

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**May 31, 1983**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I introduce to you and through you to this Assembly some students of Notre Dame college in Wilcox. Not only are they students of the college, they are the national juvenile hockey champions. The Hounds of Notre Dame are seated in the Speaker's gallery. I'd ask them to stand and be recognized.

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

**HON. MR. LANE:** — They are accompanied by their coach, Mr. Barry MacKenzie; assistant coach, Phil Ridley, and Louis Stoeckle. They are accompanied by Mr. John Weissnar. We did have the pleasure of meeting with them earlier, along with the principal, Martin Kenney. During the April 21 to 24 championship held in Ottawa, Ontario, the Hounds demonstrated the Saskatchewan spirit and defeated the Nepean juveniles to win the championship for 1983. As I advised, they had met the Hon. Paul Schoenhals and myself, the Minister of Culture and Recreation. We will be meeting with them again after question period for pictures.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all hon. members to join with me in sharing the pride in the athletic endeavours of the team, and the college. Martin Kenney advises me that Notre Dame has had a tremendous year in all aspects. I might advise the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that I believe seven of the team members have been successful in receiving athletic scholarships from various colleges in the United States. I hope that Saskatchewan at some point can address the very serious and important question of athletic scholarships. We wish them well in their future endeavours. Again, on behalf of all members I would like to congratulate them on their significant achievement and wish them the best in the future.

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

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker I want to join with the Minister of Justice to extend and join with him in the congratulation to the Notre Dame juvenile champions of all Canada. I had the opportunity of first seeing the juveniles in action in the preliminary round towards the championship which was held in Humboldt. I want to say that the display of their hockey was excellent. I knew that they could go on to better things. In fact they defeated the team in Humboldt in which my son played on, 9 to 2. And while that was regrettable, I want to extend to Barry Mackenzie, the coach, and Mr. Kenney, the principal of Notre Dame, our congratulations. Certainly sports, along with building character, has been a highlight of Notre Dame, and to all of you, I want to extend congratulations.

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

**HON. MRS. SMITH:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker it is my pleasure today to introduce to you . . . While they are not nationally renowned, there could very well be a few Hounds — in the group. They are a class of grade 6 students from the city of Swift Current, and also the rural areas. I believe there is one in there who has a father sitting on this side of the House, the member for Morse. They are accompanied by their teachers, Gerry Regier and Mr. Dick Dunlop. I will be meeting with you at 2:30 and I would hope, while this may be an educational experience, it would also contain some fun for you. I would ask that you all welcome them today.

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

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the assembly, some 24 grade 4 and 5 students from the W.C How School in Regina. They're seated in the west gallery. They're accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Jill Sargeant, and five parents: Mrs. Royan, Mrs. Konoff, Mrs. Coles. Mrs. Forester, and Mrs. Tucker. I want to first of all congratulate the parents of the students, Mr. Speaker, for taking the time and the interest in supporting their children's school activities. I'm going to meet with them at 2:30 for pictures and refreshments, and, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to join with me in extending a warm welcome to these students this afternoon, and I hope they will enjoy the proceedings of the afternoon.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Potash Marketing

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier. First, let me welcome him back from his extensive trip.

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

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — My question has to do with some of the comments which he was reported to have made during the course of the trip, particularly comments made to the Canada-Brazil Chamber of Commerce in Sao Paulo. You talked, according to the reports, about the need for Canpotex to find a number of innovative ways to market Saskatchewan potash to make it, in your words, 'irresistible' — innovations such as long-term contracts, competitive pricing and even barter arrangements. My question to you, sir, is this: were you indicating by your remarks that you were serving notice on Canpotex that for the next period of time, it either had to pick up its socks or else the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan would consider reviving its own overseas sales arm, PCS International?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't saying that. What many people around the world today want to know is that the major suppliers are prepared to go to work to accommodate some very difficult economic conditions. I believe, if you look at the events that led up the Williamsburg summit, the evidence points to very high rates of inflation, high interest rates, and some difficult periods of repayment. A country like Brazil, with about an \$80 billion debt, needs all the consideration that it can be given to cope with the short-run difficult situations with respect to their repayment potential. So what I said is that Canadians, and certainly Saskatchewan producers as represented by Canpotex, were prepared to look at ways to help the Brazilians cope with the short-run situation because we felt, in the long run, that trade and increased trade between our

two countries would be to our mutual advantage.

We said that there are some advantages, and I did — and I will elaborate just very briefly in a ministerial statement after question period — to have one voice speak for Saskatchewan. I'm sure the members opposite have done so, in talking about orderly marketing, certainly in talking about the wheat board, know some of the strengths, theoretical strengths of one voice speaking for a region, and we've faced some very severe regional competitors in eastern Europe and western Europe. All I was talking about was the strength of Saskatchewan in its ability to deal with some of its trading partners — and Brazil has been an excellent partner — in a very contemporary fashion.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. In view of the fact that Canpotex, according to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, has a policy of carrying accounts either for 30 or 60 days and no more, and that's still a current policy according to the minister. Can the Premier explain how we can effectively sell to Brazil through an arm which insists on getting cash on the barrelhead 30 or 60 days and no longer?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to talk about that in a few moments, but very briefly, we've arranged some means, with the help of the federal government and the banking institutions, to extend longer range credit. The Royal Bank of Canada, for example, is prepared to do so up to the extent of about \$15 million for up to 180 days which would make us competitive with the Soviet Union, the Israelis, and the Jordanians. As a result of continued negotiations, we hope to be able to put together some other financial arrangements which make it a little easier, as I've said earlier, for countries in south America like Brazil to cope with some very high interest payments that they have to make at the current time.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Saskatchewan's share of the Brazilian market dropped from 37 per cent in 1980 to 16 per cent in 1982 because we were not using the innovations now suggested by the Premier, will he not admit that the innovations which he now suggests Canpotex could introduce could have been introduced last year by PCS International, and improved our market share in Brazil very substantially in 1982, and not at some future time.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, two or three observations: Number one, the fall and the big drop as the hon. member knows, incurred in 1981 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 1981, under the former administration. Number two, I'll go back to my argument, and I'm sure the hon. member's argument with respect to the strength of, if you might say, a cartel, and if in fact you have a major potash producing region like the province of Saskatchewan you want to get into the ball game of, what you might call, destroying the orderly marketing process when you're into an international market. We deal with regional cartels out of the Soviet Union, regional cartel out of western Europe, and to date, we have the potential for a regional cartel out of Saskatchewan; certainly into many parts of the world, clearly not the United States.

The moves that were made by the Soviet block — particularly East Germany — the balance of payments problems between Brazil and Canada and east German countries has led to many interesting arrangements with respect to barter and trade and new trading relationships, which until now have led to many significant problems both in Brazil and in eastern Europe, and consequently into Saskatchewan. What we're proposing, and what we said to Brazil is that we're quite prepared to look at short-run

situations which will protect the Saskatchewan market — protect the Canadian market share, and not jeopardize the strength of having a regional voice speak for Saskatchewan potash.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier, and I'm now referring to the sale of Saskatchewan potash to Brazil, and as the Premier acknowledges, serious problems in that potash market developed in 1981, and it was necessary for Saskatchewan to respond. And Canpotex declined to respond, and PCS decided to set up its own arm, decided in 1981 to do that, effective July 1, '82. The use of those techniques could have sold more potash. My question to you is this: if these techniques are now, in your judgement, likely to sell more potash in 1983 and 1984, why did you not adopt them through PCS International effective July 1, 1982, and see that Saskatchewan enjoyed a much larger market share commencing a year ago?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, we want to make it very clear that what is possible in Canpotex under our administration is a lot different than what would have been possible under Canpotex under the former administration. Clearly, that's the case.

The confidence that we can build internationally, as a regional seller through Canpotex, is now becoming extremely clear. The buyers of potash from Saskatchewan from all over the world are quite prepared and are happy to hear that we're dealing through Canpotex as one voice — one voice. And the arrangements that we're making in international trade through one single seller out of the province of Saskatchewan can be no way reflected in saying you're going to take a separate, individual potash corporation, whether it's public or private, and make some tremendous big sales. I believe the Leader of the Opposition has been referring to something in Brazil that they had a couple of hundred thousand tonnes sold. There was no evidence of that at all — no evidence of that at all.

So the arrangements that we're making today, and those that we've been making for some time, in rebuilding the confidence in the industry, that was destroyed by the NDP, the former administration, takes some time. The confidence caused major falls in 1981 — major falls . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . The hon. member knows that the significant drop was in 1981. The impact that they had on the industry in 1981 was dramatic. The impact that they had in 1982 was dramatic, and it's going to take some time and some effort to rebuild the confidence in the Saskatchewan potash industry.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Premier referred to a line of credit organized through the Royal Bank of Canada. Did he organize that line of credit, or did the Government of Canada?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, it's combination of efforts by the federal government at the encouragement of provincial officials, a co-operative effort between the two levels of government and the industry to make sure that Canadians are competitive internationally.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I take it the minister agrees that it was not made by Canpotex, since he didn't even mention their name. Does he not agree that this could equally have been done on behalf of PCS International as well as Canpotex, and we would have had sales going back more than a year ago? Does he not acknowledge that potash sales have fallen and that the first four months of 1983 are below the 1982 figure which he said followed the loss of confidence in the industry?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it's clearly that the hon. member opposite would have preferred to remove the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan out of Canpotex, jeopardize the sales of all other Saskatchewan producers in markets all over the world — whether this be in Asia or South America or so forth — and the people of Saskatchewan would have lost. Well, in practice, Mr. Speaker, and in theory — and I'm sure the hon. member is familiar enough with it — there are some strengths in an oligopoly, in a cartel. And if we can build on those strengths using the entire cartel it's better than using one particular independent Saskatchewan producer and sacrifice the rest. So we have rebuilt the confidence in the industry in the province of Saskatchewan so that we can deal as a unified force internationally, except in the United States, and as a result it's going to be much more effective than tearing it down like the previous administration wanted.

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

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — A couple of quick questions. I noted also, in Vienna the Premier talked about . . . 'Devine Lauds Free Trade in Speech to Fertilizer Conference.' Does the Premier feel that free trade is consistent with oligopolies and cartels?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — when I'm talking about free trade in wheat, I expect the wheat board to be competitive and provide wheat all over the world and other countries to reciprocate. When I'm talking about trade in Canpotex, I'm talking about them being competitive all over the world and being able to trade because both countries benefit from mutual trade.

What I did talk about in both places was the strength of one region speaking with one voice. As the wheat board speaks for Canada when it comes to marketing grain, Canpotex can speak for Saskatchewan when it comes to marketing potash.

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

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — One final question, Mr. Premier. You indicated that confidence in Saskatchewan's potash industry has been lost in 1981, and in that dark year, PCS made a profit of \$141 million. When do you assume that under your enlightened leadership that record of that dark year will be surpassed, and we will see profits of much higher than \$141 million?

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

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows well that the trading that has gone on around the world internationally with respect to potash and many other commodities has changed dramatically in potash, but also in many other commodities, as a result of the balance of payments problems faced by many countries. Brazil is a typical example. When you begin to trade on a barter basis . . . When Brazil begins to trade on a barter basis with East Germany, it makes a significant impact on what might happen with the Canadian economy.

Now I will continue in a little more detail in a few moments what the impact is in terms of Canadians at the national level and at the potash industry level being able to deal with countries like Brazil which decided, as a result of international financial problems, not to trade with Canada at all on many other things.

