

July 5, 1989

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I know all members will want to join with me in welcoming to the Assembly a group of nine people who belong to the Connaught Seniors, seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. I don't know this group as well as I should, but I will get to meet them when the question period is over. The portion of the instructions where they normally put down the chaperon has been left blank, so I assume this group has been entrusted to come here without a chaperon.

I know all members will want to join with me in welcoming this group here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to this Assembly, seated in your gallery today, the Hon. Robert John Gregory, Minister of Labour for the state of South Australia, and he's accompanied by his wife Jill, today. The minister is also Minister of Marine, and is the chief secretary of the state. He is the state member of parliament for the House of Assembly for the district of Florey. He was elected in September of 1982. He's a member of the Australian Labour Party. He's visiting Saskatchewan, studying our system of occupational health and safety programs. He will be meeting with the Workers' Compensation Board. He will be visiting the Wascana Rehabilitation Centre which has been newly opened in this province. Mr. Gregory will also meet with representatives of labour and business in the province of Saskatchewan, and will tour the Colonsay potash mine. I will meet with him at 2:30 this afternoon and we will discuss our mutual concerns with respect to labour.

I would like all the members to welcome the minister from South Australia. I would ask him and his wife to rise so that you can be acknowledged, and I would ask for a warm welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martin: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the other members, four patients from Wascana Rehabilitation Centre, as well as four volunteers from the Wascana Rehabilitation Centre. The patients include Andy McFarlane, Randy Rogers, Betty Lloyd, and Bob Schultz, and the attendants, or the rehabilitation volunteers from Wascana, are Wilf Walters, Pauline Richardson, Wanda Schwartz and Kim Brydon. I'll have an opportunity to meet with them at 2:30, Mr. Speaker.

I'd ask everyone to please welcome our guests from the Wascana Rehabilitation Centre.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

New Cameco Plant in Ontario

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for Cameco (Canadian Mining Energy Corporation). Mr. Minister, I see that this company which is owned 60 per cent by the people of Saskatchewan is now opening a new plant in Port Hope, Ontario.

Saskatchewan, since we supposedly have control of the board, why did your board appointees decide to build in Ontario rather than in Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, while I'm not familiar with the detail of what happened at Port Hope, my understanding is that there is a small company set up between Cameco and some other small private company in Ontario that has created, I think, about seven jobs. And it's built on the synergies of what exists at the Cameco Port Hope facility and what this other company has to bring to the table in this joint venture, Mr. Speaker.

And as I said, it's, I think, seven jobs and I'll be happy to get the detail and provide the member with just what it is that will be manufactured at Port Hope, and the kind of things that they're doing there. I think it's a small diversification step for Cameco, and I think a good one.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, a new question. The minister seems to be saying that diversification is helping Ontario by seven jobs, but he seems to forget that indeed 100 jobs have been terminated in Rabbit Lake in northern Saskatchewan. He forgets that 14 jobs were slashed last month in regards to the shutting down of the office of SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) Cameco in Saskatchewan. How do you see this diversification benefit Saskatchewan workers?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to have forgotten that Cameco is a national company. It's as a result of a merger of Eldorado Nuclear and SMDC. They have facilities in Ontario. They're part of the company, Mr. Speaker, and because of the synergies of the existing facility at Port Hope and the private sector company, there was an opportunity. I'm sure that he's not suggesting that that opportunity should not have been picked up and run with, Mr. Speaker.

I know that when . . . well I won't even get into that for fear of stirring it up, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure that he's not suggesting that. I'm sure that he also remembers that there were about 18 — I think it's 17 or 18 jobs that were moved from Ontario to Saskatchewan. These are researchers from the research department of Cameco, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if they've moved yet, but the plan was to move them out here.

And I'm sure that he remembers as well, Mr. Speaker, that when uranium prices started to collapse and there was a reorganization at Cameco, that there were 75 — I think 75 jobs lost in Ontario at the conversion plants. And I'm

sure that he also remembers that the vast majority of the jobs lost at Rabbit Lake were lost because of the depletion of an ore body.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, another question. I think that the minister forgets that he's not the minister in charge of employment in Ontario, or he's not the national level minister — he's a minister of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — A minister responsible in Saskatchewan would look after the 100 jobs that were lost in Rabbit Lake. A minister responsible of Saskatchewan would look after the 14 that were lost in La Ronge. My question to you is this, Mr. Minister of Saskatchewan: I want to know what you will do in regards to the 100 jobs. A lot of native northerners were involved in the termination of those jobs, many of them five to 16 years experience. What are you doing in regarding and placing those people into jobs at Key Lake and other existing mines in northern Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, we have a national company. Cameco is a national company . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — This is a national company, Mr. Speaker, headquartered in Saskatchewan, in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Now if those people were sitting over here, Mr. Speaker, they would have shut down every mine in Saskatchewan. Talk about the loss of 100 jobs! now let's talk about the jobs lost at Rabbit Lake, Mr. Speaker. They were lost because of the depletion of an ore body, Mr. Speaker. Would they have us crunch up rocks just for the sake of crunching up rocks, with no uranium being produced, Mr. Speaker? No, no, I'm sure they wouldn't.

But, Mr. Speaker, the next ore body to be developed in the Rabbit Lake area is an underground ore body. That development work is taking place right now. A lot of the people . . . there would have been probably 250 laid off had we not moved to develop this underground ore body. And that, Mr. Speaker, is happening right now.

If those members were sitting over here, do you think they'd be going underground to develop that ore body? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker. They'd shut the whole works down.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, another question to the minister. Mr. Minister, we know that your national move to the privatization of SMDC through the Cameco situation has put the Eldorado, which was in national debt in regards to their situation and where we were in great equity situation, I want to know, Mr. Minister: what are you going to do in regards to the bottom line of jobs in

northern Saskatchewan? What are you going to do with the workers in northern Saskatchewan? What are you going to do with the workers in northern Saskatchewan? What are you going to do in regards to the placement? We don't want to talk about the national strategy or the Ontario strategy. We want a Saskatchewan strategy on what you are going to do with the experienced workers and miners of northern Saskatchewan in regards to the jobs in northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I've detected a small degree of hypocrisy over there. This member, Mr. Speaker, is one of the members that has publicly said many, many times that we ought to get out of the uranium business; unlike the member from Athabasca and unlike the member from Saskatoon Fairview — reasonable, fair-minded people and have some concerns about jobs in northern Saskatchewan. But let me tell you about some of the things that we are doing, Mr. Speaker.

One of the things that we have done in northern Saskatchewan that will create employment, has done, will now, because of low cost energy, Mr. Speaker, is the Athabasca power line going all the way across the North, Mr. Speaker, all the way from Camsell Portage to Wollaston Post, connecting eight communities along the way — opportunities that will come from having, Mr. Speaker, five and a half cent kilowatts of electricity as opposed to 17 to 29 cents. And it was done, Mr. Speaker, because we had the load of the uranium mine at Rabbit Lake to make it work.

