whole country accrues from agricultural research, I think it's worthy to note a few statistics that have been generated by some of the various agencies across this country and in fact throughout the world. And in fact a Canadian agricultural science council recent report, I think a 1980 report, suggested that for every \$1 spent on research there's a \$225 return on that investment – fairly impressive figures. And why research funds and the expropriation of funds to research is important, because in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, as everyone in this House knows, we have the most productive group of people in the world, I think, and at least in Canada here we have a situation where 4 per cent of the people in fact feed 96 per cent of the other folks in this country, and a good many in the world, I might add. So it's in the best interests of the whole country to spend that \$1 when it's returning \$225 in terms of economic benefit. And when you think of the fact that very few, very few people are shouldering the total responsibility for feeding the whole country, and in fact a good part of the world, especially as it relates to our livestock production and our grain production, so vital in the milling of high-quality red wheats.

One research project alone – the development of a wheat strain resistant to stem rust, which is particularly important in the eastern side of Saskatchewan and in fact in Manitoba – that project alone, Mr. Speaker, has been estimated that for every dollar expended on the development of that rust-resistant strain, for every dollar spent on research developing it, it has returned \$482 to the pockets of Canadian farmers and in fact Canadian consumers. Between 1973 and '77 losses would have been in the order of 217 millions of dollars per year, and when you put that in light of the current debate as it relates to the Pepin plan, when these big figures have been bandied around, \$217 million is a very significant figure. What a salvation to prairie farmers the development of that strain has been, and what good return the government has had on dollars invested in research.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, in the broiler chicken business. The nutrition research as it relates to broiler chicken raising where, as many of you are aware I'm sure, in the broiler industry they have very much fine-tuned that breed, and along with genetics and nutrition are producing a pound of protein for very, very minimal input in terms of grains, which is very important because we are competing with the foodstuff that will in fact feed people, as well. And in the nutrition research behind the development of those very efficient broiler operations, it's been estimated that the returns per dollar of money expended on research there, the industry got a return of \$260.

And so I think you can see, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to expand our farm production by two-thirds by the year 2000, we need to put these kinds of technologies on the front burner because they decrease costs and increase production. And if you look at Saskatchewan specifically, and the potential that this province has within its borders over the next two decades, we're in fact . . . With a little bit of help, we could see grain

production increasing by 50 per cent, not even in fact in the next two decades, but probably even in the next decade. As well, we could see hog production increase by 50 per cent, and the potential for cattle will raise 20 per cent or more.

We do not want to be counter-productive such as we've seen in this federal government move that in fact stifles technology. We want to enhance production. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that research is one of the keys, in fact it's one of the basic building blocks to improve technology behind the farm gate. And so I would suggest that rather than making cut-backs, the federal government should be looking at increasing expenditures in this area. They should be looking at building bridges to production, not putting up walls.

I spoke rather vaguely, and perhaps in rather general terms, Mr. Speaker, about some of the federal government's shortfalls in this area, in that they are cutting back staff, and in fact cutting back funding at those positions. But I will be very specific. I am prepared to be very specific because I don't believe in just general and vague criticisms. So I would offer, and I would hope that the federal government would take note, I would offer some areas that I think need attention.

I would suggest to the federal government that much of their equipment and the buildings housing that equipment are deteriorated or deteriorating. I would suggest to them that at places like the Saskatoon Research Station, which in fact has had to shut down its greenhouses and other plant growth facilities simply because of a lack of funds as it relates to just maintaining the mechanical services there – that is an area in straight black and white that's suffered strictly from a lack of funds.

The travel of many professional people and technical people to scientific meetings where the valuable interchange of information takes place to see what others are doing, and to in fact, gain, in some cases, hands-on experience of field trips to examine their work – travel expenditures to these scientific meetings have been in many areas suffering from severe cut-backs as well. Although travel seems sometimes frivolous, I would suggest, where we're trying to get the biggest bang out of our dollars in these recessionary times, it's very important to the left hand to know what the right hand is doing. So I think it's very important to not only now what farmers want in terms of research, but what universities are doing here and across Canada, what research stations are doing here and across Canada in other provinces, and as well, internationally, Mr. Speaker. So I think the need for communication is as important as it ever was. Undoubtedly, travel costs are escalating as well, but I think we cannot cut off our head to treat a case of dandruff in this matter.

Another area that I would suggest to the federal government that they are lacking in (and it's basically the heart of the matter in the recent announcement of staffing cut-backs) is that professional and support staff levels have been dropped or cut back, and in some cases shifted to Quebec. And in addition to the cut-back in staff we see as well an underusage of professional staff in that, because there is not the support staff and the technical staff there to aid the researcher, professional themselves are having to do some of the technical work. So we have two areas here of concern: it's not just the cut-back, but in fact, the underusage of the professional staff.

So the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, and this is what I would urge the federal government to pay heed to, is that currently they're spending about 0.9 per cent of Canada's gross national product on agricultural research. And I would suggest, as the Canadian Agricultural Research Council, that they move that figure closer to 1.5 per cent.

Especially as it relates to the arguments that we've heard over the last few weeks about expanded livestock development, food processing, commodity processing in western Canada, now is the time to definitely put that kind of research on the front burner, and to move that spending from a dismal figure of 0.9 per cent, Canada's GNP, up in the neighbourhood of 1.5 per cent. And I'm not so naïve, Mr. Speaker, as to expect that they're going to do this overnight. I accept the fact that they are in rough fiscal shape down in Ottawa, and maybe they're in rough physical shape as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But I'm not so naïve as to suspect that they can do that overnight. But I think they've got to start and put a framework in place so that perhaps over the next five years we can see them move to that kind of figure, and in fact see that the research development at least lead in some of the R&D so necessary to precede western economic development.

The provincial government, Mr. Speaker . . . It's not a case of the kettle calling the pot black here. I'm very proud of the role that the provincial government plays in agricultural research. It can never be too much, but I think they're to be commended for the various roles they do play in agricultural research, and I would just like to go over a few of them because for sure in this province where agriculture is the backbone of our economy obviously we do want to give research its full due.

I think of products like plant-breeding research, insect-control research, food-processing research, which, as I said before, positions were being moved to Quebec because the thrust on food processing was going to take place in that province. And yet, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have an excellent facility in Saskatchewan here that was put in place in 1977, and that's the POS Pilot Plant Corporation.

POS stands for protein, oil and starch, and was set up at that time to carry out research in food processing, technology, especially processing as it relates to proteins, oil and starches – hence the name POS – into ingredients for food, feed and industrial applications. And, of course, I think everybody here knows that food-processing research is especially relevant, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the context of the recent debate that's been raging across this country over the last few months as it relates to the Pepin plan, and in fact seeing that western economic development as it relates to these areas does in fact occur.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it's a bit of a incongruous situation to have positions – research positions, federal government research positions – being cut and being shifted to Quebec where they tell us that there's going to be an increase in food processing, when in fact we have an excellent facility out here. In fact, there are figures to show that for every dollar invested in POS by 1986 will have returned \$43 in benefits to the Canadian industry – an excellent reason for them to in fact expand funding, not cut it back.

Just to review a little bit more, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about some of the areas that are important to Saskatchewan farmers, I mentioned briefly plant breeding research, new varieties of cereal and oilseed crops, of course, and I made mention of the stem wheat resistant varieties that have in fact saved farmers out there \$217 million a year.

Another big plus for western Canadian farmers and especially Saskatchewan farmers was the development of the oilseed varieties safe for vegetable oils. This made the canola industry the miracle crop of the '70s, virtually, and I think you can see that in fact

if you look back in history. During the mid-50s we had about 58,000-odd acres in crop to canola, and by 1978 we had gone from 58,000-odd hectares, rather, to something like 2.8 million hectares, simply because the industry researchers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, developed an oilseed variety safe for vegetable oil.

So that's the kind of impact that research can have, and led to headlines, Mr. Deputy Speaker – not headlines talking about agriculture research threatened or agriculture spokesmen justifying shifts to Quebec, but headlines that said, Mr. Speaker – and this was in a recent paper and I don't have it with me here to give you the exact date – but a headline that said: 'Research Makes Canola a Miracle Industry.' Simply because of one research project . . . I shouldn't say one; that's probably oversimplifying it. By the application of research to a particular problem, we took production and went from 58,000-odd hectares to something in the order of 20 or 30 times that kind of acreage and obviously the production was there to match it, and obviously the dollars, as a result of that crop, were important to Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan's economy and the Canadian economy as well.