### Salary Increases to Premier's Staff and Minimum Wage Freeze

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. I, too, would like to welcome him back from his trip and I'm sure that his staff will be bringing him up to date on what has occurred in the province since he left. I would like to recommend to him a quick update on what the mood of the province is, and I would like to quote from the *Estevan Mercury* on that issue. And it says in part:

The folks in the Estevan constituency are still wondering when our leader and MLA is going to do something for us. After all, he was a parachute candidate and the folks were good enough to elect him to power.

The article goes on, Mr. Premier, to talk about the inconsistency of limiting minimum wage to 4.25 an hour at the same time as you increase drastically your own personal staff. And I wonder, in your trip that you took, did you have time while you were in Vienna or Rio, to reconsider the ill-conceived plan to raise the wages of your own staff, or if you're now considering rolling them back until minimum wage is increased in the province?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's question with respect to letters to the editor, it says on page 8 . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Page 8 of the *Commonwealth*, recent edition, a policy with respect to letters to the editor, and I say as a quote:

Regular letters are being sent from caucus (from caucus) but the bulk must be done at the local level to be effective.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if it's NDP caucus policy to send letters to the editor using local people so that it can become 'more effective,' then perhaps maybe we could find out who sends the letters to the editors, and provides the kind of information the hon. member is talking about.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure after that, that I do welcome the Premier back because of the mass confusion that reigns while he's here. This is not a letter to the editor. This is an editorial from your newspaper in your home riding. And I would like to quote from it again:

It's hard to visualize how a government that has frozen minimum wage for two years can be so generous to those at the top of the income scale. Those at the opposite end are finding it increasingly difficult to make ends meet at 4.25 an hour.

Now the question is, Mr. Premier, while you were on your trip, did you have an opportunity to review that ill-conceived plan to drastically increase the salaries of your staff and freeze minimum wage? That was the question and I'd like a response to it.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that same editorial might have predicted that the NDP would win the next election back in April of 1982. So with respect to wage increases, Mr. Speaker, I said that there would be wage increases corresponding to increases in productivity because by definition, it isn't inflationary.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members know that nobody is confined to minimum wage —

nobody. Nobody's confined to minimum wage. If they want to make improvements in productivity throughout the civil service, the government service, they can receive increases with respect to productivity because they warrant it.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question about one of those dynamic new team, part of the team that you talk about being so productive in getting increases — one Derek Bedson, part of the new image of Saskatchewan politics. Can you tell me where Mr. Bedson will be located after tomorrow when his job as your deputy minister ends? Can you give me his point of residence, where he will be established, and where he will have an office after today? And also, can you tell us whether his salary has been increased even further to mark the more productive work that that individual is doing?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member would recall that I announced before I left that the increase would not apply to Mr. Bedson and to Mr. Gren Smith-Windsor.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That was when you left? What about now?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — It still doesn't apply.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, the question was . . . There were two parts to the question: one, whether his salary would be increased — and I'm glad you've limited that dynamic individual to 84,000 a year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 85,000 a year I'm informed by the member for Elphinstone — but can you tell me where he will be located after today, where his point of employment will be? Will it be in the United States, in London, in Vienna? Can you tell us where he will be located for 85,000 a year?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, as a result of my trip I can say that there are many places in the world that haven't even heard of Saskatchewan, and haven't heard enough about Saskatchewan, so that there are all kinds of opportunities for Saskatchewan people to be abroad marketing the message about Saskatchewan and the opportunities we have and the products we have to sell. I'll be making an announcement in due course, Mr. Speaker, with respect to new positions and new offices, wherever they are.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Premier tells us that there are many places that don't know about Saskatchewan in the world. I wonder if this is the only individual — a person who has been in Saskatchewan for about a year — is this the only individual . . . young and vital as he is, is he the only one who you will be sending to tell about Saskatchewan and the values of it?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, there's all kinds of potential for Saskatchewan to make its mark in the world. There will be many programs and many opportunities for Saskatchewan people to express themselves internationally — in Europe, in south America, the Pacific Rim, the United States, and so forth — and we'll be making those announcements in due course.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, just one very quick follow-up. Some of your staff have shelter allowances. I wonder whether you've arranged for Mr. Bedson to have a wine allowance.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I have no response there.

## **Trade Union Act Amendments**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of labour. My question to the Minister of Labour is this: in view of the fact that you plan to introduce trade union act amendments tomorrow, I believe, has the minister consulted with representatives of employers and representatives of working people with respect to this bill?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, we have held many, many meetings with unions, with employees, with employers. In fact yesterday afternoon for five hours I was with various groups. I'm leaving in about another half-hour for a number of other group meetings with unions and employers.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is reported that some employer groups have received rough draft copies of the bill. Would the minister confirm that, and would he advise whether or not any trade unions have received a rough draft copy of the bill?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no one has received a copy of the bill.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to re-phrase my question because obviously the minister is taking refuge in 'copy.' I'll put it the other way. Have you provided a detailed outline of the contents of the bill to both employer groups and employee groups, indicating not what the issues might be addressed but rather, what solutions you proposed?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not handed out detailed specifics of The Trade Union Act amendments that are coming down tomorrow. We have given in our meetings yesterday some policy areas that we might be heading off into, but nothing in specifics.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, will the minister confirm that his consultation with trade union groups has been no more extensive than providing a general list of what he feels the issues are, as opposed to any indication of how he proposes to address those issues?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, all that we have done so far is listed the policy areas that we thought we'd address in our amendments. Those were handed out to the unions yesterday and the groups that we met, also the employer groups that we met yesterday, and I'll be doing the same this afternoon.

## **MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**

### **International Trade Meetings**

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to spend a few minutes presenting a ministerial statement with respect to the international travel that I have been involved in in the last couple of weeks. The object of the intergovernmental meetings, with several countries and industry officials, was to improve Saskatchewan's economic position in the currently difficult world of international



trade.

Recent circumstances leading up to the Williamsburg summit clearly point to large deficits in developed and developing countries alike, a growing tendency towards protectionism, and international fears of renewed cycles of inflation. The general high interest rates have caused repayment problems for developing countries, as well as trading problems for eastern European countries, which further leads to a lack of hard currency needed for their purchase of grain, livestock and manufactured goods. Thus eastern European and South American countries have been increasingly tempted by barter arrangements to avoid international interest payments.

Consequently the Saskatchewan delegation took the opportunity to find out first hand: one, the problems faced by our customers; two, the difficulties experienced by our major competitors; three, how well Saskatchewan public and private companies were performing in the market-place; and, four, the extent that international people were aware of business opportunities in Saskatchewan.

Most of the meetings were about potash markets, grain and livestock sales, energy, tourism, two-way trade opportunities in manufactured and consumer goods, and Saskatchewan opportunities in general. I'll just very briefly point on four or five meetings.

The first was in Vienna, at the International Fertilizer Association. The keynote address by Saskatchewan, followed by a significant statement by Sir Robin Ibbes of Great Britain, made it clear that world protection would only make domestic economic conditions worse in the long run. Saskatchewan took the position that more trade, rather than less, was the key to mutual success. Because eastern and western European potash producers effectively use regional marketing groups, Saskatchewan made it very clear that our public and private producers, represented by Canpotex, were prepared to represent this region of the world in a very vigorous fashion. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan competes independently for the U.S. market, and our European competitors were advised how competitive we can be in difficult times. It was made clear that each Saskatchewan producer independently considers the U.S. Midwest as Saskatchewan's backyard, and would not see long-run market share jeopardized by short-run European or Israeli activities.

We had several very good meetings with most of our major customers, like China, Japan, and India, and discussed their problems about long-term trade relationships. Similarly, in talks with competitors we gained information on transportation changes, product quality, and technological changes in the industry.

With the help of the Canadian ambassador, Mr. Alan Sullivan, several meetings were set up with Austrian energy and steel companies to explore international trade and mutual economic development. Deep-well exploration and the use of new mining technology were two topics of discussion.

Similarly, the whole question of convincing Europeans to travel to Saskatchewan was reviewed. In our view, far too many do not know where Saskatchewan is or what there is to do in the province of Saskatchewan. For example, a Canada information office in downtown Vienna did not even have a Saskatchewan brochure. Other provinces were represented, with brochures from Alberta, from British Columbia, Ontario, Nova Scotia. The individual at the desk said that if they ever did receive something from Saskatchewan they usually kept it as a keepsake because they didn't want to give it out because they weren't receiving any and hadn't for years.

East Berlin. The reasons for the East Germany visit were two fold: one, to find out how well they mined in the potash business: and two, to give them the message that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was very determined to maintain and build our market share in the U.S. Midwest. The same message, I might add, was given to the Russians, the Israelis, and the Jordanians.

We had several meetings with trade and international economic officials. Ambassador John Fraser from Warsaw joined us in the potash mine tour and in the trade discussions. The East Germans are very interested in trading with Saskatchewan and talked about such possibilities as grain, livestock, mining technology, equipment and energy.

The Alberta trade missions and the trade exhibits in Leipzig led by Horst Schmid had left a very favourable impression on the East German executive.

West Germany. Several Saskatchewan officials discussed the potential for opening a trade office in Dusseldorf. The Consul-General, Mr. Maldwin Thomas and the trade commissioner, Mr. Ed Shelly were very helpful in pointing out that many important trading jurisdictions have trade offices open there. For example, every major Japanese trading company has an office in Dusseldorf as does Ontario. A Saskatchewan trade office is under very serious consideration, with a potential announcement as early as this fall.

West German officials indicate that complete tour packages needed to be offered to Europeans planning travel in western Canada. Similarly, investment and market development funds from Europe need information on the opportunities in the province of Saskatchewan. These packages need to be produced in Saskatchewan and marketed all over Europe. The Saskatchewan presence in Europe, frankly, needs to be revamped in a major fashion.

London — the objectives of the London leg of the mission were to, dispel any rumours that the former Saskatchewan administration's plan to dismantle the office of the agent-general was consistent with the current thinking and, two, to examine the operation closely and indeed expand its capacity in London. Mr. Bob Larter was very excited over the potential for expanding the focus of the London office as both the administration centre for European trade, tourism and investment activities, and also as a development arm to penetrate the Middle East market.

Mr. Merv Johnson, retiring agent-general, was extremely helpful in providing us with ideas of what could be done with the office and many of the changes that could be made to have the communication links between Saskatchewan and the London office improved. Good economic discussions were held with the high commissioner, Mr. Jamieson, trade commissioners, financial people, wheat board officials, and other business men.

Finally, Brazil — the first trade discussions took place in Rio de Janeiro with the major trading companies and import-export licensing agencies. Perhaps due to the previous week's rather serious discussions and because of our trip, CACEX advised us that import permits would be granted for approximately 50,000 tonnes of potash to be purchased this year. This was an interesting development for several reasons: first, the market in Brazil does not open until July and August; second, the sales are about four times what was purchased last year during the same period; and thirdly, many of the

non-tariff barriers and excuses for not purchasing Saskatchewan potash were dealt with across the table.

For example, we were able to get assurance from the Canadian government and the Brazilian government to resolve their quarrel over statistics and trade balances. Secondly, with the co-operation of the Royal Bank of Canada, we were able to secure longer-run credit terms for up to \$15 million for future potash sales. Finally, a major commitment by the Brazilian Minister of Finance to make a current statement about Canadian-Brazilian trade relations was made. Mr. Brian Schumaker, consul general in Rio, and Mr. John Broadbent, trade commissioner, were very helpful.