In addition, Mr. . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Before we move to the next question, I'd just like to remind hon. members that there is a great deal of interference here this afternoon, unfortunately, when people are answering the question or asking the question, on both sides of the House. And I think that hon. members should take that into consideration and give each other the courtesy that is deserved by members.

Rebate of Flat Tax After Bankruptcy

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Finance and it concerns how you apply, and how your government applies, your infamous flat tax to farmers who have gone bankrupt in this province. I have a letter here, Mr. Minister, from yourself to the Law Society of Saskatchewan, in which you admit to your folly of charging a flat tax against a fictitious capital gains that farmers were supposed to have accrued while they're going bankrupt. This letter is dated May 30, 1989.

It's taken a while, Mr. Minister, but finally you've admitted that there's a folly in charging a flat tax to farmers who have gone bankrupt. And my question is, Mr. Minister: why has it taken you over four years to realize this mistake?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — The hon. member's interpretation of

the letter is totally inaccurate and not unexpected, however. There is a deemed capital gains at certain times, and the tax applies, Mr. Speaker. The question as to whether it should be applied during bankruptcy is the question that we raised with the law society and the matter we discussed with the law society.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the minister. Mr. Minister, the federal government realized that it was silly, very silly to charge a capital gains against a fictitious capital tax which doesn't exist. Now what's happened is you've admitted that it's a folly, but you're still putting people through the hoops. You're putting farmers through the hoops.

What they have to do now is first of all they have to go bankrupt; then they have to find some money so they can pay this flat tax; then they have to have it confirmed by the federal government; then they have to send for the material, and then they can apply for a rebate.

Now if it was a blunder, and the blunder's on your part, Mr. Minister, why is it that you're making the farmers go through all these hoops?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Are they supposed to go and get the tax before they go bankrupt? Is that what you're asking? In fact, the deemed disposition comes about because of the bankruptcy.

The Speaker: — Order, order. The member has asked the question. The minister has tried to answer, and immediately he's interrupted, and this is causing conflict in the House. And I once more bring this to the attention of members, not to immediately interrupt members. I mean, we have guests in the House who are watching. I think you should recognize it. And the reality is we have people watching on television the daily proceedings, and they see these constant interruptions, and I think members have to take this into consideration.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — The deemed disposition happens because of the bankruptcy. That's why the tax arises at that particular time, and then they apply for the rebate. I don't know where the minister's . . . or member's difficulties are.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Minister, the deemed disposition happens because of your flat tax, not because of the bankruptcy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — There's a very simple solution to this. There's a very simple solution to this, Minister. My question is: why is it that you have not included amendments to The Income Tax Act, which is a Bill before us — Bill 68 is before us in this House — why have you not included that in these amendments right now? And it would stop all of this . . . all of these problems for the farmers. Why?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — The deemed disposition does not come because of the flat tax. The deemed disposition comes because of the capital gains tax and the Bankruptcy Act of Canada. It's a deemed disposition upon bankruptcy. So once that series happens, then it's quite legitimate for them to apply for a rebate. There's no tax if they don't go bankrupt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you. A new question, Mr. Speaker, on the same issue. Mr. Minister, it is possible to rally a sufficiently charitable spirit to concede that this tax might have been born out of an oversight. However, its continued and, I might add, controversial existence for over five years strongly suggests that at some point in time you, sir, made a conscious decision that taxing the insolvency of farmers is an acceptable way to raise money. The opposition doesn't take that position, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I might add, Mr. Minister, that taxing the insolvency of farmers, it would be hard to conceive of a tax which is shorter on compassion nor longer on futility.

My question, Mr. Minister, is based on the fact that your refund procedure apparently seems to require that the tax be paid and then be claimed back. What if the farm family didn't have money to pay the tax, as I would think would almost inevitably be the case. My question, Mr. Speaker, is the status of penalties which will be charged. Will those penalties be returned with, one would hope, an appropriate letter of apology from yourself?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — First of all I won't remind the hon. member of speculative questions, Mr. Speaker, but if the farmer goes into bankruptcy . . . and Lord knows you're the experts, your members that act for the banks putting them into bankruptcy; you should have some expertise and understanding, one would expect, Mr. Speaker.

If they go into bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker, it's questionable whether it's even the farmer's money at that point; it then becomes the trustee's money. So I don't know where that leaves the hon. member.

The fact is that we have given the farmers a break with the rebate program, not a disadvantage. We've given the farmer a break. The money goes back to the farmer. It doesn't go to go to the trustee, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't go to the trustee.

The hon. members obviously do not understand the interrelationship of the capital gains, the deemed disposition because of bankruptcy, the fact that a trustee now takes over the assets of the individual, Mr. Speaker. Normally the trustee would get all the moneys from the disposition of the assets. In this case it goes back to the farmer, Mr. Speaker. The hon. members don't understand the issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — A new question. Mr. Minister, I want to make sure I understand your position. The Premier kicks about 2,000 farmers off the land. As they're rushing off the land with the Premier's boot, you're taxing them as they leave, and you're apparently doing them a favour.

Mr. Minister, my question is: what has this largess on your part towards Saskatchewan farmers netted the treasury? How much have you got out of this foolish and stupid tax?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think all members should listen. Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, there should be a rule that the hon. member opposite understands the issue before he asks the question. It would save himself a lot of embarrassment.

Mr. Speaker, upon a bankruptcy there is a deemed disposition, and therefore the capital gains is applied. That is a federal tax, the capital gains tax. The capital gains tax, Mr. Speaker, is taxable under the capital gains, or under the flat tax, I mean. It's taxable at that point.

So, Mr. Speaker, there's an automatic operation of The Income Tax Act upon bankruptcy which results in the tax, which the trustee, Mr. Speaker, one thinks should get the money if there's a rebate; in fact we give it to the farmers, Mr. Speaker. We give it to the farmers, not to the trustee. So, Mr. Speaker, the farmer's in bankruptcy, not because of the tax, because of other operations. That's drawing a bow that they know is unconscionable and wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I want to thank the minister for that highly convoluted answer. I might add, Mr. Minister, the obvious, that the more convoluted the answer, the less likely it is to be accurate.

Mr. Minister, I have one final question for you and that is: how much more pain do you intend to inflict on Saskatchewan farmers? When they get their money back, will they get it back in a lump sum? Will they get it back with interest and with the penalties which you presumably charge when they're unable to pay a tax on their own insolvency?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, they don't go insolvent because of the tax, and the hon. member doesn't understand that. Upon insolvency . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I'm going to once more call the members to order.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Upon insolvency, the capital gains tax is . . . there is a deemed

disposition, Mr. Speaker, an automatic operation of the capital gains tax provisions under the Income Tax Act of Canada. That's what happens. It's automatic, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't matter whether it's a farmer or anybody else, that's what happens at that particular time. There are other deemed dispositions that automatically operate so that the particular asset is deemed to have been disposed of, Mr. Speaker. There's a technical operation which at that particular time there is a deemed capital gains.