In fact, even in this last few months, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've heard calls from the federal government for increased acreages to canola. There are markets out there waiting for our high-quality canola and it's the challenge of Saskatchewan agriculture to fill those markets, and the farmers have never let the world down yet when it comes to feeding the hungry. We've had distribution problems, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would acknowledge that, but I can only congratulate Saskatchewan farmers for their role in feeding a hungry world.

Other research, Mr. Speaker, that's particularly important to Saskatchewan farmers includes, of course, developing environmentally safe pesticides and chemicals and fertilizers – those sorts of things, and not just the chemical agents that one can use for insect control or disease control, but as well have been instrumental in pursuing biological control using one insect to feed on another and that sort of an approach, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I've already referred to the fact that we do have a facility here in Saskatchewan that can do processing, research on food processing. And so I have a great deal of difficulty with positions being cut – federal research positions being cut here and shifted to Quebec, when in fact we have a facility right here.

I also know that farmers out there, and having had conversations with them, are very interested, very interested in seeing research go on and continue and be expanded in developing technologies that relate to seeding and harvesting, and especially as it relates to seeding and harvesting in the dryland areas. And of course I'm particularly encouraged to see some of the PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute) facilities keying on dryland farming technology, such as is the case in Humboldt. Over and above all the other areas that they have expertise in, they do have some specific expertise in that area.

I, of course, would be remiss, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I did not mention some of the very vital research that has gone on as it relates to livestock production and disease control. I think of, once again, the university, the agricultural college, the veterinary college there, and as well, the Veterinary Infectious Diseases Organization, all working together, all polling their knowledge and facilities and the professional minds there, and of course, as members may or may not know – at least those in the livestock industry, the beef cattle industry will know, and as well the swine industry will know –

some research that went on there that is a forerunner internationally. This was in the development of a vaccine for the prevention of neo-natal diarrhoea in baby pigs and in calves, which every year in Saskatchewan because of our harsh winters and our very often wet, cold, and snowy springs, has caused losses ranging in some instances to 50 per cent in beef cattle operations. Fifty per cent of their calves die before a week or two weeks of age. And at a hundred-cow herd, and you figure a calf in the fall is worth, hopefully, \$500, you can see how quickly those dollar losses can add up in farmers pockets. There's been several estimates on the numbers of, hundreds of millions of dollars that have been lost across western Canada as a result of that one disease, never mind the same sort of condition in swine industry.

Of course, members will know that because of this research that took place at the Veterinary Infectious Diseases Organization, a vaccine was developed that, in fact, became very popular, not only in Saskatchewan and in Alberta and in Manitoba, but across Canada, and eventually as licensed and distributed in North America, and now I understand, as well, is in the process of clearing hurdles and in some cases, has cleared hurdles, for distribution to other countries in the world.

So another example of Saskatchewan Agriculture funding research that benefits not only Saskatchewan, but Canada, and in fact all of the world. And I would tip my hat to the people at that organization, along with every other organization in Saskatchewan research who do such an excellent job given the constraints they do work under.

And as well I would have to say that so many of these organizations, such as VIDO (Veterinary Infectious Diseases Organization) do contemporary research. They look at the problems facing Saskatchewan farmers today, and one of the reasons that they're very close to what's on farmers' minds and acknowledging research that farmers want done is because of the make-up of their boards. It's not made up of bureaucrats, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you like, but in fact of farmers and ranchers and swine breeders and swine producers and feedlot operators and those kind of people who know what kinds of problems they're dealing with and where some research might come up with some solutions for them.

The soil research that has gone on at Saskatoon as well and work at the crop development centre has made those institutions, as well, world-renown. And I think it was the president of the university who coined the phrase that they have understood that we must farm the soil, rather than mine it. And that is this kind of thrust that the research is taking up there as they look at new strains, the salinity problem, and so many other of those areas involved in conserving our soil.

It's a matter of investing in our future, Mr. Speaker, with research funds because of the long lead-term time, and it may not necessarily benefit you or myself, as farmers today, but it's for our children and maybe even, in some cases, their children.

Just to specifically point out where in fact we have the federal government going backward with research funding, I've mentioned some of the facilities that we in fact within the Saskatchewan government do support. I would like to just expand on them a little bit and, as I point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where the federal government appears to be pulling back on research, we are in fact doing our best to increase the emphasis on agricultural research and research funding. And I would just briefly go over a few of the areas, as I've already touched on a couple. But I think it worthy to note many of the fine institutions and facilities that we do support in Saskatchewan.

I think of things like the soil testing laboratory. I don't think there is a farmer in this legislature who doesn't appreciate the work done by that lab in Saskatoon. And in fact I was very happy to see them receive an additional \$400,000 to expand their facilities, to provide the kind of service that Saskatchewan farmers want out there in getting soil analysis – only getting soil analysis and getting quality results, they're getting them quick so they can increase their turn-around times. So when the samples are taken and the farmer's waiting and looking at putting on nitrogen or phosphorous or sulfur, they're giving him reliable results and they're giving it to him quickly. And I know every farmer – every farmer who tills the soil out there – is very, very appreciative of that \$400,000 that the Saskatchewan government is spending.

I think, as well, of the commitment to FarmLab. The total sums advanced there – at least budgeted there – for the '82-83 year were in the neighbourhood of \$3.72 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I think many of the projects – the research projects – that FarmLab undertakes are once again projects initiated at the grass roots level with the FarmStart committees. And now as part of the regional agricultural extension boards at their meetings, the meetings of farmers, what's on their minds, what's the specific problems that we are dealing with in our area, whether it be in the grasslands area or in the grain-producing area, or in the areas closer to the parkland.

Every region has more specific problems. Obviously some of them are quite general. But it gives them a change to have that kind of direct contact with research formulation, research that deals with problems that the farmer today considers current and road-blocks to increased production or in fact one that's adding to increased cost. And so we get this kind of direct input, just like we had at the Agriculture Opportunities Conference, direct input on how his taxpayer's and all the taxpayers' dollars of this province should be spent on research. And in addition to the local demonstration projects of course, a good part of FarmLab's funds are spent through the University of Saskatchewan as well where more sophisticated facilities in some cases are required.

But I'm particularly encouraged in places like VIDO (Veterinary Infectious Diseases Organization), and as well in the FarmLab project, and as well, with the Saskatchewan agricultural research fund board. But those boards are made up of farmers, farmers who know and understand livestock and the soil, and know what kinds of research can benefit them most. It's a matter of listening to the people and responding to their needs.

As well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I made reference earlier to the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute, of course with the three stations in western Canada – one at Humboldt, Portage la Prairie, and as well at Lethbridge. We contribute about 45 per cent to their operating costs here from Saskatchewan Agriculture. And last year that amounted to \$1.181 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I think once again, out there, every farmer highly respects the machinery institute. They have a very healthy respect for what they've put out for their publications. They've almost become the Bible as it relates to purchasing equipment, to see what PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute) has reported on them. I know as well that PAMI is continuing to have a thrust as it relates to R&D, but as well, looking at more extension and specific applications of technology and developing specific areas of expertise at their various stations.

And as I mentioned earlier, Humboldt, in addition to its broad-based expertise, is keying somewhat on dry-land farming equipment and as well, sprayers, very much a scene

today on grain farms – sprayers – very important to have accuracy and safety, because a lot of the chemicals that farmers are using today are very expensive. The kind of sophistication that a farmer needs in applying these chemicals has to be preceded by some good R&D work because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you can save 10 per cent of a farmer's costs, as it relates to getting that chemicals on evenly and safely, safe not only to himself but to his crops and to the environment, that puts big dollars in his pockets when you look at the cost of some of those five-gallon or 20-litre cans (whatever they are now) on the farm.

And as well, I know, areas like the Lethbridge Station once again has brought expertise in research, but keying somewhat on irrigation. One of the areas that Saskatchewan Agriculture is particularly proud of, as it relates to its funding initiatives, is in the development of the toxicology centre, and this was a new initiative announced last fall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the Open for Business Conference. It's a new initiative. It's one that recognizes the times we live in, as it relates to chemicals, their potential usefulness and their potential harm.

And I'm particularly proud that Saskatchewan Agriculture is involved in funding the toxicology centre, along with other departments of government – a real benefit for all of Canada and, once again, all of the world. Because I know some of the researchers that have been involved in toxicology up at the university, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and in fact in some areas we have some of the leading researchers in toxicology in this province. We have world-class people.