Similarly, the Brazilian wheat board, Mr. Speaker, announced that it would be purchasing the maximum of 1.5 million metric tons from Canada, which is consistent with our three-year long-term agreement. Ambassador Robert MacLean met the Saskatchewan delegation in Sao Paulo, along with several trade officials, and was very helpful in meeting industry people interested in Saskatchewan.

I addressed the Canadian-Brazilian Chamber of Commerce and reiterated Saskatchewan's confidence in Brazil and the benefit of increased trade. Several meetings were held in the capital, Brasilia, with cabinet ministers and officials about Saskatchewan-Brazilian trade in potash, wheat, oil, livestock, high technology, coffee, juices, clothing, tourism, and communications technology. While we were in the midst of our discussions, we were informed that the World Bank had made a major statement that international finance should be used for increasing agricultural productivity in developing countries. This international economic statement coincided well with discussions on joint ventures in land development, fertilizer use, and the potential for the development of Brazilian Amazon potash resources, by changing Saskatchewan potash technology for a larger market share in the long run.

Brazilian people have done a remarkable job in the last 25 years. They have replaced much of their oil imports with domestically produced alcohol fuel, and are now the second largest exporter of soy beans in the world.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan delegation worked hard in over 30 meetings, by letting many of our customers and competitors know that we are indeed open for business and are serious about our international commitments, and we want them to get to know us better. We received firm commitments by many countries and companies to attend the Potash Trade Show '83 in October in Saskatoon, and to attend other Saskatchewan trade shows like Agribition, Energex, and the Farm Progress Show.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has a responsibility to the world to help feed those who are hungry, and a responsibility to ourselves to not waste our own potential. It's only the beginning.

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

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the Premier for that extensive report. I will not try to reply to it point by point. I will make a few observations and comments. The Premier found himself in the position of any ambassador for Saskatchewan abroad. He talked about grain — wheat particularly — and he found, I am sure, that the Canadian Wheat Board is a vigorous salesperson, but that we from Saskatchewan should add our weight and attempt to ascertain where there are problems in marketing of Canadian

wheat and relay those to the wheat board.

He spoke of potash and livestock. I now that others who have travelled abroad — including me when I occupied that post — did the same thing, and with some effect, as I'm sure the travel of the Premier will have some effect.

I am pleased that he noted in Vienna that Saskatchewan stands for broadening trade and not protectionism. There is little for Saskatchewan in any policy of vigorous protectionism, either by Canada or any of our trading partners. We here in western Canada, and particularly in Saskatchewan, need to underline that point.

He had meetings with our competitors in the potash industry, and that I commend. We had a number of meetings with the soviet Union, who are always a major potential competitor, and sometimes an actual competitor, and these exchanges help to improve the knowledge we have with which to do our planning.

May I make a couple of observations now. If his statement suggested that there was any plan of the previous government to close Saskatchewan House in London, he was misinformed. The rumour never had any substance.

With respect to the discussions, generally he found that interest rates have been a major bugbear in international trading in the last couple of years, and I hope he will use all of the power of his office to persuade the Reagan administration in the United States to abandon its high interest rate monetarist policies and to pursue a policy of lower interest rates and expanded economic activity.

And one final point — his discussion in Brazil indicates, I think, the nature of trading in the world today. And whether or not the people in Korea to whom one sells potash, or Brazil to whom one sells potash are private sector or public sector purchasers, the decisions are effectively made by governments. And as the Premier indicated, an import permit was given by the government to import the 50,000 tonnes of potash and that made the deal possible. We are in the day of dealing government to government throughout the world in many of these areas, and we are unwise to assume otherwise and, in my judgement, unwise to use any marketing arm in whom we do not have full confidence that it speaks for our government, because we are certainly going to deal government to government in selling potash to Brazil and Korea, whatever the form may be, and to China and effectively to India and a good number of other countries, indeed most countries outside of North America.

Those points I think the Premier would probably agree with. I thank him for his extensive statement and hope that his efforts abroad will yield great success for Saskatchewan.

## **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

### **Bill No. 97 — An Act to amend The Pest Control Act**

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Pest Control Act.

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

### **Bill No. 98 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts**

**resulting from the enactment of the Northern Municipalities Act**

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, I move first reading of a bill respecting the consequential amendments to certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Northern Municipalities Act.

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

**Bill No. 99 — An Act respecting the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders**

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting the reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders.

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

**Bill No. 100 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act**

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Land Titles Act.

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

**RULING BY MR. SPEAKER**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before orders of the day, I would like to make a brief ruling on the order brought forward by the Minister of Finance yesterday. I went back and reviewed the record, and also reviewed the guide-lines that were set out at the time that the question period was first struck; and I've reviewed *Beauschesne's* in all its clauses we would likely not be able to carry on a question period in this House because of the restrictions it provides.

I believe that the question period yesterday, though some may not have thought the questions to be urgent . . . That's very difficult for the Chair to rule — whether or not a question is urgent and of immediate importance — because it is, perhaps, of immediate importance to the person asking it and may not be to the person that was listening to it. Also, the question sometimes in its first statement does not bring out its most pertinent fact, and rather the pertinent points of the question come out in the supplementary questions. So for the Chair to rule when the question is first asked, I think, would be very, very difficult. I would ask the members on both sides of the House to try and keep question period as sharp and pointed as possible, and answers to be very much the same.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**MOTION UNDER RULE 16**

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise today to discuss and debate what we in the opposition believe to be one of the most pressing problems facing the young people in Saskatchewan today; and that is the problem that they are finding having . . . the problem they are having finding jobs — meaningful jobs — or, in fact, any kind of jobs at the present time under the economic circumstances that was now find ourselves in in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will be well aware that only 14 months ago there was a campaign ran in Saskatchewan which, in many respects, played upon and campaigned towards the audience of the youth of the province of Saskatchewan. And we will all remember the clichés and the slogans: bring the children home; and there's so much more we can be. And campaign literature that was used by the new government was full of that kind of slogans, and I have here one pamphlet call *Commitment* which, in part, I would like to quote from. It says 'Provide Jobs and Opportunities,' one section of the brochure:

An industrial strategy will emphasize development of renewable resource potential that will ensure permanent rewarding jobs here in Saskatchewan.

And this referring to young people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the youth of the province have come to know is quite different from what was promised prior to last April 26. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the 14 short months since that election campaign, we have found that unemployment among the youth segment, that segment between the ages of 15 and 24, has risen and risen dramatically in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these glowing campaign promises stand in stark contrast to the reality which is present under a Conservative government. They promise jobs, and the reality is the worst youth unemployment that this province has known in decades. And this isn't based on any numbers that we have thought up or conjured up, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They are based on what is known by the government as their own record from the Department of Labour. And by youth employment I would like to go through some of the statistics which would compare the first four months of 1983 under the new Conservative government. And the facts, their own numbers, the ones that they publish on a month-to-month basis, are in fact very revealing.

In January of last year there were 11,000 people between the ages of 15 and 24 looking for work, and in February that number was 13,000; in March, 12,000; in April 12,250 young people per month who were unemployed. And we believe that to be a significant problem. We believe that to be a problem so important that we would go forward and, through our budget which we had designed in March of last year, bring an out and introduce the biggest job creation program in the history of the province in order to alleviate that very high rate of 12,000 people per month.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Conservative government that came on the scene at that time was elected with the promise of, 'There's so much more we can be.' And here again, the theme, 'There's so much more we can be,' is really dramatized in the numbers that would indicate there was indeed so much more employment that could be created among the young people of the province.

And you'll remember the statistics that I gave you for the first four months of 1982, and I would like to compare those to the first four months of 1983. During the first four months we saw numbers like 19,000 in January of 1983. That is up from what I mentioned earlier, 11,000 in 1982. In February, the number of young people employed in 1983 was 18,000, up significantly from that time last year. And in March

of 1983, it was 20,000 young people unemployed compared to 12,000 a year earlier. In going through this record, I find that the total increase in unemployment among that sector of the labour force is in fact a 53 per cent increase for an average per month of 18,750 young people being unemployed each month at the present time.

In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan, which is often talked about being the lowest in the country, and is if you go by the raw numbers, but if you include the number of people who are now employed, so-called, on the farm — which has increased by 10,000 people in January, and February, and March . . . Lord only knows what those individuals might be doing on the farm in those months. But I would assume they're at home simply because there are no jobs in the city, and they find it one way of putting three square meals a day into their stomachs simply because of the fact that they are now living at home rather than working in the cities.

But getting back to the increase in the unemployment among young people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find that that group of people now has an unemployment rate throughout the province at 16 per cent. And my colleague from Athabasca, I'm sure, will fill us in on the unemployment in northern Saskatchewan which among that age group is much, much higher. And before members of the government caucus rise to their feet and talk about gloom and doom that they would have us believe is being attempted to be created in the opposition, I would like to say that these gloom-and-doom numbers are facts. They're their facts, and so if they're saying that they're gloom and doom, I would ask them and beg them to do something about the gloom and doom that they are creating among the young people in the province today. Because very, very truthfully the young people who I talk to who are without jobs are floundering in the province of Saskatchewan at the present time.

What the government would have us believe is that this group, too, has not got the Saskatchewan spirit. Simply if they believed in how great the Conservative government was, and if they believed in this and that, they would be all right. But the very simple fact is that this government has failed, and failed miserably in the past year, and has failed again with the program that they have brought out known as Opportunities 1983. I think you need to look at the program closely to find out where the failings of this program are.

First of all, the amount of money that they are talking about putting into the program is \$3.7 million. In asking the government earlier about the amount of money the increases in salaries will cost for their personal staff and high paid salaries of their civil servants, we find that that increase alone, by their own admission, is around \$6 million. So the youth of this province, the job creating program is slightly more than half of the increase which will go to senior civil servants and the political staff in the province of Saskatchewan.

There are other major flaws in the program, as well. For example, you have to have registered for classes this fall, as I understand it, in order to qualify for the program. So any student who is not planning on going back to university next fall, be that because they cannot afford it because of ever-increasing tuition fees and have to stay put and work a year, they will not be eligible for this new Opportunities 1983 program. If they're a graduate from a technical school or a university, they, as well, are excluded.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, even if the program lived up to the very highest expectations of the government, which would mean 3,500 new jobs would be created, that would mean that you would still have in the province of Saskatchewan about 15,000 young people

who are unemployed. And many people in the province do not believe that 3,000 or 3,500 jobs will be created by this program when you look at the amount of money which is being put into it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to point, as well, to the fact that at the Canadian employment placement office in Saskatoon, the number of people who are seeking jobs and placement in jobs at that centre alone presently stands at 2,000. And of those 2,000 who are seeking employment through this centre, only 329 of them have been placed at this time, and 100 of them for less than five days. So if you look at the number of people who have found employment for more than five days, students who have found employment for more than five days in the province of Saskatchewan, out of the Saskatoon centre, you'll find that the number is 228 out of 2,000. And this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not gloom and doom. These are the facts. These are the records. And I would ask the members of the government to stand up in their place and tell us how they expect this job-creating program to mean anything to those 18,000 or 19,000 students who presently find themselves unemployed and unable to find work, and for that reason many who will be unable to continue their education because they will not have the money to return to university.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that it's past due when this government should come to grips with the unemployment situation we are seeing in Saskatchewan, whether it's the 60,000 overall or the one-third of that 60,000 who make up the student unemployment population. I believe it's time that this government show economic leadership in the province of Saskatchewan. And that is why I move, seconded by the member for Athabasca:

That this Assembly condemns the Saskatchewan government for its failure to recognize the plight of many thousand Saskatchewan students and young people who cannot secure summer employment and that this Assembly urges the government to exercise positive economic leadership in implementing immediately a full array of effective measures which will enable the youth of this province to secure meaningful and rewarding employment opportunities.