We rebate the tax, not to the trustee who now has the assets, Mr. Speaker, but to the farmer. Mr. Speaker, it's to the advantage of the farmer, the way we operate, not to the disadvantage. The hon. members don't understand that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you. Mr. Minister, a new question. I am quoting from the letter which you sent to the Law Society of Saskatchewan, dated May 30, a copy of which was sent on to the members of the law society.

Mr. Minister, on the second page a sentence appears as follows:

We are prepared to introduce a reformed tax system that would alleviate the problem of capital gains taxation on farm foreclosures; however, we require the agreement of the federal government.

After you get the federal government, are you then going to be apologizing for all this confusion and pain inflicted on farmers?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Depending . . . well again the hon. member doesn't understand. We've indicated that we're prepared to take the case and have taken the case to the federal government upon foreclosure of farms as to what happens to the automatic deeming of the income tax, that there is, in fact, a capital gains upon insolvency.

Mr. Speaker, depending what amendments the federal government is prepared to make, they may rule that there is not a capital gains upon insolvency of a farmer, in which case the flat tax would not apply in the first place. In our view, to help farmers, that would be one way to do it, Mr. Speaker. That's the argument we've made.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Chairmanship of PCS

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I want to give the same minister an opportunity to answer a question about a subject which he may be able to answer a little more clearly and a little more easily, and that is the potash corporation.

Yesterday we talked about Paul Schoenhals and his change of status from a full-time chairman to a part-time chairman of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan following his move to Calgary which is to take place in

the middle of July.

Will you confirm, Minister, that Paul Schoenhals will be paid \$300 a day, as he told the newspapers, for as many days as he sees fit to act as the part-time chairman of PCS while he's living in Alberta. And can you tell us whether or not PCS will be paying Mr. Schoenhals' travelling expenses between Calgary and Saskatchewan when he has to attend to board business?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated two things to the House yesterday with regard . . . or three things with regard to Mr. Schoenhals and the potash corporation. One, that I don't believe that there is a need for a full-time chairman, and some major decisions have been made.

An Hon. Member: — There never was.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Yes, there was. And some major changes have been made, Mr. Speaker. The question, then, of the pay of a part-time chairman will be dealt with at the next board meeting, which I indicated to the hon. member. I also indicated to the press yesterday, Mr. Speaker, as to Mr. Schoenhals' position, his personal position, and as chairman or part-time chairman, is one that we would be looking at within the privatization context and the appointments to the board upon privatization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Mitchell: — A new question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, now I am a bit confused because I hear your answers and yet I read the report from Mr. Schoenhals' interview where he clearly indicates that he is continuing as the part-time chairman, and clearly saying what his rate of pay is to be.

Now I'd like to know who made the decision that we now will go to a part-time chairman of PCS? It can't be the board because the board hasn't sat recently. Was it you or was it Mr. Schoenhals? And who decided that we can now get by with a part-time chairman after you made such a big deal about having a full-time chairman in the first place? And really, it comes down to this: who's making the decisions in respect to this outfit, is it you or is it Mr. Schoenhals?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well, as in the normal case of most well run corporations, the board will.

Mr. Mitchell: — Final question on this subject to the same minister. It's a new question, Mr. Speaker. When the board holds its next meeting, will you be taking in a recommendation that Mr. Schoenhals be dropped as chairman of the board and replaced by a Saskatchewan resident, and can you tell us when this next board meeting will take place?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — With regard to the latter, I undertook yesterday that I would get the date of the next board meeting for the hon. member. I believe it's some time in August, but I'm subject to correction on that — or late July. But I'll undertake — you won't be going to the

meeting anyway, and if it's anything like the performance that the member from Regina North West at the Saskoil annual meeting, it was so embarrassing to the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, I hope they do show up at the next board meeting.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Environment and Public Safety Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 9

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I see you have your hand up so I suspect you're going to send over the schedule of fees for the . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. It's very difficult to hear when there's so many meetings going on besides the estimates. I'd ask members to please be quiet so we can hear the questions and the answers.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. You have sent over the schedule of fees for the PCB (polychlorinated biphenyl) storage that are of the private sector, private companies and/or individuals. We are examining them now. Can you tell me, Mr. Minister, are these now in effect and in place, or are they proposals, or what is the status of this schedule?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — These fees were supplied to us by Sask Power Corporation and they're all-inclusive fees. They cover the costs of transportation, of site inspection, and of the disposal at the end. Like, if you add them up they're all together. And I think that will be the figure used in signing contracts with the individual companies.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. You didn't answer my question. My question is: are they now in effect? It says at the bottom of the paper you gave us, July 3, 1989. Is that . . . are they in effect on July 3, 1989, or are these yet another set of draft proposals which somebody is examining? I mean, is this now in place — it's been a long time — and can the people who are going to have to abide by these new schedule of fees ready to take a look at them and get some action going here?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The indication we have is that these are the fees that will be used as SaskPower enters into contracts with people to take their product into storage and for disposal.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you. I gather from your answer that therefore they're ready to enter into contracts, Mr. Minister. Good. Thank you very much.

Mr. Minister, a couple of more questions on this. I'm not going to spend a great deal of time. I've got a number of issues which I want to spend a short amount of time on,

but I want to cover them all because they all are important. But has there been an arrangement, to your knowledge, between the city of Saskatoon and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to move the PCBs out of the location in the Nutana area where they are now located? Is there an agreement, Mr. Minister, and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — To the best of my knowledge they haven't entered into contracts with anyone except SaskPower at this point, so they will be dealing with it, but they haven't, as far as I know, entered into a contract yet. They're working on the fee structure, talking to others. They've brought forward a number of drafts, as I told you yesterday, and this is the most recent list of fees, and they indicate now they're ready to enter into contracts.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — This is the final schedule of fees. They're ready to enter into contract, and we can anticipate that some action will take place relatively quickly. Mr. Minister, I suspect you will do everything in your power — exercise the influence of your department and yourself — to make sure that this be done expeditiously, because surely you will agree that this, not exclusively, is a situation where there is some potential, a very hazardous situation potentially, but in this particular case it is pretty severe, so I assume that you're going to be taking some action to make sure that this happens quickly.

Now, Mr. Minister, some time ago, as a matter of fact, September 6, 1986, you provided a list of locations of PCB storage sites in Saskatchewan. I'm not sure whether this was the final list because your initial list that was provided by your department was not a complete list and you had to do some revising.

I don't know that you can give them to me today or if not necessary to do so, but will you undertake either to send it over now if you have it, or in the very near future, by correspondence with me, a list of those locations from which the PCBs have been removed? We have the list of where they were. Will you provide a list of the locations where they have been removed and where they have been transported to the Estevan location.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I want to just answer some of the comments you made prior to your question. You indicated that there was a real dangerous situation in the storage unit of the PCBs in the Nutana site. That site meets all the federal guide-lines for a PCB storage site so there isn't really a potential danger there. I think it's a very safe site. We will be encouraging SaskPower to move all of the PCBs into the storage sites at Boundary dam as quickly as possible. But which site is going to be first, I couldn't tell you.