Not to dwell at any great length, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but just to briefly go over a few more areas that we provide funding to in Saskatchewan: special crop demonstration programs; research on black fly control, which is very important along the North Saskatchewan River and one that's a pesty problem, so to speak, every summer. And, of course, there's a couple of biggies – a couple of funds that put out a good deal of money for various projects. I think of the market development fund and in fact the Saskatchewan agricultural research fund and, as I mentioned just a few moments ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the agricultural research fund board, made up once again primarily of farmers and very much in touch with what's going on, what's needed, and very happy to see that kind of grass-roots input.

One has only to look at some of the programs that the funds have supported to see that they do have a feel for all areas of agriculture, all areas of processing of agricultural commodities, and they don't just strictly limit themselves to some of the ones that are very much in the news these days, such as soil conservation, soil fertility, salinity, water management, soil inventory and mapping, acid soils, but as well get into bio-insecticides, lentils, varietal strains, triazine research on triazine-resistant rapeseed.

As well, research on reproduction as it relates to beef cattle. I think specifically of studies on spermatozoa, a study of the effect of beta-carotene on reproduction in cattle. There's projects involving sheep, embryo transfers, selenium status.

And so I think you can see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that while the federal government is making cut-backs in agriculture, we are increasing these thrusts and the emphasis on research in Saskatchewan. I know for a fact that it can never be enough, but there have been increases, and in some cases very healthy increases, considering the recessionary times we live in. It's not just enough to have the provincial and the federal governments involved in research and to have increases in research capability. As well, it's important for governments to co-operate and work with other sectors in society that

in fact are important in research, as well. I think here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of governments working with agribusiness and industry, and in fact international governments when it comes to research.

And I can only congratulate this government and the Minister of Agriculture in fact for the leafy spurge control conference held here in Saskatchewan, here in Regina, last February of this year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Leafy spurge – an important disease problem, an important plant weed problem in Saskatchewan. In fact for the member of Quill Lakes and the member from Shaunavon, where in fact it is a fairly significant problem, for their information, there's about 10,000 acres severely infested with leafy spurge and it does occur mostly in pastures. And of course, one of the reasons for international liaison on some of these problems that affect not just Canada and not just Saskatchewan, but for international liaison, is because this is a problem of the central U.S. and the north-west states.

In part, with the communication theme, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where it's important for everyone to know what everyone else is doing, I was particularly heartened by the fact that the Minister of Agriculture would take the initiative, and in fact invite people from . . . And just to read you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a few of the people that were at this leafy spurge control conference: we had people from Saskatchewan Agriculture, of course; Alberta Environmental Centre; Alberta Agriculture. The commissioner of the North Dakota Agriculture Department was here. People from the North Dakota Agricultural Experimental Station, and Mr. Orlin Hanson, in fact who I introduced to this legislature the day he was in town for this conference, a North Dakota state legislator was here. As well, people from Agriculture Canada. And as well, the North Dakota Stockmens' Association.

And of course, in North Dakota and Montana it infests not ten thousands of acres, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but in fact hundreds of thousands of acres. And so here we had a gathering of some of the best minds in dealing with this problem, and rather than one province or one research institution go off unilaterally in a tangent and do work perhaps that had already been done by another research institution, we go the best minds together and in fact worked at an international level on a common problem. And that's very important when you want to get the biggest bang that you can out of your research buck today, because the important thing is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it comes to research, is you don't want errors, and you don't want omissions, and we certainly cannot afford costly duplications. And so I commend the Minister of Agriculture and the Government of Saskatchewan and the Premier for the kinds of good relations they have with these U.S. neighbours to the south, so that we can initiate joint conferences like this on problems which we have which are of mutual concern. So this kind of initiative and the Agricultural Opportunities Conference, and having boards comprised of farmers and ranchers and people in agribusiness, we are getting the kind of research emphasis, or emphasis on research in the areas we do need and do expect, and the farmers do expect it to.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to reiterate once again that it's not a time for cut-backs in agricultural research. It's a time for increasing research positions and research funding for equipment and for facilities all across Canada. It just is another example of a divisive policy to take positions from Saskatchewan and from western Canada and ship them to Quebec. We've already got one proposal presumably about to come before the House of parliament in Ottawa that is divisive, as well as the fact it will be devastating and do violence to Saskatchewan's agricultural economy. We don't need another one like this. It's just throwing salt into the wound, and I would urge the

federal government to get on with the job of augmenting farm production out there. We have world-class researchers working in conjunction with world-class farmers. Just give them some resources.

And with that, then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would move:

That this Assembly urges the federal government to keep the Department of Agriculture's complement of research staff at full or increased strength in western Canada.

It is not a time for another assault on western Canada. We cannot tolerate these repeated attacks by the federal government on western Canada. I would so move that motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Humboldt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Domotor: — Mr. Speaker, I would certainly commend the member from Weyburn on the resolution calling for the federal government to keep the Department of Agriculture's complement of research staff at full or increased strength in western Canada, and am happy to second that motion.

Let us take a look at what the provinces have done, as the member from Weyburn has mentioned that there have been soil testing laboratory areas where we've spent money, the FarmLab area, the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute. And I'd like to dwell on that for a moment since it's in my town of Humboldt.

The Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute is funded by three provinces, and that is Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba. The majority of the funding comes from the province of Saskatchewan. And the breakdown for the 1982 grants totalled somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$1,073,473 in 1982. In Alberta it was . . . their contribution was 834,924 and in Manitoba approximately \$477,099. The locations in Alberta were at Lethbridge and in Manitoba was at Portage la Prairie. The centre is located in Humboldt. The testing areas between Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba gives the farmers a chance to take a look at the different kind of equipment that they do test. When they go out to make a purchase, they don't have to go out there blind. They can take a reading. They send out the PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute) reports, and I think everyone probably in the farming area, anyway, is familiar with the PAMI reports, and are able to look at these and assess the different productivity of the machine, the strength, the durability, and how well it performs on field tests.

It's important that we have this kind of research available for the farmers of Saskatchewan, because this gives them an opportunity to have something close by where they can run down or phone up the institute, and say, 'Well, I'm thinking of buying this particular machine. How does it test out? What is its efficiency?' And they have it all broken down. In the PAMI report, 1981-82 report, it shows all the different kind of machinery that they do the testing on, and it's quite explicit.

Not only do they test the farm agricultural machinery, but they also do some testing for the manufacturers. It gives an opportunity for them to do it on a cost basis. The small manufacturing plants that are located in the Prairies haven't got the facilities or the money to do all the extra research and testing their equipment. They can contract it out to PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute). The research staff there are willing to

take these on, and are able to go ahead and bring them to their site. They do take them out on field tests. They have the trucks and the capable staff to monitor the machine, and they drive alongside it, whether it's combining or swathing or whether it's with respect to tillage, or whether it's with respect to how-drills, or whatever they are able to go ahead and make a good test on it.

The other testing that they have done is, of course, with respect to sprayers, as the member from Weyburn mentioned, and he knows that on certain areas they've done testing in England, with respect to not only fan-shaped nozzles but the circular type. And it's good to see that we have a certain amount of money that's been spent in that area. Not only has the PAMI reports done some testing, but I notice that Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has some testing and evaluation of the spinning-disc and low-pressure nozzles.

Other areas that we've done testing or research, and money's been applied to it, is in soil conservation, as soil fertility and salinity is mentioned previously. Water management, soil management – a lot of money has been put into this area, and it's indeed good since we have our basic commodity in Saskatchewan. A lot of our income is from the farming community.

The advantages of maintaining research staff in western Canada, and increasing the staff, can only benefit not just western Canada, but also all of Canada. The importance that the federal government can gain from this research is a better agricultural base. For example, research branch programs are designed to determine optimum conditions of soil and climate for production of specific crops and animals, develop new and improved varieties of plants and animals, reduce losses caused by disease, insects and weeds, improve management techniques for crop and animal husbandry through biological and engineering studies, and develop new and improved technology for processing, preservation, and utilization of food.

The funding of research to industries and universities is vital, in that out of this research the agriculture community can utilize new ideas, improve their productive capacity and generate increased income. And you know generating increased income means more taxes or more income tax. This is all generated back to the federal treasury, and back into the communities, and the communities can then spend it in their respective areas.

For example, an Agriculture Canada report in research areas such as Swift Current: the use of 60-centimetre and 90-centimetre spacing between rows in seeding forage crops resulted in yields that were greater by 35 per cent and 144 per cent respectively than those obtained with rows 30 centimetres apart. Now that is a significant contribution. And if the research funding is taken away by the federal government it means we'll have a reduction in this kind of research and a reduction in efficiency that the farmer or the rancher can utilize.