**MR. FOLK:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With a great deal of pleasure that I rise in the House today and move an amendment to congratulate our government for its measures to help students to find rewarding employment this summer. That motion which I will introduce will read as follows;

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the words 'that this Assembly and substituting therefor the following: 'congratulates the Government of Saskatchewan for the success of the Opportunities '83 student employment and commends it for establishing the small business employment program which will provide 4,000 new jobs in the small business sector.'

Mr. Speaker, I've listened a little bit to the members of the opposition and in particular the member from Shaunavon who says, 'Don't get up and talk about gloom and doom.' Well, perhaps I won't do that because they obviously recognize that that's all they can talk about over there. As long as that black cloud just goes over those three members there, that is fine with me.

As all members of this House are aware — or at least I think all members — we, the



industrialized countries, in recent months are years have gone through a period of economic recession. This has had many ramifications, Mr. Speaker, which the former government of our province tried unsuccessfully to grapple with and which our government, during its first year in office, had fought effectively through a number of positive actions.

As the Minister of Finance stated in his excellent budget address just two months ago, nationally, inflation is down; and in Saskatchewan, inflation is down even further. Through such measures as elimination of the road tax on gasoline, the Mortgage Interest Reduction plan, changes to the oil royalty structure, and the farm purchase program, our government has helped to ensure that Saskatchewan's economy gets healthier and healthier, leading all other jurisdictions in what I believe are the most important measures of economic performance.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we all recognize, I think, that during difficult times it is often the young and students who suffer because of rising costs and unemployment. And it is precisely because youths are particularly hard hit by financial difficulties during downturns in our economy, that this government took a major step to help create summer employment during 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that Opportunities '83 is a program which gives an excellent view of just what this government is all about. It is responsive to the needs of students and it is responsive to the needs of employers. This government, in other words, is responsive to the needs expressed by the people of the province, and flexible enough to meet those needs. This flexibility, I submit, was illustrated by the addition of \$1 million to the program's original allocation of \$2 million when it became apparent that more students and employers than anticipated wanted to take part in Opportunities '83. Also, Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that this amount is by far larger than any amount ever allocated by the previous NDP administration.

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

**MR. FOLK:** — In moving this amendment today, I would like to review the terms of reference of this program, and talk a little about what our government was doing when it implemented this successful program. The program announced in the March budget set out to provide a total of 2.7 million this summer, to allow farms, businesses, non-profit organizations, municipalities, and other local government bodies to hire students with the government subsidy of up to \$350 per month for up to three months. High school and post-secondary students who were enrolled in post-secondary educational institutions for this fall were eligible for employment under this program.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the aims of this program were clear. They were to provide employment for students who required summer-job income in order to continue their education, and to provide for that employment throughout the province and throughout the many sectors of our economy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this program responded so well to the needs of our people. It was such a step in the right direction that the Opportunities '83 office received even more applications for employment of students than was expected. Our government, displaying its responsiveness to real needs, added an additional \$1 million to this program in late April, to add even more student jobs to the expected 3,000 jobs which we anticipated the program would originally create.

This program has been a prime example of our government's recognition of the needs of young people. It is helping young people financially, and it is helping young people develop the skills, both academic and work-related, which will be necessary for their successful transition in the world of work.

I would like to point out that this program, while it is a temporary measure designed to address a specific problem, is not a program which is mounted in isolation from overall government policy. Opportunities '83 is one program this year, but on the larger front of ensuring that there is adequate employment and training for our young people our government has taken many initiatives, initiatives which are well thought-out and co-ordinated. The government, as the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower has stated, has embarked upon a plan to expand Saskatchewan's technical vocational capacity by roughly 60 per cent over the next three years — taking us to more than 8,600 training places per year, up 3,100 from the current level of 5,500.

This year alone, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government is spending about \$7 million to add about 1,200 new training spaces — adding sports at out three institutes, planning for a new technical institute in Prince Albert, and using the Saskatchewan skills extension program to take this invaluable kind of training out to the people throughout the province.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in view of our government's moves to increase accessibility of education, flexibility of programs, thus making more and better training available for our young people. I believe that we are in fact serving well the needs of students and youth in the province. We recognize that our youth is our most valuable natural resource, and that the development of our human resources is a key element in any successful economic recovery program.

The Opportunities '83 program is one specific program which illustrates our concern and our willingness to act for the people. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to relate one incident during the campaign last March. When we were going door-to-door I talked to one person in my constituency and he indicated he was going to vote NDP. And I asked him why, and he says, 'Well, the PCs have got the best programs.' And I say, 'Well, why are you voting NDP?' He says, 'Well, for the past two summers I had a job up North. They paid me in the neighbourhood of \$2,550 to \$3,000 a month.' And I say, 'Well, gee, you must have been doing good work.' He says, 'Well, no, not really. I just basically sat around.' But that's good money, Mr. Speaker.

So when I look at the motion brought forth by the member from Shaunavon, 'to secure meaningful and rewarding employment opportunities.' I would like to draw this parallel between what the former administration did for meaningful employment, and what our government is doing through the employment '83s.

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased in view of all this to commend the government ad move this amendment here today. Thank you very much.

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

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. It gives me great pleasure today to get up in this House and debate this very important issue that we have before the legislature today. I find it quite interesting that the Conservative government would amend such a motion and stand up in this House as the member for Saskatoon

University has just done, and congratulating the government on what they have done, when the statistics that their Conservative government has put out themselves, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speak plainly for themselves.

I don't know who he's been talking to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but when I go around this province — and I just got through going around northern Saskatchewan — I've seen hundreds and hundreds of young people who have no opportunities to go to work; there's no programs proposed for them. And I just wonder what the member from Saskatoon University is talking about when he says, 'I congratulate the Conservative government of Saskatchewan for the opportunities that the youth have in this province.'

Let's take a look at the figures. As my colleague from Shaunavon has just indicated to this legislature, the figures speak quite plainly as to what the problem is in this province. They seem to feel that the way to solve the problem of youth unemployment is to put millions of dollars — and he was quoting in millions of dollars . . . And that's fine, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You can put as many millions of dollars as you want out to try and slow down the high unemployment rate that we have with our youth. And on the other hand, what do they do? They cut programs.

Let's just take a look at some of the programs that they have cut, and taken away jobs away from the youth in this province. And it's quite plain. Yes, they want to put money into youth programs, but what do they do? By their own admission, they cut 90 jobs out of the Woodland Enterprises in Prince Albert. They cut them out of the bush and they say, 'Well, we're going to take the 90 adult jobs that they had in the bush, and we're going to let them plant trees for the summer.' And they're taking 90 jobs away from the youth and the university students that always have them jobs, and this is what they're doing. Let's take a look at what's going on in northern Saskatchewan.

And I find it quite interesting that the member from Saskatoon University would indicate that an individual told him that he was working in northern Saskatchewan and receiving \$2,500 a month for doing nothing. I just don't think that is possible . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . And the members, they laugh. They feel that the jobs . . . that the individuals who are getting paid these large sums of money in northern Saskatchewan are sitting on their rear ends and doing nothing. That's what they're indicating.

But let me say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how many jobs has SMDC created this summer for the youth in this province? Every year SMDC has university students that were coming out. Geologists — young geologists who were in their first, second, and third years of geology — went out and worked for SMDC in the bush in northern Saskatchewan. They no longer have them jobs; they're no longer there. One just has to go and take a look in northern Saskatchewan and you'll find out that SMDC is just not doing any exploration work any more. It's been cut right off.

And when you take a look at the figures . . . Let's take a look at the figure for April, or for January. Under the NDP government, there was 11,000 students unemployed. Under the Conservative government, one year later, there is 19,000 unemployed, by their own admission. That's their numbers; that's their figures. And you go into northern Saskatchewan, like I did last week, and I seen hundreds of young people between 15 and 25 looking for work and said o me, 'What has gone wrong? There is absolutely no jobs. Housing has come to a dead stop. Road construction has come to a dead stop. Roads aren't being built any more.'

There's cut-backs just about in every segment of government that we have in this province. And that why the youth of this province, the teenagers that are coming out of grade 11 and 12 and usually have summer employment, university students who usually go and work on Highways projects — them jobs are not there any more. They have been eliminated. And you go and talk to any foreman on the highways crews, used to be foremans, and now they're out driving machines because of the 157 employees that were laid off. Former superintendents are now operating machines just in order to have a job, and the jobs that the Highways created for the youth are gone. They're just not there because there's no highway construction in this province compared to what there was under the NDP government.

And I say the members of this Conservative government, putting out the figures like you have just put out, and to get up and say that you're going to congratulate yourselves for what you have done for the youth in this province to create employment for the youth, I think it's bad, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think it's real bad, because you go out and you talk to the youth of this province, talk to the graduates as I have done in the last week, where I went to four graduations, and I saw young people graduating out of grade 12 and graduating out of the community colleges, and where are they going to get jobs? No hope at all, Mr. Deputy Speaker. No hope at all because of the cutting and slashing of this Conservative government. They're continually cutting programs. And then they threw a few million dollars into make-work programs. And they say, 'Well, we're solving the problem.' But I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Conservative government is not solving the problem. It is creating more and more problems and more and more of our youth in this province are unemployed and they feel insecure and they just don't know where they're going to go.

Jobs that they had in the nurseries — they're gone; jobs in SMDC, as I said, in northern Saskatchewan exploration has come to a complete stop. That's where these jobs are gone. So I just say, you may be going to put in a few million dollars into the pot and say, 'We're going to create 400 jobs . . . 4,000 jobs.' You may create 4,000 jobs and cut back on 8,000 or 10,000 jobs. And the figures indicate that. And that's a sad situation.

You can say what you want in this House, but I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you ought to get into the communities and there's where you're going to see the youth. Don't sit in this House and then tell us figures and say everything is rosy and congratulate the government. Get out into the communities; go to these graduating classes, and just see what the youth of this province are saying. And I tell you: I've been all over this province and they're saying that we are in trouble. What are the jobs; where are the opportunities?

Drive down the highways. I tell you . . . You drive down the highways on week-ends between any of these major cities and you don't see any traffic any more. You're not going to have problems with highways because people can't even afford to travel. A year ago you could drive up these roads and there was just one massive line of traffic. I tell you, that's not the way it is today. And we had our youth out there and travelling and they were mobile and they had jobs and they were going back to school in the fall and they knew that they had money to continue their education. They don't have that today, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have overdone my time here and I will sit down and let some of the other members get into this.

**MR. GLAUSER:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In spite of what the member opposite from Athabasca was saying, I, too, am pleased to rise today in support of this amendment. I would like to remind the member that economists can rarely agree on anything, but this is a particular time that they do seem to agree on one thing, and that is that the private sector must create jobs. We cannot have the government . . . The governments in the past have performed dismally at creating employment for people, and our program of opportunities, Opportunities '83 — the student program — and the small business program are two examples of the manner in which the private sectors do co-operate, and they are providing jobs as everyone in this House knows.