Now as far as providing you with a list of the sites that have been cleared, we may be able to do that, but it would be only SaskPower sites up to this point, and they may clean them out today and then have others accumulating there again until they have another load. So I don't know how valuable that kind of a list might be to the member.

If you really think it's valuable, we can try and get it, but I

think that it's a very fluid situation and likely the list won't be of much benefit to you at this time. So I would just as soon not provide it, but if you're very anxious we probably can. I just don't think it's very valuable to you.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — On the contrary, Mr. Minister, I would find it very valuable. At least provide me those locations from which the PCBs have been removed on which there no longer is going to be a new batch of them deposited. Surely there must be some of these locations which are not going to be used for PCB storage any more. Will you at least undertake to do that, Mr. Minister? And I will figure out then from there where all the other locations are in which there are going to be PCBs from time to time. I questioned whether there ought to be.

And one of the reasons why you are removing them from these locations, Mr. Minister, is so that they wouldn't be there and cause a dangerous situation, or an "at risk" situation. But will you at least undertake to provide a list of those locations from which the PCBs have been removed and in which no longer are they being deposited?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, we'll undertake to do that.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I want now to refer to your budget speech — not yours, the Minister of Finance, but obviously you must have had some input. In the budget speech you indicated that this budget provides funds for a three-year \$54 million soil conservation agreement with the federal government.

Now, Mr. Minister, I am somewhat concerned when I read the June 29 *Leader-Post* in which it is indicating that this federal-provincial soil conservation agreement has now been put on hold because the federal government is not moving on it for some reason — and I suspect it's the same reason as the ERDA (Economic and Regional Development Agreement) grants have been cancelled, and so on, in that it's a budgetary consideration.

I think that's shocking news, in light of the fact that in the the *AgNews*, produced by Saskatchewan Agriculture, the Deputy Premier was saying in no uncertain terms, in fact he announced, that the provincial government has agreed in principle to the signing of a Canada-Saskatchewan soil and water conservation development accord. It goes back to my earlier arguments with you, Mr. Minister, that you make these pronouncements, but in effect there is no substance in which to back them up.

Are you able to explain to the House, Mr. Minister, why there is this delay, and when you expect that this thing will finally be put into place, because there are organizations such as the south-west soil conservation area, the Wheatland soil conservation area, which have been dependent on funding from the PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration)? That has now expired. They are in limbo because you have not concluded these other arrangements which they had been promised would be the new source of funding. Can you provide a report on the status of this agreement, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The only report that I could provide on

the agreement . . . Agriculture is the lead agency, as you can appreciate, in this particular agreement. I'm involved with it from Environment and from the water side.

But Saskatchewan has signed the agreement and has forwarded it to Ottawa for their signature. The signature hasn't been forthcoming from Ottawa and the delays, I guess, are budget delays. I would hope that we'll have a signature soon, but so far I can't tell you whether it will be this month or next month, or whether it will be two or three months. We just don't have that answer.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Minister, that's really not satisfactory from the point of view of the organizations such as the Wheatland conservation area, which has existed for a large number of years, which I think has a membership of 3 or 400 — correct me on the figure — which has a program that is a very effective one from the point of view of doing research into soil salinity, into conservation measures, into prevention of soil drift, and a whole list of other things that are very important when we consider the kind of seriousness that agriculture faces in Saskatchewan because of soil degradation.

Mr. Minister, have you taken any steps to contact the federal ministers, or minister, about this matter to determine what the delay is and when in fact there may be some funding? What's this Wheatland conservation area supposed to do in the meantime — sit there and twiddle its thumbs and have its program fall apart and have people lose interest because of this vacuum that exists?

(1445)

It's not good enough simply to say, well maybe it will come in several months. I know it's the federal government is delaying it, Mr. Minister, but at least you could take the initiative to put some pressure on the federal government. I understand that at least he likes to pretend that he's got a — the Minister of Agriculture — the Premier's got a great relationship with the Prime Minister. I mean, obviously that relationship isn't being very productive when it comes to this very important issue.

What steps have you taken to put pressure on the federal government to deliver on this important program?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I have taken the steps that are possible from my department to encourage the federal government to move, and perhaps I should agree with the hon. member that it's not satisfactory that the federal government not sign the accord. We worked together as two governments to draft the accord. Saskatchewan has signed it; I'm encouraging the federal Minister of Agriculture to finalize the agreement, and hopefully we will have that soon.

But I have no guarantee of which day, so I can't give you a promise of which day. I have talked to the federal minister by telephone and in person, but haven't had an answer that I'm satisfied that I dare give a date to the public, because I'm not sure of the date.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — So knowing the record of the federal

government recently, since it's re-election, I'm not surprised that you wouldn't want to make that commitment because I think you'd be putting yourself at some great political risk if you did.

The point I want to make, and I'll leave it at that, is that it is not satisfactory, if we're really talking about the importance of soil conservation . . . I've got enough information to go through, reams of statistics on how much drifts away every year and what the cost of that is in productivity, and so on. I don't need to get into that.

But it's really, and I'm sure you'll agree, unsatisfactory for the federal government, having made the commitment, having signed the agreement with the province, can now renege on it or even to delay on it to the extent that they have been delaying, because some of these things can't wait, Mr. Minister.

And I only hope that, and I would urge that you take every step possible, including the involvement of the Premier, in urging the federal government to act and to act quickly so that people who are dependent on this funding, who have done a tremendously good job and providing great leadership, don't find themselves faced with some very serious shortage of funds and have their program fall apart because the federal government, being so far away, has ignored their need.

Mr. Minister, I want to ask you a couple of other questions on other issues here. There was a report in the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, June 16, in which it is indicated that southern Saskatchewan possesses the perfect geology for the hazard and waste disposal site being considered by the province.

Mr. Minister, it says further that the provincial environment department is currently developing a strategy to handle the more than 50,000 tonnes of hazardous waste generated in Saskatchewan each year, and that this disposal site may be included in the new plan, Mr. Minister. Is that the case? Is it true that your government is considering establishing this disposal site in Saskatchewan, and if so, where?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The article that the member quotes from, I'm not familiar with. I don't believe it's anything to do with our department; it's somebody else writing it.

What we have, dealing with hazardous waste, is that we have put 200,000 in the budget for a study of hazardous waste disposal. That would be the beginning of a broad look at the province and identifying the quantities and the types of hazardous waste that we produce, and we will, in that process, begin to look at methods of disposal, whether it should be within our province or whether we should co-operate with Manitoba or with Alberta or some other province.