Research extends to a large area, Mr. Speaker. Let's take an example in Alberta, for instance. Irrigation, salinity studies in southern Alberta were continued and have been extended to solonchic soils. Field and laboratory research programs on solonchic soils has proven the feasibility of reclamation of these soils, and appropriate recommendations have been made jointly with the Alberta government. Now estimated benefits in reclaiming some of these salt areas or salt soils have been in the order of \$50 per hectare. I suggest that is a considerable amount, but research in this area has to continue.

Research has provided many areas such as crop production, commodity analysis, food-market analysis in food quality and processing technology. Increased research staff could give us, for example, alternative sources of energy, thus insulating us from the uncertainty of oil supply from the Arab countries, and from the inevitable decline of fossil fuels. This type of research takes money, and the federal government should be willing to place money in the area, for the eventual benefit would go to all Canadians, not just a few.

Any research in this area will benefit not only western Canada but the East also. If we take for example where research has been done in Nova Scotia with respect to windmills. They have developed a certain kind that is quite efficient. We can utilize some of these perhaps out in the Prairies. We can reduce the amount of dependence in fuel, of the fossil fuels. Maybe we can go more to natural gas at the present time. But then there's also alcohol production that we could be looking at. We look, for example, during the world war, Germany or Sweden ran a lot of their engines on alcohol. We can utilize a little more research in this area. We can use the grains we produce. For example, research done in that, you still have the food value that people can still eat from the by-products, and we can use the other part for running engines. These are all cost benefits that can not only save us in the long term but also in the short term. When benefits can accrue to all society, we cannot emphasize enough to the federal government to increase research funding.

Not only are the benefits to crop production or new varieties or better processing, but the benefits can go on to market development. If there's any increased markets, the benefits will translate into more income to the provinces and to the federal government who, in turn, can continue funding research development. Market development, for example, with respect to agricultural research: when you develop new varieties in canola and greater production in canola, we're able to sell a certain amount to Japan or to China or to the Asiatic countries – this means that it returns income to the farmer. Not only that, it adds to the balance of payments that the federal government gets through this type of activity, and this all reflects back into research.

Market development is important. Without market development we have no place to export our products, and therefore we need that research in that area. We can process a lot of the final end products of the crops that we produce here and maybe sell the end product, and the final analysis is that it will create more jobs back at home and give us more return per dollar in our economic return. Without research we would not today be growing crops in the Peace River area either. By dedication and hard work of researchers new varieties were developed that would be more tolerant to drought and new varieties were developed with shorter growing seasons. These are a few examples, Mr. Speaker, that have helped over the years.

If the federal government reduces staff in western Canada, it is only again showing that central Canada feels that the West is not significant. Again, we see them pulling out of western Canada and putting the jobs or the research into eastern Canada and forgetting about the West. The resources that the West has are important and are well worth the expense by the federal government. This is a large country, Mr. Speaker, and if we are to deep our country as one united entity then the federal government must recognize that money spent in the West is to their advantage.

Let's take a look at Agriculture Canada, the research stations in western Canada, and I just happen to have a list here from Agriculture Canada. Research stations are located

in Brandon, Manitoba – I'll just read a few of them out – Portage la Prairie, Winnipeg. In Saskatchewan we have them located in Melfort, Regina, Indian Head – and everyone knows the tree nursery there; we have Saskatoon university, and Swift Current, Saskatchewan. In Alberta we have some at Fort Vermilion, Vegreville, and Lethbridge.

These are research stations that are in the West, and I maintain they should be kept there because of the benefits that accrue to the area. You can't go ahead and start conducting a bunch of research with respect to crop varieties or tillage – how it's going to work – in soils that are in Ontario. You have to adapt them to the conditions and the climatic conditions where you're going to be growing them, and that's the only way. And the only way you can do that is by decentralization and having research in various parts of the country, various parts of the provinces. And therefore it's very significant and important that this is done.

The other part – the objectives and goals of research. What are the objectives? Well, some of the objectives they outlined in the brochure, 'Agriculture Canada Research,' and it says, 'Land, for example, soil management and conservation: some of the objectives there – they were going to try and go ahead and solve some soil problems. Soil problems – it can vary from improvement with respect to how you utilize it, soil drifting, utilization with respect to soil moisture conditions, how you can get the best return out of your dollar for it. This is research, Mr. Speaker, and these are some of the objectives that the research development was supposed to look at.

What about water and irrigation? These are part . . . Irrigation in Saskatchewan or Alberta or Manitoba is not just related advantage to them, but it can spread throughout the country. It can be advantages to Ontario, or B.C., so, therefore, we have to have them related to the specific areas that they are being utilized.

What about some of the other research stations? We saw what happened to the weather station in Regina. We need the meteorological and climatic indices as to determine what the climatic conditions are going to be. When we're seeding a crop, we want to know more or less what are the possibilities of moisture for that year. Or when you're going out there and combining, you want to know what's the weather going to be like for the next week or two. And if you have more research into the meteorological areas so they can determine a couple of days in advance whether you're going to get rain or not, you can put the pressure on a little more and get your crop off in dry conditions.

So these are some of the areas that we have to have more research in, and by reducing the staff, or taking them out, we lose. Not only do we lose, Mr. Speaker, but the whole country loses because it means there's a reduction in the production capacity in the West – in the agricultural area.

What about energy? I mentioned before about energy. I mentioned that with energy we can have independence from relying on foreign oil supplies. We see what happened to the oil supplies. They went zooming up; caused us great inflation. Then they got up to a high point, then all of a sudden because of conflict between Iraq and Iran, and because of need for moneys, Saudi Arabia not agreeing with the West, we see oil cartel falling apart and we see the oil prices dropping. When we see this happen, we don't know whether they're going to keep going down, or whether they're going to keep a certain price per barrel. A few years later, all of a sudden it can turn around and the price may go sky-rocketing again.

And we should be looking at the possibility of having alternative sources of energy, and the only way you're going to get this, Mr. Speaker, is by having research staff, developing new areas where we may be looking at, and that is as I mentioned before: alcohol plants, or whatever. Or solar energy, or biomass energy. All of these need research, Mr. Speaker, and the only way we're going to do that is to have the staff to do it. And if we pull those staff out and take that money out of here, we won't be able to continue in that area.

Further, they have in their brochure, in the structure of the research branch, areas on production and development of animals. For example, beef cattle. What are some of the goals there? The goals they had was in selection and cross-breeding: how they improve the stock, cow-calf systems, how to improve a better cow-calf crop, and how to utilize they type of range land, or forage crops. And this had to do with research. Feedlot systems – how feedlot systems can be improved. How insect pests can retard the growth of the animal and therefore cost you more days in the production of the beef that you're going to go ahead and sell. And in order to help the farmer, these are certain areas that they can zero in on and do research. And therefore it's important, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the research area is kept here.

Dairy cattle raising or having a dairy system or feeding animals in Saskatchewan or northern Saskatchewan compared to southern Saskatchewan is different. And when you compare that and you take feeding or have a dairy in Saskatchewan or Alberta or Manitoba, each province has different various climates and different kind of facilities. And this is totally different than having a dairy say in the coastline of B.C. where the temperatures are different. Or having a difference in Ontario where again we have different fluctuations of temperature. Or difference in the possibility of selling the feed to the open markets. We're more land-locked here. Where is our traditional selling area?

So you have not only development of how you can produce the beef better but also how you can market that beef and where you're going to market. And we have to be careful in that area also. You need the researchers to develop or to determine where the animals, where we're importing livestock in from.

These is the whole gambit of areas that research staff are needed and one individual can't do it. You need a battery of individuals. Two heads are better than one. And when the federal government comes along and wants to go ahead and take some of these out and reduce the amount of money there, we automatically lose. And as the member from Weyburn pointed out, every dollar spent in there has a certain extra number of dollars in return.

Poultry and sheep – we have these areas that can be developed. Honey-bees – we have honey farms or honey production in Saskatchewan. It's different possibly doing it here than doing it in different locations. And these are important.

What about cereal crop production? Cereal crop production is very important. We have wheat production, barley, oats, etc., rapeseed, mustard, flax – all of these crops are produced in the Prairies. Now where are you going to go ahead and do the research? Down in Ontario or down in B.C.? We have to do it here and the more we can generate research into developing hardier crops, shorter growing seasons and more drought-resistant, the better off we are going to be.

And these are the areas, Mr. Speaker, that the research staff have been working on and I suggest that we must keep them in that area.