In speaking to the amendment I would like to draw the attention of the House to some specifics regarding this government's summer student employment program — Opportunities '83 — to add to my colleague's argument that this program illustrates how well we on this side have responded to the needs of youth and students this year. Mr. Speaker . . . Deputy Speaker, pardon me . . . All high schools and post-secondary students who were enrolled in post-secondary educational institutions for this fall were eligible for employment under this program. I think my colleague on this side and the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, when this program was first announced, have given a good description of the aims of this program and how it fits into this government's comprehensive and well-thought-out strategy for training, employment, and economic recovery.

So I would like to turn to some of the facts and figures regarding the operation of Opportunities '83 — facts and figures which show how well this program is working for the youth, for the employers, and for the province of Saskatchewan. At the time of the March budget when Opportunities '83 was announced with the initial funding of \$2.7 million, it was anticipated that approximately 3,000 student summer jobs would be created throughout this program; but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by April 22 — the application deadline — about 4,000 employer applications had been accepted requesting assistance for more than 6,000 summer students. Clearly this government was addressing a need which was felt around our province. So Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you and members of this House are aware, our government decided to respond in an even larger way to the needs of students by adding \$1 million to the original program. This infusion of money meant that more than 3,500 students jobs could be created by this program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell members that our most recent view of statistics concerning subscription to the Opportunities '83 program shows that of the more than 4,100 employer applications we received, we have approved approximately 3,300, or roughly 80 per cent of the applications.

Mr. Speaker, I think this was a commendable figure and one which shows just how well our government is responding to the needs of students and employers in Saskatchewan. These are interesting figures as well, Mr. Speaker: I can tell you that these approved employer applications have so far provided for the employment of about 3,800 students in Saskatchewan this summer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I submit to members opposite that this is not a give-away program. It is a program that is providing for gainful employment of young people, so that they can further their education, and I submit that members of the former government

cannot have it both ways. On the one hand they criticize us for inaction and not helping people. On the other hand they criticize us when we do spend money for what I consider to be valuable and worthwhile programs. And, Mr. Speaker, we are providing for this valuable program for youth and students in amounts which, when you look at the local figures for some of our centres, are much more generous and much more responsive to people's needs than the former government's YES (youth employment services) program . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And wait till I get there! Or your youth employment programs were.

Let's look at Moose Jaw, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In Moose Jaw last year the YES program provided \$47,857 for summer students employment. Well, what was it this year, Mr. Deputy Speaker? This government through the Opportunities '83 program is providing \$70,125 for student employment in the city of Moose Jaw. Well, let's look at Prince Albert. The story is the same. Last year the YES program provided \$35,683 for student summer jobs, and this year Opportunities '83 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And listen to this, member from Athabasca: this year \$142,450 — fur times as much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And in Saskatoon (and the member from Shaunavon should listen to this), last year YES provided \$257,207; this year we have provided through Opportunities '83, \$478,275.

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

**MR. GLAUSER:** — And for the member of Elphinstone: in Regina last year YES provided \$208,277, while this year Opportunities '83 is providing \$425,275.

Clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government listens to the people of this province and acts in a positive manner to meet the needs of people. Opportunities '83 demonstrates this, and so do many of the other programs our government has introduced. Mr. Speaker, because of the responsiveness to the needs of youth which this government has shown so well through the tremendously successful Opportunities '83 program I am pleased to add my support to the amendment.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to add a few words to this debate. Speakers prior to me in this debate have pointed out the stark figures, the fact that unemployment among young people is up well over 50 per cent in 1983 over last year. And I think all of us are now familiar with the problems which are being faced, particularly by students — university students and high school students — in getting employment. And that's evidenced by the many headlines which we are seeing in papers. I see one here which says: 'Educated, Graduated, Unemployed.' Another one which says: 'Unemployment Isn't Working For Students.' Another one which says: 'Students Want Jobs Not More Excuses.' And another one which no doubt has been mentioned, indicating that 407 STI graduates face a grim outlook. And I know in my own experience, and I've talked to a good number of law graduates from across Canada who are having a real difficulty getting positions where they can serve their articles and get themselves admitted to the bar, and in my own personal acquaintance there are many who are in difficult circumstances.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not only the fault of the government opposite. It is not only the fault of the government which preceded it. It is a fault which we all must share, and I just want to just take a few minutes to point out some of the real human consequences of this. And I may refer, if you will permit it, to a clipping of something which the United Church had to say over the week-end, and saying that in their view job creation must be top priority, and they went on to say this in the course of their resolution on

unemployment and job creation.

There flows from prolonged unemployment extreme human hardship, despair, and degradation, with severe consequences of increased crime, alcohol, and drug abuse, family breakdown, loss of self-worth, depression, and even suicide.

Well, that of course is an extreme way of stating the problem, but for many, many people it is a problem in human terms, and for young people it's a particular kind of problem. It's in the nature of youth to expect that the future will unfold; that if you as a young person apply yourself, if you train yourself, there will be an opportunity, and you will have an opportunity to use your talents — for your own service, yes — but for the betterment of your neighbours and your community as well. That is what youth very frequently feels. We sometimes refer to it as youthful idealism. Whatever we wish to call it, it's a characteristic which we need in our society, and we need to nourish in our society.

We as a society are failing these young people. No one says that all young people can expect a rose garden. And I am not feeling particularly unhappy about some who have to scramble a bit, because it is not part of life to be necessary launched from your educational career into a job which is easy to find and well paid. That may not always be the case. But it is certainly a part of our responsibility as public servants in the broader sense to offer some opportunities to young people.

The situation which is prevalent in Canada today has been the subject of statements by many people. I particularly wish to refer to one published by a committee of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, entitled 'Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis.' In which they pin-point what they feel is the obligation of governments — and when I say governments, I include oppositions as well. I'm not here trying to indicate that it's only the job of the treasury benches to solve these problems. On the very top of their list they put this one:

First, unemployment rather than inflation should be recognized as the number one problem to be tackled in overcoming the present crisis.

And they go on to indicate their reasons for that. And they say, and I'm picking up another quote:

At the same time, working people, the unemployed, young people, and those on fixed incomes, are increasingly called upon to make the most sacrifice for economic recovery.

And they go on to say that we as governments are calling upon young people and others, but particularly young people, to accept the state of unemployment because we are unwilling to act to create full employment because of our fear of inflation. And it behooves us to find ways to address both unemployment and inflation. It has been done in a free society by some countries — not perfectly, but with a good deal more success than we have realized here. It involves what is essentially a co-operative approach by government, business, and labour to limit increases in incomes, particularly for those who are higher incomes, but increases in incomes for those who are working so that governments may stimulate the economy to create jobs without inducing inflation.

Now that is what is needed, and that is what must be pursued, and that is what has been relatively successful in countries like Japan and West Germany and Sweden, where there are certainly low levels of unemployment and low levels of inflation by our standards. Certainly no country is immune from the difficulties, but they have all had rather greater success than we have because they have pursued what might be called the social contract — a policy of co-operation between government, management, and labour. There is no question that a persistent state of unemployment tends to generate a climate of social fear and a passive acceptance. I'm now quoting the Catholic bishops:

. . . a climate in which we take away from young people some of the greatest opportunities that they have to use their youth to expand their opportunities and the society in which they live.

I'll just refer to one other comment on the moral consequences of unemployment, and I refer to the encyclical of Pope John Paul II, entitled *Laborem Exercens*, and I'll quote just briefly from that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they talk about unemployment:

. . . which in all cases is an evil and which, when it reaches a certain level, can become a real social disaster. It is particularly painful when it especially affects young people who, after appropriate cultural, technical, and professional preparation, fail to find work and see their sincere wish to work and their readiness to take on their own responsibilities for the economic and social development of the community sadly frustrated.

That is what we are doing to many, many young people in Canada today. The encyclical goes on to offer its solution which suggests overall planning with regard to different kinds of work. I will not pursue that except to say that we are dealing not only with statistics, but we are dealing with the need for governments to act so that young people's lives are not blighted, so that we do not brand and stigmatize a generation of young people with their . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — The Leader of the Opposition has expired his time.

**MR. MYERS:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you, member from Quill Lakes, thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a pleasure to rise once again in these Chambers and to speak to the amended motion concerning the Opportunities '83 student employment program. The program is proving to be a bigger success than originally anticipated. The \$2.7 million originally required has had an additional \$1 million placed before it, and we've been able to employ another 1,000 students, bringing the total to 3,000 students this summer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Minister of Finance has stated in the budget address last March, he and the Minister of Education realized the current level of unemployment is too high, but even at its present rate it's still the lowest in the country. To counter this high rate of unemployment in this province, the government's actions in the past six months and for the forthcoming year have and will move to address the unemployment rate.



The Build-A-Home program has proven to be a very successful program, and will be continued to August 1, and no doubt this activity will also employ a large number of students and summer students. The youth employment program for the summer months will assist the students who will be seeking summer jobs so as to enable them to return to schools, technical institutions, and universities next fall.

One of the major concerns expressed by the Premier's advisory board was the shortage of summer jobs for students. This is a valid concern since the majority of students enrolled in post-secondary institutions rely on summer earnings to make it through university of technical schools in the winter. The administration has listened to the concerns expressed by our youth and responded by introducing and increasing the Opportunities '83 program. This program was a result of the government's listening to the Premier's youth advisory board. The nine youth that come from many parts of the province to make up this board have expressed their concerns and requirements and will continue to express their concerns and requirements for the students of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Opportunities '83 program is a new summer job program designed now to create 4,000 new summer jobs for Saskatchewan summer students during the periods of May 1 to September 30. We will assist employers with job creation by subsidizing each student's salary to a maximum of \$350 per month for up to three months. In other words, the Opportunities '83 will assist Saskatchewan businesses, Saskatchewan non-profit organizations, and Saskatchewan municipalities. It will also assist Saskatchewan students by creating more jobs, and by opening up more opportunities for summer employment.

Let me give you an example of how this program works. I can think of a young man or a young woman in my constituency, in my neighbourhood, who needs summer earnings to complete his or her last year of computer sciences at the University of Saskatchewan. She has convinced a local hardware store owner that she can help him with his plans to computerize his accounts and stocks. He needs assistance, and he would like to give this student a break. He's impressed with ideas and the energy of this student, but he can't afford to pay the additional salary out of his own pocket. Now the Opportunities '83 program can bring the two of them together and provide both of them with requirements that they need — the employer in his business and the student in using the abilities they have attained through their education and will use upon graduation.

Municipalities need playground supervision and lifeguards; regional parks require maintenance staff; the chamber of commerce needs students to man tourist information booths; businesses need clerks, secretaries, cashiers, sales people, industrial workers, construction crews, carpenters, accountants or, as was just said, just plain gophers. The list of employees and employers is endless; all of them will benefit from the program.

Let me talk about the details of Opportunities '83. The eligibility requirements for both employers and employees are very straightforward. Eligible employees include Saskatchewan businesses, non-profit organizations, municipalities, and local government bodies. Employers must guarantee the summer positions are new opportunities, and that no regular employee will be replaced by a student. Eligible employees include permanent Saskatchewan residents who are either high school or post-secondary students enrolled for the fall of 1983. Application forms and brochures were sent to local chamber of commerce and filed offices and Department of Agriculture, Culture

and Recreation, industry and commerce. The information could have been picked up by secondary educational institutes, high schools, and community colleges.

So this program did work towards employing the summer students. I think we have a right to be excited about this program. It doesn't take a crystal ball to tell us that young people are our future, and Opportunities '83 is going to get the future working for Saskatchewan.