So we haven't made any assessment that any particular area of the province is the right type of soil or the area that we should select as the storage site for hazardous wastes. That hasn't been accomplished yet.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I now want to ask you a couple questions about the matter dealing

with radon gas; you're familiar with the issue. In my opinion, and in the opinion of a lot of experts in the field — and I don't claim to be one of the experts — but in my opinion, the levels of radon gas in homes and work places and the acceptable levels as we have in Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister, are way out of sync with what are now considered to be the acceptable levels in other parts of the world, in the United States.

And as a matter of fact, the World Health Organization has set their action guide-line for radon gas as 2.5 PCI per litre. And I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, have you given any thought to changing the standard in Saskatchewan, or encouraging that that standard be changed to prevent the kind of danger that exists, danger which it is well-known results in cancer, lung cancer, for many people who may be affected. Can you indicate whether you have given some consideration to changing that standard, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The standard that is used in Saskatchewan is a Canadian standard. Now that Canadian standard is 800 becquerels per cubic metre. Most of the homes tested here in the province fall well below that level, many of them below 100. So they're well within the guide-line.

The (Canadian) Council of Resource and Environment Ministers about two years ago structured a committee to look at radon gas and the levels that had been decided upon by the Health department in Canada. That committee reported back and indicated that the committee still feels that the figures that we are now using are the right figures and that they are still well within the safety range as far as people are concerned.

So I don't see a move in the immediate future to make another attempt at changing that figure, because it appears from the expert advice that we get that the figure is a satisfactory guide-line to follow.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now, Mr. Minister, I guess that's the question: is the Canadian standard adequate? I think there's enough evidence to show that it's not. If it's an adequate standard . . . I believe it's 20 PCI per litre. The standard in the United States is 4 PCI per litre. The World Health Organization has set a guide-line for 2.5 PCI per litre. Mr. Minister, what makes all of those organizations and nations of the world wrong and makes the Canadian standard right?

You must understand, Mr. Minister, that the reports show that there are between 5,000 and 30,000 deaths that are called from lung cancer as a result of radon in North America. That's a very high figure. It doesn't matter what the figure is; 100 is high if we can do something about reducing it.

Mr. Minister, in light of all the evidence that's there, why would you not consider changing the standard to a more acceptable level in Saskatchewan? What possible negative repercussions would come out of that?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The people who are much more expert in that field than I ever profess to be, have looked at it and view it as being the proper level for Canada to

follow. Now there may be other experts at universities and things who disagree with that, but I think when we get the standards set by the Health department for Canada, that we have to draw a line somewhere on how many experts we call in.

Now they feel that this is the right figure. You quote from different units of measure. And yes, the 20 picacuries that you are relating to would come just about exactly at the same level as the 800 becquerel figure. The two would relate about equal. So we should stay with one source of measurement or the other, but I think that we need to stay with Canadian standard.

If somebody can convince Canada that we should change that figure, then perhaps it will be changed, but the council of environment ministers, when we structured a committee and met with the Canadian level, got the answer back that we were still on the right guide-line and they wanted to stay there.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I beg to disagree with the council. I don't know where they get their information from, but there is also other information world-wide that shows that the standard in Canada is too high. And I simply say that I don't agree with you that it shouldn't be changed, and I would urge you to reconsider, to introduce some regulatory changes that I believe very strongly, and so do a lot of experts believe very strongly, are necessary.

But on another side of this issue, Mr. Minister, are you prepared to implement a province-wide radon gas testing program to protect Saskatchewan home owners and renters? This is a question that was asked of you by my colleague, the member for Saskatoon University constituency, in a letter he wrote to you not too long ago, as matter of fact May 31 — well that's a little bit of time. Are you prepared, Mr. Minister, to provide such a program, to follow the lead that has been set by the city of Regina which recently indicated that they are going to provide more publicity to this issue, provide information to the public.

This has been encouraged by Dr. Bev Robertson at University of Regina, who is encouraged that the provincial government should be giving this issue a higher profile and should set up, in fact, a laboratory in Regina, rather than having to ship all of this to Ontario or into the United States. So my question is twofold: one, are you prepared to provide a more extensive testing system; and two, are you prepared to provide some facilities so that the tests can be analysed here in this province?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I just want to advise the hon. member that Saskatchewan Department of Environment did a fairly extensive testing of homes in Saskatchewan. They tested about 2,500 homes in the late '70s and early '80s. At the same time, the federal government tested about 2,500 homes also in Saskatchewan, but a different 2,500, and in those tests we found that the majority of homes, there were very few that were above the safety levels. So I think that the testing has been reasonably well done.

(1500)

Now to go out and do every home would be a pretty major cost. I don't think anyone is proposing to do every home, but what they are suggesting is that new homes are going to be tested — brand-new homes. In other provinces they are suggesting that they may do new homes. Winnipeg, as an example, has indicated that they may.

But I'm advised by my staff that there is now a company in Saskatoon who is capable of doing radon testing. They call it CAIRS, Canadian association of independent radon . . . and so on — I haven't got all of it. But anyway, there's a company that can do the testing, and I believe that that is about as far as we should go at this point.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — My colleague points out, Mr. Minister, that when the testing was done, 10 to 20 per cent of the homes had radon gas level in excess of the U.S. standard. Mr. Minister, I think that should indicate that maybe there needs to be more effort that is taken, and maybe the home owners should share some of the cost. I don't know that. But I think most people who would be concerned would probably welcome that opportunity if it was made available to them. So I don't think it's a matter that should be simply taken lightly and disregarded as if it's not an important issue.

Mr. Minister, are you saying, therefore, in light of all that, that you have no plans at all to increase the testing capability in the province so that we can do something about some of the potential risk that's involved? And I welcome the fact that it may very well happen in new homes. I'm not aware that it's happening in Saskatchewan, but that's not where the only problem is. Some of the older homes are much more serious risk than some of the new ones. If I'm wrong on that, you might correct me and explain why, but many of the new homes have air exchange systems and things like that which make a considerable difference.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised by my staff that the city of Saskatoon had 700 homes tested. There were no homes out of the 700 tested that exceeded the Canadian standard. Now you quote American standard. We happen to live north of the American border, so I guess we still go on Canadian standard and maybe you should just adjust your thinking a little and be in Canada.

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Minister, the point that my colleague has made very clearly is that if these home owners lived in the United States, their homes would be deemed to have radon gas levels far in excess of the acceptable level in the United States. In fact, as you well know, of all the homes that you tested in Saskatchewan, you found that consistently there were many communities that had 10 to 20 per cent of all homes with radon gas levels in them that were in excess of American standards.

Now, Mr. Minister, the reality is that the Canadian government and your government, when it comes to standards for low level radiation in this province and in this country, are way out of whack with the rest of the world.

Why is it, Mr. Minister, that in Sweden, for instance, the standard is eight times tougher than it is in Saskatchewan?

Why is it in the United States the standard is five times tougher than if it was in Saskatchewan? If these homes, Mr. Minister, were in Sweden, this would be a matter of great public concern.