It's a priority of spending. It's the priority of spending that is important. And if you spend your dollars in the right place, you got a lot more return than just spending it all over the place.

Processing is another area in technology that we need to spend some time on and if the research development is utilizing that area, the better off we will be.

I think that generates pretty well the whole research area. I'd like to commend the Minister of Agriculture and the member for Weyburn for bringing this up. The amount of money that's been spent in our programs. We have for example soils and water: there's total funding for '82-83 is about 1,103,500; crop production 1,460,000, just to give some examples. Into animal agriculture you have 738,500; economics and production, 20,000; toxicology, another 48,000. When you add up the numbers, Mr. Speaker, there's a considerable amount 3,500,000 in total grants and total amount. Then you have each net evaluation – for example, market production – that Saskatchewan Agriculture has contributed: 26,100 commitment there; flax growers, 3,000 commitment there. I can go on and on, but I'd just like to illustrate a few examples of what Saskatchewan Agriculture is doing for research in this province.

And I would suggest that if the federal government is sincere in being a federal government that reflects not only just Ontario and Quebec, that it go ahead and spend money in the West as well, and not only that – beef it up. And perhaps they'll get more unity in this country than they ever had before.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure in supporting the motion as presented by the member for Weyburn. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have just a few comments I'd like to make on this motion, Mr. Speaker. I don't think there are too many members here that would disagree with the fact that we need increased expenditure and research for agriculture. Agriculture is one of the, I think, most important industries that we have in Saskatchewan, and maybe the most important to Canada.

I think in the past we have seen a commitment by the former administration to research in agriculture, and I would only hope that the present government would continue that commitment, and they would provide more research, and more assistance for agriculture. However, I don't think that that has been the case in the past year, and the Minister of Agriculture is smiling there, and I'm sure he's going to improve that situation for next year.

I think it's sometime difficult for leaders in eastern Canada – political leaders in eastern Canada – to understand the industry of agriculture and what it does for Canada, because there's always been a problem trying to get different programs and different funding for agriculture. And it didn't matter what party it was, whether it was the Conservatives or the Liberals. They tended to make . . . If there were any cuts that could be made, they would make it in areas of agriculture. A good indication of that is what's happening with the Pepin plan and the Crow rate at present, where, if they're going to try to save any money, they're going to be doing it in an area that's going to affect

farmers. And that, Mr. Speaker, is something that I think we should be trying to address ourselves to, and trying to make Ottawa aware of.

One of the other things that I found kind of interesting is the kind of support that should be given for agriculture and really isn't. It isn't done on the federal level, nor is it really done on a provincial level. We have seen provincial governments all across Canada tend to be a little soft and want to . . . (inaudible) . . . assistance to the farmers and to agriculture. And that is happening in a lot of provinces, and it's happening in Saskatchewan to some degree. I can think of one area, if you want to look at using an example, would be the recent cut in the program the family farm improvements branch, and that was an area that assisted farmers – the department, or a branch, that assisted many farmers.

A lot of farmers over the years used that program to obtain a supply of water on their farm, to get waterworks installed in their homes, and it allowed them to do this with some technical assistance provided by FFIB, and also supplies that were given to them at a very reasonable rate, at a very reasonable price, Mr. Speaker. And that was something that the farmers appreciated. But what has happened to that program? It is no longer there. As of July 1 there will no longer be a family farm improvement branch. And I think it's somewhat ironical that this government can stand up and criticize the federal government for the cuts that they are making in agricultural research and in other areas, and at the same time, they go and they get rid of programs right here in Saskatchewan – programs that were beneficial to farmers. And there are going to be a lot of farmers there, Mr. Speaker, that are going to be critical of this government doing away with FFIB. So I think before we go and be too critical of the federal government we should look at what's happening provincially also, although I agree that there are a lot of criticisms of the federal government regarding agriculture. And I would hope that this government continues to look at them and to address what is happening in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, the critic for agriculture, I know has a good number of comments that he'd like to make on this motion. And since he is away at a meeting today, I would, therefore, beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 17 – Testing of Cruise Missile

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Chairman, I'm real pleased today to begin this debate regarding the resolution, on the resolution regarding the widespread opposition throughout Saskatchewan, throughout Canada, throughout the United States, to the opposition of the cruise missile testing and also the nuclear arms build-up.

In a social democratic society, people ought to have the opportunity to be heard, Mr. Speaker, and to have their issues represented in this legislature. As every member of this Assembly knows, Mr. Speaker, all across Saskatchewan, thousands of men and women are becoming increasingly concerned about the nuclear arms race, about the cruise missile testing proposed for northern Saskatchewan, and about this Conservative government's refusal to raise its voice on the issue. I therefore urge every member of the Assembly to join with me in supporting this resolution.

I would like to share with you my views on the cruise missile and why its testing must be stopped, as well as share with you some thoughts about the Devine government's

general approach to these questions – not divinely inspired. First though, Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell you something about myself and about why the issue of the cruise missile testing in northern Saskatchewan is so important to me.

I spent my early years in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, on the west side, not far from the Primrose bombing range. This land has been inhabited by my people for generations. It is their land, it is their community and it is their home which are at immediate risk. For many, many years now, the people of northern Saskatchewan have been ignored, neglected and poorly treated by the exploitive economic forces beyond their control. This government and its administration, its policies, are just one more example. It is therefore because of my deep personal roots in that part of our province that I initially developed such an intense feeling of this issue.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the CCF and the NDP have taken a firm and consistent stand on peace from their earliest days. This was made clear in the Regina Manifesto in 1933. Some 50 years ago at a time when memories of the First World War were still fresh and when aggressive patriotism was emerging from all over Europe. It was made powerfully clear again in 1956, Mr. Speaker, in the Winnipeg declaration of the CCF. Its opening sentence was as follows:

The aim of the CCF is the establishment in Canada by democratic means of a co-operative commonwealth in which the supplying of human needs and enrichment of human life shall be the primary purpose of our society.

Further on, in a section entitled 'Basis for Peace,' the declaration said:

The solution of the problems facing Canada depends in large part on removing the international dangers which threaten the future of all mankind. Therefore no task is more urgent than that of building peace and of foregoing international policies which will banish from the earth the oppressive fear of nuclear destruction. Only if there is a determined will to peace and if every part of the world is free from the fear of aggression and domination can progress be made towards a lasting settlement of outstanding differences.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote to the members some facts and figures which I picked up in a paper called the *New Internationalist* paper, dated April, 1983. And at this time, let us just take a look at the size of the world's war machine: 'Global military spending is now running at more than \$1 million per minute.' Also, Mr. Speaker: 'And there are some 50 million people world-wide working in the war machine of potentially aggressive nations.'

Mr. Speaker, these figures stand in stark contrast to the totally inadequate measures by the United States and some other countries for the basic services to the poor. There are inadequate health care services, Mr. Speaker, inadequate social services, even inadequate education services. Mr. Speaker, it is with this goal and this determination in mind that we must therefore all join in the struggle to stop the testing of the cruise missile.

Let there be no mistake. The cruise is not a defensive weapon. It is for one purpose only; it is an attack weapon for offensive purposes alone. It is becoming increasingly clear that the circumstances surrounding the signing of the Canada-U.S. agreement are highly suspicious. The federal government has been less than candid with Canadians,

and it now seems obvious that the Trudeau government has for many months been committed to allowing the U.S. to test this weapon in our country and in our communities.

There is evidence of a growing ground swell of opposition to the cruise missile from all over Saskatchewan and all over Canada. Just the other day, over the weekend, we had well over 80,000 people demonstrating in opposition to the cruise missile testing in northern Saskatchewan and also in northern Canada. There were people in Prince Albert, Saskatoon, and Regina, Vancouver, and various other communities throughout Canada that protested, that raised strong opposition to the testing of the cruise missile.

In Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker, and in northern Saskatchewan, in Meadow Lake, ordinary people of our province are coming together to discuss the issues and to join the common struggle against the cruise missile testing in Canada. That this is merely because of the immediate danger that it poses to my people in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker; that danger is not an insignificant one, though. Within recent months, for example, there have been three crashes involving military planes in that one part of our province. Within three months, there has been three jets with malfunctions that ended in destruction, Mr. Speaker.

No, the real reason for that opposition is much deeper and much broader. It is because all of us as morally responsible citizens know that nuclear arms pose the gravest threat to mankind ever known. We know that the cause of international peace is not furthered by nuclear proliferation. And we know that as responsible Canadians, we must struggle to reduce nuclear threats in the world and not to increase them.