The opposition has talk about this program, but all they have expressed are the negative views. They don't know how to look to the future, to utilize the future of this province. They have negative attitudes. They've had negative attitudes since the budget came down; they can't see any good in it. They can't see the budget helping the people of this province, but it is; it's working for them all the time.

Mr. Speaker, I'll be supporting the amendment and will not be supporting the original motion. Thank you.

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

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we drew up this resolution we felt it was important that we bring to the attention of the government the concerns and the hopes and the aspirations of young people in Saskatchewan — indeed, in all of Canada.

I think that what is developing in our country, indeed across the world, is an isolation to the concern of the unemployment situation which has indeed struck so heavily on our young people. And it seems to me that the youth of our province, and indeed our country, is our hope for the future, for it is on their shoulders — or our youth — that we place the awesome responsibility to build a better society, build a better society for what we have left them.

But today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many of our youth who would so eagerly and idealistically take up the challenge of making a contribution to society are being denied that opportunity, for many of our young people have become a part of the yearly statistics, the statistics of unemployment. For many of our young people their hopes have been shattered, their idealism replaced by despair. The youth of our province ask not for handouts. All they ask is the right for meaningful employment.

And we bring this resolution to the floor of this Assembly, not on a purely partisan political basis, because the problem exists throughout our nation. I read recently — just to put it into perspective, Mr. Deputy Speaker — the young people of Canada today, according to Statistics Canada, are unemployed at the rate of 34.4 per cent in the month of March. This compares with the unemployment rate for adults in the country as a whole of 13.9. And some 1,658 million Canadians are out of work — again according to Statistics Canada. We find a developing trend where one-third to almost one-half of the unemployed in this country are young people.

As an elected representative I can see no situation which is more critical and which moves me more than the situation that is developing for the future of our young people. I talked to a niece of mine who recently graduated with great distinction as chartered accountant, silver medal. And she talks to me and she say, 'What a sad situation. Many of that class I graduated with have finished their articles and were relieved of their positions in the various firms.'

Recently I was home over the week-end and I find young people milling around desperately, hoping to find opportunities for jobs. I'll tell you, a young fellow was at my door the other day — a bright young fellow — first year engineering. He has tried in Saskatoon; he has tried in Prince Albert. Today in Humboldt what he's doing is weeding gardens for elderly citizens.

This is the future that we here in Saskatchewan are providing to our young people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, indeed it's honourable, but that's fine. You can call it honourable, but I'm telling you what the situation is: that there are young people in this country should have the opportunity of full participation and to reach the maximum of their abilities. I want to say that, you know, you take this provincial government, and oh, they rave about cutting the road tax. They said how a great use that would be to our young people. Yeah, it was a great use, but today thousands of our young people don't have a job, can't license their car, and that's the fact of the situation.

You know the Tories had another expression during the last campaign. Our provincial government says, 'Oh, there's so much more we can be.' And I want to say that our youth realize what this means for them — unemployment and a loss of a career opportunity. The leader of our party indicated some of the prospects that have been noted throughout Saskatchewan at various graduations. I look at one here which took place in Moose Jaw.

'407 STI Graduates Face Grim Outlook.' All dressed up (it says) with no place to work. 407 young people graduated from the Saskatchewan Technical Institute Saturday in an unusual atmosphere of the 25-year-old school. Once a definite stepping-stone to a wealth of job opportunity, the institute has found itself caught in the economic slump unable to find work for most of the students.

I look at another indication of the problem where it says, 'Unemployment workers march downtown Regina.' And still more touching we find at the graduation at the Regina university, and it says, 'Only one cloud dims biggest-ever convention: Where's a job?' This is the situation that is facing our young people here today in Saskatchewan. It seems to me that our society was built on a work ethic and I think that is commendable. But it seems to be that when a free enterprise society, free enterprise system fails, fails to provide the opportunity to our young people, then surely that system must be challenged.

I want to say that the answer to this very serious unemployment situation with our young people have been a makeshift approach by the government opposite. They entered into an agreement on the NEED (new employment expansion and development) program, put in a budget, they told the people of Saskatchewan, for \$10 billion and they used \$2 million. It wasn't that there was no unemployed. They had no intentions of spending the money to generate jobs. but even look at the NEED program. It's a makeshift. It doesn't go to the crux of the economic, worthwhile activities — meaningless. Opportunity '83, and all members stood up here and said what a great program this is. Well, I want to tell you that individual after individual in my constituency have said they have applied and they have received no answer in respect to their application.

Secondly, what they have done is set up a grant to business — \$5,000. Not a single cent is going to be spent this year in the budget in respect to that. It seems to me that the government opposite, indeed their Liberal counterparts in Ottawa, have one economic

strategy for solving unemployment of the young people. And this is brought forward in the Parliament of Canada, that what should be done for the young people is to put them into a stint in the military, from a year to two years, and this would help to alleviate it. And guess who supported that? That was the Tory answer to providing meaningful employment — voted with the Liberals.

I guess what you can say is that there is a growing concern. And the Leader of the Opposition has indicated that the church groups across the world . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — I must remind the member that he has used up his time. His 10 minutes are up.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

## MOTIONS

### Resolution No. 10 — Natural Gas Industry

**MR. MORIN:** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the Assembly today with the intention of moving Resolution No. 10:

That this Assembly concurs in the government's program to stimulate the natural gas industry by promoting domestic and export sales, and urges the federal government to approve the export application of Ocelot Industries.

Mr. Speaker, since taking office this government has taken progressive steps to stimulate the natural gas industry in the province. In support of the resolution, I wish to outline to this Assembly today the steps that were taken and the environment within which they were made.

Saskatchewan has significant reserves of natural gas which could be developed. As of January 1, 1982, Saskatchewan had 41.194 billion cubic metres or 1.462 trillion cubic feet of remaining, established, recoverable reserves. Indications show that this ultimate potential could be a great deal higher than recognized by the previous administration, given major new markets for Saskatchewan gas, favourable physical conditions. Most of Saskatchewan's reserves are found along the western border of Saskatchewan and particularly in the Hatton area north-west of Maple Creek — an area which has remained largely undeveloped. In the past, because of their shallow nature, there has been a reluctance to rely on the Milk River gas reserves in the Hatton area for long-term deliverability.

However, Mr. Speaker, the application by Ocelot Industries to the National Energy Board showed that the Hatton-Milk River reserves are capable of supplying the long-term needs of domestic and export markets. Yet with all this capability only 16 natural gas wells had been drilled during the 18 months prior to April of 1982. No major new gas fields have been discovered for more than a decade. This is due to the lack of incentive to explore and/or to develop new gas supplies in the province.

At the time we took office, producer net-backs were unrewarding at 5 cents per thousand cubic feet for old gas — and old gas is gas which was on production prior to

October 1, 1976 — and 14 cents per thousand cubic feet for new gas — or gas brought onto production since October 1, 1976. This, compared to Alberta's full tax net-back of 39 cents per thousand cubic feet for old gas and 58 cents per thousand cubic feet for new gas — and not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the royalties to the province and its people was only 2 cents per thousand cubic feet.

The Ocelot proposal to export up to 100 million cubic feet per day of natural gas from the Hatton area, over the period 1985 to 2000, inclusive, promised to develop the Hatton reserves and promote substantial reserve increases by additional drilling results and market stimulation. The Ocelot proposal, Mr. Speaker, meant the drilling and tie-in of over 800 wells to meet the full export commitment of 100 million cubic feet per day by November 1, 1986.

Four hundred and thirty miles of field-gathering system would have been required, which together with the wells, would have used over 8,250 tons of steel. In addition, four compression stations were needed. The project meant 450 person-years of construction employment in the short term with a further 400 person-years of jobs, and close to \$1 billion in revenue to the provincial treasury over the life of the project. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the project promised to serve as the catalyst needed to stimulate the oil and gas service sectors in south-west Saskatchewan.

No wonder the government supported Ocelot's application before the National Energy Board. We were subsequently very disappointed when the National Energy Board, on January 27, 1983, decided to deny the Ocelot application. The board's reason for the decision was based on lack of agreement between Saskatchewan and Alberta on the sharing of export revenue. The decision effectively shut off one of the few opportunities open to stimulate a Saskatchewan industry that had languished over the past decade.

The government knew, of course, that the flow-back issue would have to be dealt with if the export application had been successful. I want to spend a few moments on the flow-back issue. In Canada we have a two-price system for natural gas — a higher price for exports and a lower price for domestic sales. The difference between the two prices, minus an appropriate cost to service, is called flow-back.

In Alberta and British Columbia, the major exporting provinces, the flow-back is shared so that the producer gets the same return whether selling to the domestic or the foreign market. We believe this to be a reasonable principle that preserves economic efficiency for the producer. But when you take Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia producers as a group, the principle does not hold. Saskatchewan producers do not have access to flow-back revenues, even though they contribute to the exportable surplus, and because Saskatchewan does not have the advantage of exports and the associated throw-back, we are not in a position at this time to give our producers the same benefits that they would enjoy in British Columbia or Alberta.

However, we're continuing our efforts to gain access not only to the domestic markets, but to export markets. Once we are successful in gaining access to the export markets, returns to producers will be similar to those in other jurisdictions. Notwithstanding our disappointments over the NEB decision, the government recognized that producer returns had to be raised substantially in order to bring on new projects to satisfy the Saskatchewan market.

Initially, upon taking office, this government raised the fieldgate prices retroactively by an average of 25 per cent over the period July 1, 1981 to January 1, 1982. This

increase was designated to cover escalating production and exploration and development costs. Subsequently, after extensive analysis and review of the industry, on February 17, 1983, and is designed to stimulate exploration and development in the province's gas fields. The average fieldgate price rose by over 85 per cent to an average of \$1 per thousand cubic feet in 1983. However, the increase will not directly cause a significant rate increase for the natural gas customers of Sask Power Corporation. The direct impact on consumers as the result of the increase alone is assessed to be about 16 cents per thousand cubic feet, or less than 5 per cent in current residential price.

Effective February 1, royalties increased from 10 cents to 2 cents per thousand cubic feet. Subsequent increases in fieldgate prices will track increase in the Alberta border price. Under the Canada-Alberta energy agreement, the border price is scheduled to rise by 25 cents per thousand cubic feet on August 1 of this year. Subsequent increases in the Saskatchewan royalty will be 5 cents per thousand cubic feet for each 25 cents per thousand cubic feet of increase in price.

Mr. Speaker, this government is fully aware that even at new levels, producer net-backs are still only half the levels enjoyed by Alberta producers. But we believe that with the stimulus of our new policy, industry, and we'll enjoy cheaper Saskatchewan gas and avoid more expensive natural gas imports in the future. When major markets open up — and we're confident that will happen — we'll be in a position to offer producers returns more comparable with those in the other producing jurisdictions.