The Swedish government provides assistance to home owners to overcome the problems with radon gas with these kind of levels that we're seeing in Saskatchewan, and exactly the same thing happens in the United States. Home owners are warned in the United States that when radon gas levels exist as they do at levels in 10 to 20 per cent of the homes in Saskatchewan, that is a matter that is urgently dealt with by state governments in the U.S.

Now you explain to me, sir, why it is that your government here in Saskatchewan says to home owners that it's no problem. You don't even alert them to the cancer risks that may be associated with it. You don't even bother, Mr. Minister, to have a comprehensive testing program for radon gas in communities where it's known that radon gas levels are high. You're just prepared, Mr. Minister, to close your eyes to the problem.

You explain to me, sir, why you're prepared to let Saskatchewan residents suffer potential health risks, and particularly cancer, from high radon gas levels that would be unacceptable in the United States, that would be unacceptable in Sweden, that are unacceptable to the World Health Organization, but that are somehow acceptable to you, sir. You explain that to this Assembly.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I think if the hon. member will take a look at the Canadian standards and finds that Saskatchewan is within the Canadian standards, and these are set by Health and Welfare Canada.

Now I'm not in Sweden, I'm not in the United States, or in any other country; I happen to live in Canada. We abide by the rules and regulations set for Canada. And for that reason the tests that were done by both Canada and Saskatchewan have shown that we don't have a serious concern in this province. And I believe that that test has been well done.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, it's a pity that you choose, as on many other issues, just to simply turn off and to blind yourself to some of the realities around the world. I mean, there are many cases where the world has learned from us, but we shouldn't be so cozy about that that we don't think we can learn from the rest of the world.

I would have accepted if you would have simply said, yes, maybe we should look at this. But you're simply categorically saying absolutely no; you're right and everybody else is wrong on this matter. And I really think, Mr. Minister, that that's not very acceptable. I'm not going to spend the rest of the afternoon trying to convince you because I don't think that's going to work. I simply say that I think the position you have taken is the wrong position. You should be more open-minded about it. Your government should be more open-minded about it. This is a situation that is serious enough that it deserves the kind of high attention that is certainly not displayed by the answers you've given here today.

Mr. Minister, I want to ask you a question on an issue which involves the Rural Municipality of Val Marie and a road to the Foothills Compressor Station. There is a lot of concern out there by the municipality, by people concerned about the environmental impact of the road. And I know that your department is involved in this, because in some correspondence that has taken place, it is indicated the Department of Environment is.

Mr. Minister, is there a study being undertaken or an impact study which involves your department at the present time with regard to this; and if there is, when do you expect to get it; and when you get it, how long will the turnaround time be so that some decision can be made so all people concerned know where they stand?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised by my staff that the study came in to the office on June 26. They're almost completed their internal review of that paper. They're looking at the public review period — like you have to have a little time to advertise it. They're looking at the public review period, likely from July 20 until August 19.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — And after that the people involved, the R.M. and people concerned about the environment will know what the results of that are, is that what you're saying? Right after that there will be a statement that will come out to clear the air on this thing, with a decision?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Well after that public hearing process, then my department either give approval for the project to proceed or the project is denied, one or the other. Now it may take a few days after that to evaluate all of the information that you get during the public review period, but it will be worked through steadily, and as soon as possible a decision will be made.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, on many occasions during these estimates we've spoken about environmental impact assessments and public inquiries and looking to see that all the steps are taken to protect life and health in the environment.

There's a situation at Cigar Lake, an underground uranium mining development which is taking place there. It is agreed by most that it will pose a major life and environment threatening situation.

I refer you to a committee for the House of Commons in which the president of Atomic Energy of Canada came forward as a witness and indicated, when asked if he thought that there should be a public inquiry and whether there would be any objection to that, he indicated no, there would be no objection. He indicated that this is going to be an ore body which is going to present hazards which have not been encountered in other uranium mining situations.

Mr. Minister, there is a growing body of opinion that this project requires an inquiry with full public hearings before any work is undertaken. What steps, Mr. Minister, have you taken to see that such an inquiry is undertaken?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The only approval that has been given at Cigar Lake is for a test mine. That process has been ongoing now for a while and they're trying a variety of

things, but there has been no approval to go ahead with full-scale mining at Cigar Lake project.

When Cigar Lake is finished with its testing process, and if they make the decision then that they want to proceed to full-scale mining, they will have to do a full-scale environmental impact assessment, and then there will be a public review period and, if we see it necessary, then we can also structure a board of inquiry.

So all of these steps are before us and we, at this point, don't even have a request from Cigar Lake Mining company for the proposal to go ahead to full-scale mining.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, it's been indicated that the risk of radiation-induced cancer faced by workers at this proposed mine would be an average of 400 times greater than at any existing mines. I think that certainly is . . . that's a pretty strong argument why there needs to be a full public inquiry because that is not the kind of thing that one should, at any level of government, should ignore.

There is evidence that in mines in Ontario, there have . . . as a matter of fact, the statistics are here. The Ontario Workers' Compensation Board has accepted 170 cases of cancers that have been induced by radiation at the Ontario uranium mines, and they certainly don't have the kind of concentration that this one will have.

So am I hearing correctly, Mr. Minister, or am I hopefully interpreting what you're saying, that you would favour an inquiry, a public inquiry, if this mine is to go ahead, so that all of the questions can be answered; and to make sure that the health and safety and the environmental safety questions revolving around those issues are addressed adequately before any work goes ahead?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The reason that they're doing a test mine at Cigar Lake is because of the very high quality ore that is in that mine. And they need to look at other methods of mining before they make a decision whether or not they can mine it. So they're looking at remote mining and doing a number of different things, and they're doing a lot of tests as they go along.

Now I think all of us realize that this ore is going to take very special care if you're going to mine it. It's very high quality ore. Before the approval for a full-scale mine is granted, there will be a very major environmental impact assessment needed and the public review period will be required.

And I think it's at that time, when the public review period is completed, that you make the decision whether a board of inquiry needs to be structured or not. It's certainly something that we'll look at. I'm not making a commitment to that today, but it's something that will be looked at very seriously as this project would proceed.

(1515)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, on another issue, I understand that you have hired consultants to report on changes at the Rabbit Lake open pit storage system — there have been some changes there — and that those

consultants have given you several reports, and that last June — correct me if I'm wrong — there was the final report that you have available, but that it has not been public at the request of the province, Mr. Minister. Why are you not making that final report public? And if I'm wrong in that, will you make it available to members of the House by either sending it to me or making it available during these estimates?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I would like to reply to the hon. member that there was a report done for the company by a person that they hired and paid, so that information basically is company information. The department then hired a review done by its own consultant, and that report came in about a month ago, and I'm advised that I could make a copy of that available. I don't have it here today, but I can make it available to you.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you. I would appreciate that, Mr. Minister. And when I see it I may have some other matters that I want to follow up on it, but as soon as you can get it to me I would appreciate it.