Not only must we continue to inform our neighbours, not only must we continue to object to the cruise missile testing at every opportunity, Mr. Speaker, we must also persuade this Conservative government to oppose it, to state its position and to represent the views of the people that demonstrated so strenuously against the testing of the cruise missile.

As you know, so far the Devine government has not issued a single protest on this matter. It has not issued or raised one single objection. It has not spoken out for peace. Instead it has consistently tried to hide behind the shallow excuse that this is a federal matter, not a provincial one. This is not true, Mr. Speaker. You know and I know that peace and a noble and secure future for all of us are indeed matters on which our provincial government can and should speak out. To the extent that the Devine government quietly supports the cruise testing by its silence on the issue, to that extent it shows its moral bankruptcy.

To me it seems clear that the Devine government's morally bankrupt approach on the cruise testing issue, Mr. Speaker, is similar to its approach on some vital issues which affect us all. Let me just mention some of these.

First, there is the whole policy approach to the people of northern Saskatchewan. As you know, the Tories have done two things: destroyed the programs and services that had finally been established in northern Saskatchewan, and secondly, it has ignored the economic and social development needs of northern people.

Secondly, they have made drastic budgetary cuts in the wide range of environmental protection measures programs in this budget for the current year.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The question material in the motion that you are discussing is very narrow. It doesn't include the items that you are now raising, and I would ask the member to stay on the subject of the motion.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that to me, at least, the deliberate budget cuts demonstrate a general approach by the Tories, the same general approach, general policy approach as the quiet Tory support for cruise missile testing in Saskatchewan — a negative attack on programs for people, a negative attack on programs for our future, a negative attack on policies which show some responsible, moral leadership.

In conclusion then, Mr. Speaker, I wish to summarize a few main points about this issue. Nuclear arms are a concern to us all in this Assembly, and throughout Saskatchewan, and throughout Canada, and for many others, . . . (inaudible) . . . communities in the United States. To sit by silently, passively, as this Conservative government has been doing, is simply to abdicate moral responsibility. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude my remarks today by, once again, urging all members of this Assembly, on both sides of the House, to join with me in supporting this resolution. With that, I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to address a few brief remarks on this resolution. I had the opportunity Saturday to participate in a rally, and I want to repeat some of the comments I made there and add some.

I just want to deal initially, Mr. Speaker, with the Primrose air range and deal with some of the nonsense that has passed from the Attorney-General as the truth. Primrose air range treaty was signed in 1954. The treaty has no term on it. It is a treaty signed in perpetuity so long as the federal government wants to use that air range, and it was not renewed by the then attorney-general in 1980. And the suggestion coming from the Minister of Justice is false, and I can only assume he is very poorly informed.

What occurred in 1980 was in fact a renegotiation of the compensation due to the province; that must take place periodically. But there was no renewal of the terms, the term of that lease is in perpetuity. All the then attorney-general was doing was haggling, if you like, about the price. But he had no opportunity to haggle about the term of the lease itself.

I think it is largely irrelevant to drag into this debate the merits of signing the treaty in the first place. That treaty was signed in 1954 during the era of the Cold War. A different mood, a different culture prevailed at the time. To judge the government of that day by the standards and the prevailing mores of this day is unfair and illogical. And I am surprised that the Attorney-General should stoop to that sort of an argument. It has nothing to do, I suggest to members opposite, with the events of this day some 30 years later.

An Hon. Member: — When did the Cold War end?

Mr. Shillington: — The member from Prince Albert asked me when the Cold War ended. In the minds of some members opposite, I suppose the Cold War never will end. I suppose some members opposite will always need someone to dislike and someone to mistrust. And they're as far away and as misunderstood as anyone. I suppose the Soviet Union will do the member from Prince Albert as well as anyone. So if you want to continue the Cold War in your riding, hop to it. But I suggest to members opposite, and

the members on this side of the House, because not all the government members are opposite. I suggest to members in the government caucus that the continuation of the Cold War does very little to bring about peace.

I was present on Saturday and I felt a bit of nostalgia, Mr. Speaker, I felt a bit of nostalgia on Saturday, because I had not seen that kind of a movement, and that kind of a rally for many, many years. My first initiation into the . . . My first involvement with any peace movement was back in the early '60s when the unilateral disarmament movement began in the very early '60s, in '59, '60, '61. I was at that point in time just a teenager. That movement was as short-lived as it was illogical. It created a good deal of controversy. I think, because of its illogical nature, but it was very short-lived.

It was followed some three or four years later by the anti-Vietnam war movement. And I am sure members opposite are still fighting that one as well. You're probably still wishing that we had gone in and nuked the poor groups in Vietnam. That movement, however, Mr. Speaker, was successful. It began in the early '60s. It was a very long struggle, but that movement was successful, because the U.S. eventually withdrew unilaterally from Vietnam and left them to solve their own problems . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . In spite of the considerable temptation from the member from Prince Albert, I'm not going to rehash with him the Vietnam war. Suffice it to say, I think, if the member from Prince Albert is proud of the U.S. role . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I believe that the motion here deals only with the cruise missile and the testing range at Primrose Lake and in Canada. We cannot get into Vietnam or other wars.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, I will admit that I did succumb to the temptation to respond to the member from Prince Albert. He's always best ignored, and I should have kept that in mind, Mr. Speaker, and I will do so. Suffice it to say there's a mood out there today that I haven't seen for many, many years. I'm not sure what is causing it, whether it is just a cyclical thing, or whether people simply don't trust President Reagan; whether they find him less stable than they did Lyndon Johnson or John F. Kennedy. But there is clearly a different mood out there.

At the rally on Saturday which dealt with this issue, someone close to me said to me, 'You know I haven't seen this sort of a rally since the 60s.' Frankly, that was exactly what was going through my mind when that was said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I say to members opposite who are braying in the midst of my comments, I say to members opposite that the opposition to the testing of the cruise missile, and the support of the peace movement is very, very broad.

As I suggested to the government members opposite, I was preceded on the podium by the deputy mayor of the city of Regina; the Catholic archbishop, the Most Reverend Charles Halpin; the Anglican archbishop, the Most Reverend Michael Peers – and following me should have been someone from the government, but of course, you people chose not to. It's obvious from your comments shy you weren't there, because basically you don't share the goals of that peace rally.

The testing of U.S. armaments in Canada is scarcely new. That began long before I was born. What is different about the cruise missile is that heretofore the U.S. military involvement on Canadian soil has basically been for defensive purposes. NORAD (North American Air Defence) is a defensive treaty. It is not an offensive treaty. And the

U.S. military manoeuvres on Canadian soil have been defensive.

As my friend from Cumberland pointed out, this is different. This is different because the cruise missile is offensive in both terms of that word. It is offensive in the sense that it is meant for aggression; it is offensive in the sense that it is obnoxious to the vast majority of Canadian people. So the member, when he asks if it's offensive, uses it at least partially in the right term.

An Hon. Member: — Are you actually qualified to make that statement, Ned?

Mr. Shillington: — Well, I can say to the member from Regina North I've got one qualification for making that statement: I got elected to the Assembly of Saskatchewan. I was asked by the people of Regina Centre to provide some leadership and that's what I'm trying to do. I suggest to the members opposite that you might try to exercise some leadership on behalf of your constituents as well.

That is the only qualification I have, Mr. Speaker, to take a position on this, is that I feel I have a responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan to show some leadership. I only ask that members opposite show some of that same sense of responsibility.

There is little, Mr. Speaker, that Canada or Saskatchewan can do to contribute to the world's military arsenal. There is very little this country can do to add to the armaments. I am left in the dark as to what purpose all those armaments serve, bristling and pointing at everyone, but even if they did serve a purpose there's very little this country can do to make any meaningful contribution to it. Our population base and our resources are simply too small.

There is something, Mr. Speaker, that this country can do to bring about peace, peace in the world. Canada enjoys an international reputation far beyond its people or its resources, and it is that international reputation, that rapport with third-world nations, which we can use to bring pressure to bear equally on all of the superpowers. And I single out not one or the other. I suggest that we have a responsibility to bring pressure to bear on all super powers, because unless we do, unless we show this kind of leadership, we face imminent danger of nuclear war. We have never been closer to it than we are in this decade. And all peoples everywhere, whether they live in Germany, or Regina, or Prince Albert, have a responsibility to do what we can to bring about peace in the world.