Domestically, we have sought our market opportunities to get development going. New demand will be generated by such projects as the rural gasification program which was recently announced by the Hon. Lorne MacLaren, minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Under this program, natural gas service will be extended to 25,000 farm and 10,000 urban families by 1990. As well, new industrial opportunities based on natural gas, such as the production of ammonia and nitrogen based fertilizers, can help supply our agricultural needs while diversifying our economy at the same time. Already, Mr. Speaker, results are evident. During the first three months of 1983 alone 10 natural gas wells were drilled. The Department of Energy and Mines' March 8 sale of Crown petroleum and natural gas rights realized \$15.3 million. Of the 15.3 million, the total sale of petroleum and natural gas rights in gas prone areas was \$2.98 million. The total number of acres sold in permit and lease form in gas prone areas was 138,356. The March 8 sale was the largest sale of land in gas prone areas in the recent years.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan natural gas industry is on the upswing. Producers who've been approaching SPC enthusiastically are ready to enter into new gas contracts. In some cases producers have also initiated discussions with the Department of Energy and Mines in order to present new production proposals. The future of our natural gas industry, indeed, looks promising. However, we need exports at this time to develop the industry to its fullest potential. At the same time, a system has

to be in place to show the export flow-back revenues with Alberta. The Ocelot proposal would have led to the development of 800 wells over the next three years. This would have resulted in 450 person-years of employment in the short term, and a further 400 years of jobs over the life of the project. The proposal, in essence, would have stimulated further exploration and development of natural gas in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition has some confusion on potential for gas development in Saskatchewan, as evidenced during the estimates in this House. We now have an underdeveloped industry. We produce less than 40 per cent of or consumption of 100 billion cubic feet per year. This is the policy of importing over 60 per cent of or consumption from Alberta at higher prices than we could produce our own. Our recoverable or developed reserves are about 1.4 trillion cubic feet. For the present policy, consuming 40 billion cubic feet of Saskatchewan gas per year, these reserves would last for about 35 years. Our discovered but undeveloped reserves are about 1.2 trillion cubic feet. For the present policy, these reserves would then add up to another 30 years, and our reserve estimate total would be about 65 years. It's an undeveloped industry.

Continuing the policy provides no incentive to explore for new gas. To increase our reserves, exploration will have to occur, and exploration has been at a standstill for years. Our ultimate reserves may be 4 trillion cubic feet or more, which we won't even know until we encourage and increase the pace of development. There is gas in Saskatchewan. If tomorrow we were to be supplying all of our current consumption from Saskatchewan supplies, our known recoverable and discovered reserves of over 2.5 trillion cubic feet would last more than 25 years with no exceptions. Of course it would be practically impossible to make such a switch overnight, nor do we intend to attempt it. We will have a use for pipeline gas imported from Alberta for many more years to come. The TransCanada Pipeline contract itself does not end until 1992. We are looking for vigorous, but orderly, expansions to the gas industry in Saskatchewan.

Let's put the Ocelot export project into context. If approved by the national energy program, or National Energy Board rather, at full volume the Ocelot project would export about 35 billion cubic feet of gas beginning in the late '80s. with our known reserves, we could supply all of Ocelot's export proposal and reduce the Alberta gas imports by about half, and still have 25 years worth of reserves left, and that assumes no new exploration.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that these comments will clarify the apparent misconceptions expressed by one of the hon. members in opposition recently. And may I repeat for their benefit that if we continue to import 60 per cent of our gas from Alberta, present Saskatchewan supplies will last through 65 years. If we were to supply all of our present needs, about 100 billion cubic feet per year, known Saskatchewan gas reserves would still last for 25 years. Or, if we were to produce all of the gas Ocelot proposed to export and reduce our imports from Alberta by half, our present known reserves would still last for 25 years. And, Mr. Speaker, the above assumes no exploration.

Our policy of rising the price to Saskatchewan producers from 54 cents to \$1 per thousand cubic feet will stimulate exploration. Interest in gas lands has already been expressed in the March sale, and we expect more interest in the upcoming sale in June. The overly pessimistic and cynical view of the gas industry taken by the previous administration will be proved wrong, Mr. Speaker, both in the short and in the long term.

And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday I was in Calgary meeting with a number of oil and gas producing companies and we talked about the land sale coming up on June 7, and there's a great deal of optimism in it and we're encouraged by that. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Saskatoon South:

That this Assembly concurs in the government's program to stimulate the natural gas industry by promoting domestic and export sales, and urges the federal government to approve the export application of Ocelot Industries.

**MR. MYERS:** — Yes, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's with great pleasure I rise again this afternoon to speak on the actions which have been taken by our federal government in not allowing us to export or natural gas to the United States. This comes at a time when this country is direly in need of economic development and, as the opposition points out, they would like us to provide jobs to the people, and this would be one way of providing jobs to Saskatchewan people. Not only would we be allowed to develop the Hatton gas field but we'd also be allowed to provide the pipes and other necessities associated with natural gas development.

There are quite a number of ways that this would benefit not only Saskatchewan but the country as a whole. But the federal government has taken a dim view on allowing Saskatchewan to rise to its place in the sun, a deservedly well-placed place in this country. We enjoy almost half the farmland in Canada and we can call on two mountain-fed rivers to assist our economic development. Irrigation and recreation should come natural to this part of the country, and we shouldn't forget that timber and mineral resources and thousands of lakes which also help to encourage recreation and tourism in this province. We have superb hunting and fishing. We have top-notch technical schools and universities.

If that doesn't boost a person's confidence, let's compare Saskatchewan to the rest of the country. We have the lowest rate of unemployment, and I admit it is, even at its point, it is much higher than we would like it to be. We have the lowest gasoline prices. And we have the best mortgage assistance program in the country and it came at a time when mortgage rates were high and it came when it was needed. It wasn't just a judicial piece of legislation that was inserted into the province like that of the former government, but it came when it was needed.

In 1982 this was the only province in Canada to have a net gain in jobs — almost 1,000. Our finest assets though, they are human resources — the Saskatchewan people. Our work ethic and our will to win has provided us with a good lifestyle — a lifestyle we would like to maintain. And through the export of natural gas which the member from The Battlefords has explained with his facts and figures that we will be able to provide to a hungry market, to a hungry market that wants that resource and will also provide s and this province with the economic stimulus to move ahead. I don't condemn the federal government but I certainly don't appreciate their unwillingness to co-operate with a western province — a western province which has so much more to offer Canada.

The export of natural gas to the United States will only strengthen the ties that we already have with our neighbours to the south. But not only will it strengthen our ties to the neighbours to the south, it will also strengthen our economic position within this country. And when our position is strong, the rest of the country grows from that strength and not from the negativism that has been prompted in the past.



In the past we imported, and we still do import, natural gas from Alberta. Matter of fact that import extends up into the 1990s and it's at a rate of about \$1.50 a thousand cubic feet in relationship to \$1 a thousand cubic feet which we ourselves produce the gas for. In order to vitalize the industries in this province and to have economic growth in this province, we must develop these fields. And we cannot develop them without exporting some of the natural gas because we need that revenue, that capital to initiate the projects in this province. Just to give you some idea, for example, in December we repealed the cumbersome, complex Oil Well Income Tax Act in favour of the simpler freehold oil gas production act. At the same time we simplified the fiscal regime even further by eliminating both the producing tract tax and road allowance levy on oil production. We are willing as a government to stimulate this industry, to stimulate this province, but we need, we need the assistance of the legislators in Ottawa. We are not selling off our heritage. We have proven by our stimulating activities in the oil patch that we have more than we need, and we should be using it at a time when we need it, which is right now.

We will not take the negative attitude that the former government took, but we will move ahead, and we will press the federal government. And if we can't press this federal government, then we will move to elect a new federal government, a new government which will listen to the responses of Saskatchewan residents. We need this export, and we need it at a time when we need it most to stimulate jobs and activity.

I will not take up any further time in this Assembly. I will be supporting the motion. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just have a few words to add on this topic, and I will be asking for leave to adjourn debate. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard a couple of speeches here today which talked about the export of natural gas, and the consumption of natural gas, but we haven't heard a great deal about one of the promises of the Conservative Party, and that was to extend the rural gasification program to rural Saskatchewan.

And in talking earlier during estimates of Energy and Mines, I had an opportunity to ask the Premier about production of natural gas, of known reserves and of anticipated reserves, and at that time he indicated to me, and the record will show this out, that if we were to switch totally to Saskatchewan natural gas at present rates of consumption of the known reserve — that is what is on the stream and being produced — that we would indeed have 12 years of known production in producing natural gas. And I think in answer to me, I would just like to read into the record again his reply. I had asked the minister:

I would like to ask if you have at your disposal information on the amount of natural gas known reserves in the province at this time at the present rate of consumption.

And he went on to answer:

... from calculating feet to metres, but we think we've got it together. Established reserves in the province are 400,000 million cubic metres. That doesn't include probable reserves. (That's reserves that we may have.) And we use 2.9, or 3,000 million cubic metres annually.

I asked him, 'So roughly, I think that that would be about 12 years of reserve, is this correct?' And Mr. Devine replied to me:

That is correct. About 12 or 13 years of established reserve at present consumption.

So when members are talking about the fact that we now have, all of a sudden, 25 or 30 years of consumption . . . This is one of the reasons that the energy board, the National Energy Board, is having difficulty knowing, and one of the reasons that Ocelot is having difficulty getting an export permit is because the government of the day . . . It depends on who you talk to as to what our reserves are.

I think that if we were to get our minds straightened out on whether we have 12 years of consumption at present rates in Saskatchewan or whether we have 24 years — I've heard stories of 50 and 60 years — I think it might make a great deal of difference. I believe that the problem in getting an export permit for Ocelot at the hearing was not only the fact that there was an agreement between Alberta and Saskatchewan. That was part of the problem and I don't know what the government to date has done to rectify that problem, but as well the conflicting views coming out of Saskatchewan as to what we have in terms of usable natural gas at the present time.

But it's not bad enough to confuse the issue by ranging the years of consumption from 12 to as high as 50, but also we have this wishful thinking that is so well known in Saskatchewan now at the present time. It seems to me that all you have to do to get double your gas production or triple it or quadruple it is simply to have a positive attitude to double your gas production or triple it or quadruple it. What indeed you have to do is have natural gas exploration, and that gets us around to natural gas exploration which was to have been done last year in the grasslands park in Saskatchewan — exploration which was not done because of lack of funding by, here again, the Conservative Government of Saskatchewan.

So I think while we have a resolution on the order paper which talks about natural gas exports and how this government is going to support that type of an application, I think there are two or three things they can do on their own very quickly in order to see that exploration and export permits are granted. One of them, get the story straight on how much natural gas we have in Saskatchewan. Secondly, take part in the natural gas exploration which is proposed and supported by and funded by the federal government. And thirdly, get the agreement that is needed between Alberta and Saskatchewan which was lacking at the time of the original application. And I think if the Saskatchewan government was to do their homework and get their work done that the people of Saskatchewan and Ocelot Industries would be much better served, rather than attempting to blame someone else, which we heard many speeches earlier on when this government was first elected, that we weren't going to have a blaming of the federal government of our problems.

I notice that all six resolutions which we have on the order paper by the conservative government now either urge the federal government or — I don't think there's a condemn — but all of them urge the federal government to solve the problems of Saskatchewan. We had assumed when this government came to power that they would be solving the problem. And I'm sorry to say that it has taken only one year for them to turn the tables, and they are now blaming the federal government for all of their

problems including the lack of exploration and the lack of permits for natural gas in Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have more words to say on this topic when I have a chance to do more detailed research on the natural gas situation in Saskatchewan. I therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Resolution No. 11 — Final Report of the Regina Airport Study**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to get up after some lengthy time this has been on the blues and speak to the resolution before us . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I might point out to the member of Shaunavon that this motion also urges the federal government to complete the implementation of the final report of the Regina airport study, and one of the reasons for that is, of course, that the Regina airport is owned and operated by the federal government and is not under our jurisdiction. That is one of the reasons why we have . . . urging the federal government to proceed.

On the face of it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the motion in front of the House today may appear to only affect the city of Regina, but as I will point out a little later in my remarks, the airport in Regina really serves the whole south part of Saskatchewan and the study that I will be discussing in a moment will indicate that those figures . . . A great many of the passengers emplaning and deplaning from the Regina airport are from outside the city of Regina.