I'm going to allow . . . or I'm going to have my colleague, the member from Saskatoon University, ask some questions. He has some issues which he wants to address with you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I want to ask you a question with respect to the proposal for a 10 megawatt Slow Poke reactor at the University of Saskatchewan campus. I'm sure, Mr. Minister, that you have some familiarity with the proposal. I understand at this point in time that the environmental impact assessment is being worked on, both by Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. in co-operation with the University of Saskatchewan.

You will know, Mr. Minister, that the proposed location for this reactor that Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. would like to build is in perhaps the most densely populated part of Saskatchewan. And there are thousands of people, obviously, who frequent the university campus every day, so you're talking about, first of all, a faculty and student body of about 15,000 people that would be in close proximity to where the reactor is proposed to be located.

It would also be very close to the University Hospital in Saskatoon that is directly adjacent to the campus. And there are a number of neighbourhoods, Mr. Minister, that I represent, that would also be located very close by to this proposed reactor site.

And, Mr. Minister, you will also be aware of the fact that a similar proposal, a 10 megawatt Slow Poke nuclear reactor, was recently turned down by the people of Sherbrooke, Quebec. Before Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. came to the University of Saskatchewan wanting to build its Slow Poke, it's been trying to sell it in Sherbrooke, it's been trying to sell it in Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories. It's made a proposal that was rejected by General Electric for a reactor to be located at a facility that they have in Peterborough. So, Mr. Minister, wherever Atomic Energy of Canada has gone to date to try to sell its 10 megawatt Slow Poke reactor, it's been turned

down. And now we have this proposal at the University of Saskatchewan.

My question to you, sir, is: in light of the points that I just made, are you willing to assure my constituents, and the faculty and the student body at the University of Saskatchewan, and the people of Saskatoon, that before any decision is made on whether or not a Slow Poke reactor will be allowed to be built at the University of Saskatchewan, that you, sir, as Minister of the Environment, will ensure that there is a public hearing on this matter with a full opportunity to participate by all Saskatoon residents and anybody else who is concerned about this issue, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised by my staff that up to this point we don't have any request for the project. We've had an initial visit with the former president of the University of Saskatchewan. By the way, he told me you were in favour of this.

The next step that would have to be taken, if the University is serious and wants to proceed in that direction, they would have to have a full-scale environmental impact assessment, and then there would be the internal review by the department and also a public review period. So they would have to go through all of that environmental impact assessment process and have the public involvement before any approvals could even be considered.

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Minister, you know full well that the environmental impact assessment is being done right now, and I am sure will be on your desk, Mr. Minister, within a matter of months.

And, Mr. Minister, I realize that you haven't received the environmental impact assessment yet, but there are a number of issues associated with this 10-megawatt reactor, Mr. Minister, that should be obvious to you as they are to the people of Saskatchewan. Obviously this reactor, Mr. Minister, is going to generate nuclear waste, obviously on a much smaller scale than the larger reactors that we've seen built in Canada today, but there will be at least a tonne of nuclear waste generated by this reactor every three or four years, Mr. Minister.

It's well established that this model of reactor doesn't have an airtight containment system. It's one of the controversial issues that I'm sure you must know was being debated in Sherbrooke, was the fact that short-lived radioactive gases are vented regularly by this reactor, which would not be a major concern if it was located in a remote part of the province, but certainly is a concern when you propose to locate this kind of a facility in a densely populated area. I want to reiterate to you again, Mr. Minister, that we are talking about a location that is more densely populated than probably any other location that could be chosen in the whole province of Saskatchewan for this facility.

So, Mr. Minister, I know you don't have the environmental impact assessment yet, but you will no doubt make a decision on this project, and whether or not it will be approved, before we have Environment estimates again. And so my question to you is that I want

your assurance, sir, that before this project . . . before a decision is made on this project by you, that you will guarantee my constituents and the faculty and students and administration at the University of Saskatchewan and the neighbourhoods that I represent adjacent to the university, who are obviously concerned about the possible health consequences that this kind of a reactor could propose, that there will be an opportunity for public scrutiny of this proposal at a public hearing in Saskatoon. Now give us your commitment on that this afternoon, sir, would you.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I want to advise the hon. member that the university may be doing something internal at this point. They have not come to my department for specific job . . . or environmental specific guide-lines for a nuclear reactor to go into the university. So they may be doing a feasibility study on their own, or something of that nature that we are not being kept aware of, but they are certainly not going ahead at this point with the full-scale environmental impact assessment because they would have to come in here for guide-lines to spell out what we require if they are going to go ahead.

But when they do go ahead, if that's the decision at the end of their internal review, if they decide to go with the environmental impact assessment, they will have to meet the requirements of the department, and then there will be a public review period. After the impact assessment is written and our department has done all of its internal reviews and has written the department's views on that impact assessment, then they will have a 30-day or more review period.

If at the end of that there's still felt to be a need, then we can have a board of inquiry or open meetings or whatever is required after that. But it will take a very major review before any kind of approval would be given. I would imagine that we'll likely be back in Environment estimates again prior to that time.

Mr. Prebble: — Well that's not very reassuring, Mr. Minister, in light of the schedule that I know Atomic Energy of Canada Limited has for this project which, as I understand it, is to have its documentation to you this fall, Mr. Minister. I know that there's going to be a public review period because that's required in statute by the environmental legislation that we passed in the early 1980s. I'm not asking for a public review period because that's required by statute. I'm asking for a public hearing.

Now, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you another question with respect to this, since you're obviously hedging around on your unwillingness to make a commitment with respect to a public hearing, and that is you will know, sir, that your government right now is negotiating with the Government of Canada with respect to providing moneys for the additional infrastructure costs associated with this project at the University of Saskatchewan. You will know full well, sir, that this project by itself is not economically viable.

The University of Saskatchewan is going to have to first of all undertake major changes to the tunnelling system that it has on the campus, because that tunnelling system is not set up right now for the kind of hot water system that

this reactor would be providing heat to. Currently the University of Saskatchewan is set up for basically a steam heat system, Mr. Minister, and you will know that there are large costs — and we're talking here about millions of dollars — that are associated with undertaking changes to the University of Saskatchewan in order to accommodate this kind of a facility, and your government is obviously preparing to subsidize the cost of doing that, sir, in conjunction with the federal government.

Now I wonder if you could enlighten us with respect to the negotiations that are taking place right now with Ottawa on providing those additional moneys, and if you can tell us why instead you would not choose, Mr. Minister, to take some of those tax dollars, and instead of putting them into facilities to accommodate a nuclear reactor on the campus, instead put them into safe, renewable sources of energy that the University of Saskatchewan might experiment with, or into a major energy conservation initiative that the University of Saskatchewan might experiment with, something that would be safe in environmental terms, instead of taking more tax dollars and pushing them into the subsidization of an industry that is basically dead in Canada already — because AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) has been trying to sell these Slow Pokes around the world and they haven't had any buyers, and now they're trying to sell them in Canada to the Northwest Territories and to Sherbrooke university and to Peterborough, Ontario. And they haven't had any buyers there either, sir.