The member from Cumberland has given his view of how that can best be done. His suggestion is that by refusing to allow this offensive weapon – offensive and offensive – by refusing to allow this weapon to be tested on Canadian soil, we can say to both superpowers that we believe that disarmament is a route you should be following, and we're going to do what we can to ensure that that happens. That is the one positive contribution we can make. We can bring pressure to bear on the superpowers – both equally, both equally . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I don't know what they're saying in Moscow about me. I'd be delighted to think that any comments I had were of such great import that they were the subject of discussion on the streets of Moscow, but I frankly don't think that I'm going to make it. I frankly don't think I'm going to make it.

Before I get called out of order, though, because I'm not sure I'm on the topic that I'm discussing, I want to close by saying that there is something positive we can do. The member from Cumberland has suggested what it is: to say to the superpowers, 'You cannot test or use offensive weapons on Canadian soil,' would be a message equally to

both superpowers. It would be positive. I urge the members opposite to show some leadership and at least allow the resolution to come to a vote. If you must oppose it, do so. But I urge members opposite to at least allow this resolution to come to a vote. You know what they were saying at the rally on Saturday. They were saying that you people don't share the goals of the peace movement but that you haven't got the guts to say so, and that's why you weren't there. That's why it was a no-show for members opposite. I would be delighted to think they were wrong. I'd be delighted to think you people will take a stand. So I urge members opposite to allow this to come to a vote. Vote as you will, but show some leadership on what must be the most important issue of our time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to an issue that I think many people across this country, and around the world, no doubt, are very concerned with. And to the Premier, and to the government side of the House, and I think they'll share, and the members opposite will also share my feelings generally about peaceful coexistence. I believe that every one of us in our society collectively abhor war. We collectively abhor war.

I would just like to extend to the opposition they're welcome to join us in this abhorrence of holocaust that has been historically shared by all nations of this world for thousands and thousands of years, virtually.

In the past 40 years, since the war – approximately 40 years – since the war to end all wars, I think there's probably more progress toward world peace than there was in the thousands of years preceding the great war to end all wars. The position that the opposition has taken today indicating that the government side of the House has no interest in peace . . . I might just express one experience I had recently, in fact it was shortly after Christmas when there was a candle lit for peace in Victoria Park in downtown Regina on an evening. I don't know exactly the temperature that evening, but it was nearing 30 below zero, and most of the members of that group were required to go to the Hotel Saskatchewan in shifts in order to warm their feet and hands so they could participate in a group meeting for peace. The one thing I noticed – and I wouldn't have brought it up today, except our colleague in the House from Regina Centre mentioned we are not interested – the only member from the legislature that was there that was invited, other than the opposition, was myself. I shared . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

He was present. I stand corrected – I was saying from the government side of the House. The member from Lakeview was present. It was so cold that evening, so cold that evening, that I never noticed the member from Lakeview just because of the breath – the breath for peace, Mr. Speaker, that we all share. The obvious absence was members of the opposition were not there to share in the march for peace in Victoria Park when it was 30 below zero. They chose to be there, and the member from Regina chose to be there, Mr. Speaker. He chose to be there when the temperature was near 20 degrees Celsius – the only time he's probably been for a walk, a walk of any kind, in 1983, let alone a walk for peace. He does not choose to walk for peace. He took his family out for a stroll on Sunday afternoon and happened upon a podium.

The Attorney-General apologized to this House yesterday in question period; he had other commitments. He was unable to be there, but he showed the respect we all have in this House for world peace, and I can appreciate the Premier and the Attorney-General when they suggest that the federal position and their position is for mutual

disarmament – mutual disarmament. The members opposite and their philosophical equals around the world would choose to have unilateral disarmament - unilateral disarmament, of course, giving their philosophy the advantage of the hammer and the advantage of the sickle, if you want to go that far. We in fact on this side of the House do not agree with unilateral disarmament, to arm one member or one nation against another, without the opportunity to defend itself. We also support mutual disarmament. We all support, on this side of the House, the mutual disarmament of all nations to strive toward world peace. And this side of the House will in fact endeavour to increase the level of activity in that area.

The opposition this evening also suggested that . . . The member from Cumberland suggested earlier that we have not addressed the issue. He said he has not heard a position expressed by the Government of Saskatchewan. The member from Cumberland may not have been in question period yesterday when the Premier of the province and the Attorney-General so articulately expressed our position. They outlined the fact that the agreement signed, that was negotiated in 1953, that was renegotiated in 1981 by members of the party opposite who were then in government, it was signed and it was in fact re-established in 1981 by Roy Romanow, who at that time was in a position where possibly he could have renegotiated the terms of this agreement. It wasn't done. It was renewed and extended. It's extended into perpetuity, Mr. Speaker, an agreement that was signed by a former government with a philosophy similar to those on the opposite of the floor at a time – and I can appreciate their concern at that time – a time nine years after the Great War. The concern, I think, was shared by all in Canada who had suffered and been touched by that war either through the death of friends, neighbours, relatives, or whoever. But I think the objective probably, at the time when that agreement was signed, was common to the objective we all have today: to assure world peace, to assure peace in this world that all nations can share and all people can share.

This peace will not come easy. It hasn't come easy historically, and it will not come easy into the future. It will only come through the negotiated efforts of nations throughout this world in aligning themselves in a manner that is not threatening to their neighbour. And I'm sure the government . . . We support that position. The Premier and the Attorney-General outlined yesterday in question period that mutual – mutual – disarmament in the goal that is shared by the federal government who has the auspices over this area. National defence does not come into the political theatre of provincial governments. National defence is the responsibility of the federal Government of Canada.

We are brought into this debate today by an opposition who is hell-bent for an issue. Unfortunately, since we've been elected, unfortunately for the opposition, we have governed this province in a manner, Mr. Speaker, that has probably been more responsible than any government we've had in the past 40 years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — And the opposition has raised an issue today that is shared by all but is not within our auspices and they are well aware, they are well aware of the government's position on this issue. But because of the fact we've governed well in the last 11 months and the fact that they have run out of gas on other issues . . . The gas is cheaper; they've run out, but they can buy it for less money than they could on April 25th last year. And I find that raising the issue as it is outlined in the motion which

suggests that the Government of Canada . . . the Assembly express to the Government of Canada its opposition to the testing of cruise missile systems on the Primrose Lake Air Weapons Range in northern Saskatchewan . . . I can appreciate expressing that concern and it has been expressed by all governments provincially in this country to the federal government. They have set their policies based on those, that input.

Today being the anniversary of the victory of our party, April 26th, 1982, they chose to raise an issue that deflects from the people of Saskatchewan the importance of the victory of the Progressive Conservative Party on April 26th, 1982. The importance of this victory . . . And, Mr. Speaker, I realize that you feel I may be getting off the topic . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. The member is off the subject of the debate and I would ask him to come back to the debate.

Mr. Sveinsson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point generally was that our concern for Saskatchewan people has been addressed in the last 11 months. And our concern for this issue, I can promise the people of Saskatchewan, will be taken very seriously, very seriously. And within the jurisdiction that we can act, we will act upon this particular issue very, very seriously, Mr. Speaker. And the people of Saskatchewan, I think, in the last 11 months have found that they can trust us as a government. We offered them several packages during our election campaign in April last year, and I'd just like to suggest to the opposition that most of those promises, most of those promises — promise is a tough word for them to accept — most of the promises have been delivered. And it's the promise of this government that the concerns shared by the people of Saskatchewan will be aired by this government regarding this problem.

I would like to remind members opposite also that members of your own government, prior to April 26th, were in fact involved in this debate to some degree. And I would just like to read from *Hansard*, March 17th, 1982, when a member of their own caucus rose in the House, Mr. Prebble, and questioned Mr. Romanow on exactly what we're discussing today. His question was:

My question to the minister is whether the Government of Saskatchewan would be prepared to advocate that the federal government adopt a policy of favoring a nuclear weapons-free zone in this country under which the testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons 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 proposal for nuclear submarines or nuclear-equipped aircraft to enter Canadian waters or Canadian air space.

A question by Mr. Peter Prebble, member for Saskatoon University, on March 17, 1982, and answered by Mr. Roy Romanow:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can endeavor to answer the hon. member's question in these terms. Obviously this is an area which is the responsibility of the federal government.

We agree with Mr. Romanow on that point . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . As the member just mentioned, there's not . . . We don't have consensus with Mr. Romanow on many issues; we do on this.

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 area 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 in 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.