To give you a little history, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Regina airport. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the city of Regina has had an airport since 1928 when 160 acres of land were purchased by the Regina Flying Club and the city purchased the land from the flying club later that year, and in December 1928 an air mail service was started by Western Canada Airways which served Winnipeg, Regina, and Calgary. It took 10 years, Mr. Speaker, to 1938 before the first transcontinental air mail and passenger service by Trans-Canada Air Lines began, and Regina was one of the points of call.

Through the years up to 1972, the city of Regina owned its own airport. In that year, the department of National Defence and Transport Canada assumed the full responsibility for the airport when they purchased it from the city for approximately \$2.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, during the time from 1928 to present, there has been a steady growth in the city of Regina. As new residential developments such as Lakeview, Whitmore Park, and Albert Park were constructed, the demand for additional residential land has resulted in proposals to develop the area south of the airport and has brought into focus the possible conflict between the use of land and airport operations. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of serving on the council in the city of Regina when that very problem came before the city and the provincial government at that time, and a real conflict between the use, the airport use and residential use, came about.

Mr. Speaker, just to give you an idea that the airport in Regina is not just for the use of the people in Regina, the Regina airport serves as a point of origin and destination of

scheduled flights for approximate area which is roughly formed by the United States border to the south, the Alberta border on the west, the Manitoba border on the east, and a line through these figures were used . . . This book was compiled in 1978. At that time, within that area there were approximately 300,000 to 350,000 residents.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I'm about to speak to, vis-à-vis the Regina airport expansion and the study that was completed and agreed to by the three levels of government — the federal government, the provincial government, and the city of Regina — recommended a number of things to happen to the airport. But a few statistics, Mr. Speaker, that would give you some idea of the volumes of traffic that go through that airport and are projected to go through that airport in the next four or five years.

In 1976, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the passengers emplaned and deplaned were 500,000 people in that year. The forecast for 1991, or eight years hence, is for 1.4 million people to emplane and deplane at the Regina airport. In 1976, the total aircraft movements were 180,000, or 493 per day. The forecast for 1991, or eight years hence, is for a total aircraft movement of 260,000 per year, or 712 per day.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of effects that this increased traffic in the air will have, and there's a number of effects the number of people will have. As I mentioned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the joint study which was approved in June of 1978 by the three governments resulted in no action from the federal government. Mr. Speaker, the federal government, when they accepted that report in 1978, indicated that they would move — as I will indicate in a moment — that they would move on the study and would proceed to implement its recommendations, which they did not.

I was more than pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see that the Deputy Premier, the member from Souris-Cannington, in august of last year after only serving in his office for some four months, achieved what the NDP could not achieve for years. I must say, Mr. Speaker, however, that the federal plan now and what they've accepted is not following the full study recommendations. I read, Mr. Speaker, a number of the issues that were brought out in that joint study in 1978. Some of the issues read as follows, and I read from page 18 of the joint study, 'The Final Report and Recommendations of the Regina Airport Study,' which reads:

Based on forecast demand, the existing runways with an improved taxiway system will reach capacity in the late 1980s.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is with an improved taxi-way system.

By the end of the planning horizon, which is 1996, it is projected that there will be some 200,000 local aircraft movements in addition to 120,000 itinerant movements per annum. (It concludes) To meet this level of demand, additional runway capacity will be required.

It goes on to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

. . . that the major constraint to the use of the airport for international charter and/or scheduled operations is the limited runway length available for take-off which restricts the number of destinations which can be reached non-stop. The restriction is most severe in the summer months and a limited runway length of 7,900 feet virtually eliminates reaching any transoceanic

destination without a technical fuel stop.

The study goes on to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

The issue of aircraft noise is significant, and has increased over the past years as the volume of air traffic has grown and as residential areas in the south-west part of the city have been developed. The annoyance from flight operations to and from runway 0725 (which is the secondary runway) is somewhat less because there are fewer operations.

The types of operations which do not cause concern over built-up areas are the larger air carrier aircraft, especially during night hours, and the Canadian Forces jet aircraft. Related to the annoyance of aircraft noise, there is also a small number of people who do perceive that there is a hazard to living in the flight path, a perception which is reinforced by noise and frequency of operations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would now like to read to you some of the recommendations of that joint study of 1978:

The essential characteristics of the conclusions reached and agreed upon by the three levels of government — the federal government, the provincial government and the city government — were: the acquisition of the necessary land and the associated planning of the airport to permit future development of a major parallel runway system; a centrally located terminal area; and adequate commercial/industrial aviation facilities and services; the determination, development, and promulgation of relevant municipal land use plans to fully foster and protect an expanded airport complex; and the planning, funding, and providing of facilities to meet the needs demonstrated through the forecasted growth of aircraft movements and passengers.

The report goes on to say, Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with those conclusions, Transport Canada (and this is in 1978) would undertake the following. (They would:) Assemble land through purchase or option by the early 1980s to permit the expansion of the runway and the terminal systems.

I might point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that to this point the only work being done at the Regina airport is for the terminal system. No work is being done, or has been planned, for the runway system. Transport Canada also said in that study that they would undertake early major expansion of air terminal facilities, which they are doing, and associated services including those processing transborder and international flights as soon as financial resources and engineering designs will allow.

They would undertake the construction of a parallel 12-30 runway approximately 3,500 metres long to satisfy growth forecasts which indicate the need for that runway by 1985. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that need is two years hence, and they have not undertaken any work on that parallel runway. Transport Canada would further undertake ongoing programmed improvements to the airport to maximize operational facilities and services.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the point here, and the point of the motion, which reads:

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to complete implementation of the final report of the Regina airport study by proceeding with the construction of the recommended new runway.

is to the point because, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the point is that there's no use building a grand, new airport facility if you can only land Piper Cubs to get into it. I think the point is that, given the recent federal budget statement . . . I read from the budget in brief of April 19, 1983, which would indicate under the special recovery capital projects of the federal government that they would provide public capital projects totalling \$2.2 billion. They will be put in place over the next four years, and it would entail more than 100 projects involving all regions of the country. And they went on to say that they would take special steps . . . or special steps are being taken to fast-track the new projects and ensure that they are carried through on time and on budget and that they include major investments in airports, highways, and port facilities

I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, given that they have agreed in 1978 to proceed with the new Regina airport which includes not only the taxi area, the new airport facility but the runway, and include the runway, given the 1983 budget which would indicate that they intend to put more money into airports, that we should, or this House should agree, and I would move, seconded by my colleague from Regina Rosemont:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to complete implementation of the final report of the Regina airport study by proceeding with the construction of the recommended new runway.

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

**MR. DIRKS:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As the member from Regina Rosemont and a citizen of the province of Saskatchewan and a resident of Regina, I'm naturally concerned about this particular motion and would definitely want to speak in favour of it. The motion reads:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to complete implementation of the final report of the Regina airport study by proceeding with the construction of the recommended new runway.

And I would like to draw attention to the fact that the blame for the fact that the runway has not yet been constructed lies directly at the feet of the federal government.

I think the historians of the years to come will look back upon the Trudeau years with regard to Saskatchewan and will class them as years of indifference, years of neglect, years of disregard, years of perhaps even callousness, as they have attempted to put, perhaps, eastern Canada on the map and have neglected the very serious needs of many of the people of western Canada. I think the federal government perhaps could be classed, in many respects, as being notorious for ignoring the needs and aspirations of Westerners. And a graphic example, I think, of the fact that they have ignored the needs of Westerners can be seen by the fact that the runways here at the Regina airport have yet to be upgraded even though a three-level government study concluded that the runways needed upgrading as long ago as 1975.

For years the people of Regina have persuasively advanced arguments in favour of upgrading the airport facilities here in Regina. My colleague from Lakeview here in Regina has, once again, persuasively advanced those arguments. I don't think there is anyone here in this House that would argue with the proposition that Regina's airport is not in immediate need of substantial modernizing, not only the facilities themselves but the runway. This, of course, was the conclusion of the Regina airport study, and I want to underscore again that it was the agreement of all three levels of government that the runways and the facilities should be upgraded.

The study was commenced in 1975, after much prodding. So, in fact, we would really go back to the mid and early 1970s. At that time already the citizens of Regina and of southern Saskatchewan, indeed I expect citizens from right across Saskatchewan, were calling for substantial upgrading for Regina's airport facility. The study commenced in 1975 — that is almost a decade ago — and was completed in 1978, completed five years ago. And so for over a decade now the people of Regina have been calling for action, action which I think all members of this Assembly would agree is entirely justified.

In the first place, the city of Regina is, of course, the Queen City of the Plains. It is the capital of Saskatchewan and as such it deserves an airport and a runway facility that is in keeping with the importance of the stature of this particular city. My colleague from Lakeview has in a very commendable fashion indicated that the traffic projections for this particular airport are such that the runway capacity is in need of immediate upgrading and expansion. The limited length of the runway at present certainly militates against the handling of traffic projections that we see in the study itself. The member from Lakeview has already pointed out that there are substantial sound and noise problems that the people of Regina presently undergo.

I think it's important to underscore, again, that the commerce of this province, the tourism industry, the economics of the city of Regina would be substantially enhanced if we were to see a runway that was lengthened. At present international flights are simply not able to be accommodated adequately here in Regina.

I think many of us here in Regina just about gave up hope that the federal government was going to do anything with regards to this particular issue. Not that long ago, however, a ray of hope was injected into the problem. The federal government did indicate that they were going to be moving on some recommendations. They indicated that they were going to upgrade the terminal and that, of course, is fine. We expect that. It's necessary. They indicated that they were going to upgrade some of the runway taxi areas. That is, of course, necessary. It's difficult to commend them after the foot-dragging that they evidenced over the last seven or eight years. And I think perhaps it would be in keeping to remind the members of the Assembly that were it not for the fact that the federal NDP party was responsible for putting the Liberals back in power we might not have had that kind of foot-dragging that we have seen on this particular issue.

The main problem, of course, is that although the federal government has indicated that they will move to implement some of the recommendations, they have not indicated that they are going to upgrade the runway. I think this is particularly unfortunate. The runways that we have will be utilized to the maximum in a few short years. I think it's absolutely necessary that we commence action now. They have, as my colleague indicated, allotted a capital project fund of over some \$2 million, and we

would hope that they would be using some of those funds to in fact build the parallel runway which is so necessary.

The indisputable conclusion of the Regina airport study is that this runway is necessary. I concur with that conclusion and I would ask all members of this Assembly to support the motion that has been advanced and that I am seconding. Thank you very much.

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

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't want to delay the House long on this except to say that I concur with the sentiment of the resolution. It is difficult to be a person living in Regina and using the airport frequently without being aware of the need for upgraded facilities, and we are aware of the fact that the matter has been studied. We're aware of the fact that a new runway has been recommended. We're all aware of the fact that runway limitations have made it impossible for the runway to be used with certain types of aircraft . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — 747s.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes, 747s, although occasionally 747s have landed at our airport. The strip is simply too short for permitting a maximum operation. The strip is short for other types of aircraft as well. And in any case, generally the airport needs upgrading. One is tempted to deal with the terminal and the many, many promises of a new terminal and the dates, the receding date at which the construction is going to commence. But I will confine my remarks strictly to the resolution and the construction of the recommended new runway and say that I concur with the resolution and join with my colleagues on both sides of the House in its support.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.