Basically he agrees that it's a federal jurisdiction. The problem is one that will be dealt with at a federal level, although the concern's certainly shared by members of the provincial legislature.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to sum up the position the Attorney-General and the Premier expressed yesterday during question period, that of mutual disarmament of nations around the world, and that we would definitely support a position of mutual disarmament. I would like to ask the opposition to share with us in that appraisal of this problem, that in order to defend the freedoms and the rights that we share as Canadians, our interest in mutual disarmament is an extremely important factor in the end result of weapons manufacturing, wherever it may be in this world. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't really intended to get too heavily involved in this particular debate today because the matter was being well handled by my colleague from Regina North West. However, there were some accusations thrown around earlier, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the Government of Saskatchewan is somehow war-mongering, pro-war, and anti-peace, and I for one, on our side of the House, resent that implication. I would not say it's an absolute direct statement, but certainly it was implied, Mr. Speaker.

I share . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I see the member from Regina Centre is piping up again. Now, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman is rapidly becoming the John Q. Dingleheimer of Saskatchewan politics. And who, may you ask, is John Q. Dingleheimer?

An Hon. Member: — Who cares?

Mr. Maxwell: — Exactly. Thank you, member from Shaunavon.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't start this argument. You're all my witnesses on both sides of the House, but if we're going to get into an argument, then I'm certainly not going to be one to back away. Because, unlike some of the members on this side, I know where I stand on this issue, and we're not an obsequious, ingratiating little party who are trying to play up on the emotions of people who got involved in peace marches, Mr. Speaker. When the negative, disappearing party can come out and take a strong stand on anything, I'll be completely, surprised, Mr. Speaker.

Now I know exactly where we stand on this one. This government is deeply concerned

about cruise missile testing. We are concerned. We are also concerned about the whole area of nuclear arms proliferation. But the direct responsibility on negotiation on this particular subject is not ours; it isn't ours. Weapons testing is a matter which is related to national defence, as these members to my right well know. If it is a negotiable item in any sense, it falls within the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government. And the agreement in 1954, the then CCF Government of Saskatchewan signed, conceded control over activities within the Primrose weapons range to the federal government. That was a situation we inherited.

Now what was the motive of the CCF Party of the day in signing that agreement? I listened with interest when the member from Regina Centre talked about a cold war in 1954 and a different – he used the word – culture. Certainly there were different circumstances in the world of that time, a scant nine years after the end of World War II. Well, at that time in 1954, the member from Regina Centre is quite correct about the extent of the Cold War. We'd also come off a war involving Korea.

I agree that times have changed since then to some extent. But I do believe that the party and the government of that time was probably adhering to a belief, a belief that sprang up from the events leading to World War II, and that belief is, Mr. Speaker: the best way to prevent a war is to be ready for a war. I'm not saying I particularly adhere to that today in 1983, but it certainly must have been the motive of the CCF Party in 1954 when they signed the agreement, an agreement we didn't sign, but one which has bound us since that time.

Obviously Canada and its allies would prefer not to deploy missiles or nuclear weapons of any kind. Any probably at that time the government of the day was convinced that negotiations on disarmament would not succeed if western allies showed any signs of weakness. I submit, Mr. Speaker, we're facing a similar situation in 1983.

Canada's security policy for the past 35 years has had three main objectives. The first one is preserving peace – not promoting war, but preserving peace through collective security. And collective security arrangements revolve around NATO and NORAD also, promoting verifiable arms control and disarmament agreements. Third, working for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the removal of underlying political and economic and social causes of international tension. I agree once more with the member from Regina Centre, that Canada has had a role to play in that particular area of negotiation, and I think Canada has done extremely well. I don't mind agreeing once in a while with the member from Regina Centre. He doesn't always speak poppycock, Mr. Speaker – mostly, but not always.

Now those objectives are closely related to one another – those three particular objectives. In particular, participation in collective security arrangements – a support of some type of western deterrent are complementary with Canada's commitment to vigorous arms control and to disarmament policy, which I happen to believe in, if it is multilateral disarmament and not unilateral disarmament, and I don't recall hearing that particular distinction being made earlier by the members of the opposition.

Security is the key – security. The Canadian government does not consider that unilateral restraint or reductions by one side will lead to successful arms control agreement. Nations can be expected to accept reductions or limitations on their weapons only if they can be sure that their security will not be put in danger. And given events in Afghanistan and other points around the globe, I have serious questions

about our security, Mr. Speaker, should we be involved in unilateral disarmament. Again, I favour multilateral disarmament. I'm not sure that as a province we have the negotiating rights to conclude any type of multilateral disarmament agreement with any power.

I heard it said earlier by one or two members that we're talking about an offensive weapon in the cruise missile. It's rather hard to count the cruise missile an offensive weapon when it has a top flying speed of 500 miles per hour. One old farmer told me not so long ago – because we had a snowfall recently in the town of Spiritwood – he said, 'Given the speed of the cruise missile, my snowmobile could get to Russia faster than they could.' So I hardly count it as being an offensive weapon.

It is certainly not a first-strike weapon, in the sense of the word first-strike to initiate nuclear war.

As a provincial government, we don't have a say in the testing of the cruise missile at the Primrose Air Weapons Range, because of an agreement signed by the previous CCF government. We didn't bring that agreement in, and it wasn't there by our choice. The fact of the matter that it is there, and we are bound by it, does not mean that we are pro-war in any sense of the word. And once again, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say I take serious offence at being told that we are opposed to peace on this side of the House.

And with those few remarks, I know we have another speaker who'd like to address the issue. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Weiman: — Generally, Mr. Speaker, when I stand in the House, I usually preface any remarks I'm going to be making by saying that it's a privilege and a pleasure to be able to enter into debate. I generally look forward with a great deal of relish to enter into debate with the members opposite. This is one of those times I would like to say it is a privilege, but not so much a pleasure.

I would like to offer a couple of comments and a couple of thoughts to this House, Mr. Speaker. I may go back just a point when I said it was not necessarily a pleasure. I think we do, as a government or as an opposition, a great injustice to the people of this province when we raise their expectations as to the power of a provincial government vis-à-vis any agreements that the federal government has with any other nation of the world. As I mentioned, I believe it is a great injustice to raise those expectations of the people of our province. No one in this House in the debate that I've heard thus far could speak in favour of nuclear proliferation. No one in this House wants to even consider the devastation that a nuclear attack, or a surprise attack, could bring to this great country of ours.

This isn't a time to be discussing unilateral versus multilateral disarmament. What we are discussing here in this House today for the people of Saskatchewan is whether we as a sovereign province have the power to change or to control the jurisdiction of the federal government.

It reminds me, when I think of the holocaust that is possible with a nuclear strike, reminds me of a quotation that is said to be Winston Churchill's. After the Second World War, Winston Churchill was asked to comment on the great second world war to end all wars, as the members have mentioned, and to foretell what the third world war

might be. Winston Churchill thought about the matter for a moment and replied: 'I cannot tell you what the third world war will be fought with, but I can assure you that the fourth world war will be fought with sticks and stones.'

All of us here in this House would never want to see the day that our children had to fight that fourth world war. So it goes without saying, that to continue on and talk about the devastation of war and the cruelty of war is not the time at this particular moment.

The two thoughts I would like to bring up, Mr. Speaker, is one that was broached yesterday by the Attorney-General. Fact number one is, that we would not be in this situation today, discussing the deployment of the cruise for testing purposes over soil over Canada, under Canada, had it not been for an agreement that was made with the CCF government in 1954 and the Liberal Government of Canada.

Now one of the members opposite had mentioned that it was an unfair comment to make. My colleague from Turtleford suggested that it was not an unfair comment to make and I concur with that. If ever the mentality of the world was ripe to work towards peace, it must have been after the conclusion of the Second World War and the Korean conflict. The tragedy, the suffering of those years were still fresh in the memories of the Canadians, as well as the many new immigrants that came to this country and many of which came to the province of Saskatchewan. So I suggest it was a fair comment.

If that government in 1954 has seriously considered the moral implications of the agreement that it was signing, it would never have sat down at the table with the Liberal Government of Canada in 1954.

Fact number two, that the people of Saskatchewan should be aware of, and I alluded to it earlier when I talked about the opposition raising unfair and high expectations of the power of the provincial government via-a-vis the federal government. The fact is, it is in federal jurisdiction. Mr. Romanow, the attorney-general at the time, wanted to be clear on this issue and had asked on March the 16th, received a memo on March the 16th from a Mr. John D. White, the director of constitutional law, to give him some input into this matter. The reply to the attorney-general at the time was, and I quote on page one:

The federal government enjoys exclusive jurisdiction over defence.

And this agreement (the agreement of 1954) and the implementation of it are clearly exercises of a defence power.

In light of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:58 p.m.