And they have been trying to sell their Candu reactors around the world, and they haven't had a single sale for 10 years. I mean, isn't all this really, Mr. Minister, about another attempt by your government using Saskatchewan tax dollars to bail out Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. who can't sell a reactor anywhere in the world, let alone domestically?

(1530)

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Well I'm almost flattered that the hon. member thinks that my department has all this control over everything that happens in government. Let me advise the hon. member that I have not been involved in negotiations with Canada, with the Government of Canada, with atomic energy control board, or anybody else to push forward the idea of a Candu reactor or a Slow Poke reactor.

What my department will do is to review — a very, very thorough review of any proposal that comes forward, and we have not been involved in all of these underhanded negotiations that the hon. member is alluding to. If he knows of something like this and it's in some other department of government, he may have to ask his questions at that time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I want to pursue another matter which involves the Atomic Energy of Canada, and that's the recent attempt by one Colin Hindle and his company, which is called Western Project Development Associates, who are advocating the construction of a nuclear power plant in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, in our view there is no need for a nuclear reactor in Saskatchewan. There are alternative forms of energy generation which are cleaner, safer, and cheaper. And, Mr. Minister, we should be using the new technologies available to increase energy conservation so that our need for expensive new power generating stations, no matter what type, are reduced.

That's the point at which you should be starting, Mr. Minister, and your colleague, the minister in charge of the power corporation. You choose not to do that. In fact, you have done away with the energy conservation agency that once existed, a very effective one, that had initiated some pretty interesting and effective ways of conserving energy.

So I think, Mr. Minister, that it's time that your government clearly stated its position on this proposal. And so I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, what is your government's position on a nuclear reactor for Saskatchewan? Are you in favour of it, or are you against it, or are you prepared to take the kind of other initiatives on conservation that we should be initiating here in Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Let me advise the hon. member that this department has had no request for assistance to provide guide-lines for an environmental impact study on a nuclear reactor by Colin Hindle or anyone else. So it isn't up to us at this point, at least to be making that kind of decision.

It's simply some speculator who is here in the province, who thinks he could make some money if he could build a nuclear reactor. This department would not be involved in making that kind of a decision until the environmental process comes. At that time we will certainly be involved and take a look, but we haven't had a request up to this point for anything of that nature.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well herein lies the contradiction and the dilemma, Mr. Minister. You say you're not prepared to take a position because there's been no request. I ask you, what is the government policy on this? Surely you can speak as a minister of this cabinet what the government policy is. Has the government got a policy on whether there is a need and whether it would favour a nuclear reactor for the generation of energy or electricity here in Saskatchewan? What is the policy of the government, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — To the best of my understanding, the government has not made a decision on that — whether or not a nuclear reactor could be built here. Maybe SaskPower has indicated that they want one, or some other part of government, but the government as a whole has not made that formal decision.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, if the government has not made a decision, why has the Premier said that he favours a nuclear reactor in Saskatchewan?

Here we have another case where you as the Minister of Environment are peddling one line; another minister, in

this case the Premier, is peddling another one. How is it that the Premier knows what the policy is — he says, yes, he wants a nuclear reactor — but you don't know what the policy is, Mr. Minister? Will you please explain that contradiction?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I have a feeling that the hon. member is trying to put words in the mouth of the Premier, and I don't believe the Premier has ever made that statement. I believe that we should go in with our eyes wide open and take a look and see whether a nuclear reactor is the way to go. Ontario has very definitely found that a method that is providing good power for them, but I don't have any indication yet whether it's the best way for Saskatchewan.

We do happen to have a good source of coal, low-sulphur coal, that's doing a good job for us, and I don't see the need, at this point at least, to move. But from our department we have not had a request from anyone indicating that they want to build a reactor.

Certainly I've read the same news releases and things that you have, but that's as far as it's gone up to this time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Apparently you had no requests from anybody except the statements by the Premier, Mr. Minister, and I hope shortly that we'll be able to show you the news reports in which he is quoted as saying that he favours a nuclear reactor. I think he tied it in with something to do with acid rain or something, in his usual flippant way that he approaches these kinds of issues, Mr. Minister.

And I ask you again: Mr. Minister, can you state categorically, can you state categorically for the record, that there is no decision by the government to proceed with a nuclear reactor, that the government does not favour the proceeding with a nuclear reactor in Saskatchewan for the generation of electricity? Can you say that categorically in the face of what the Premier has been saying about that particular question?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I indicated quite clearly to you that if we have a request by a company that wants to build a nuclear reactor here, then we would go through the whole environmental process and evaluate whether or not that was the direction that we should go. But I'm not going to go further than that with it.

Mr. Goulet: — Yes, I would like to ask a few questions in regards to the Namew Lake mine in north-eastern Saskatchewan. And for the public that's listening, I would like to state that the Namew Lake mine is just off the community of Sturgeon Landing. It's located about 120 miles north-east of Nipawin, and it's only about 25 miles from Cumberland House.

Now this mine is under the control of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, which is of course a subsidiary which is owned by Anglo-American of South Africa. And the key issue of course here is in regards to environment.

I might add, Mr. Minister, that the historical record on Namew Lake, which is Saskatchewan waters, is fed in from the Churchill River through the Sturgeon-weir River system, and it cuts across at Frog Portage, it comes across

to Pelican Narrows, and then on to Beaver Lake, then over to Cumberland, to Sturgeon Landing, then over to Cumberland House. Then that water veers into Cumberland Lake and on throughout the Tearing River into the Saskatchewan River system. So the majority of the waters are located in our Saskatchewan waters. So that's the number one point.

The mine itself, the Meadow Lake mine is located just off the shore of Namew Lake, just on the edge of the Manitoba . . . just inside the Manitoba border. Now from an historical perspective, we've had the problem of acid rain in that area for a long time. We've had the mine at Flin Flon, which is located just 40 miles north of there. And the acid rain has already caused economic damage to the area, and also environmental damage to the area.

And I think I recall the past year where I mentioned that to you, in the sense that when we did fishing there, as a child growing up we did some fishing in that area and fished for both trout and sturgeon. If you would check that area now, the trout is gone. You will know that the aspect of trout and the lake does not completely disappear. There's always a certain amount of trout in situations, but in this instance they were gone.

And I raised that issue at that time, saying that a lot of the foam on the lake must have been done by an interaction between the acid from the sulphur dioxide emissions from the Flin Flon mine in combination with the limestone. And a lot of the trout were probably . . . and I made that point myself last year in regards to the trout being gone from there. But also the fact that some of the largest sturgeon were caught in that area. About oh, 50- to 90-pound sturgeon were caught in that area, but those have also disappeared.

So now on top of the acid raid we are entering a new mine of base metals. Now there has been a hearing from the Manitoba side, because it's within the Manitoba borders, and your environmental department has had dealings with the Manitoba environmental department.

I would like to know from yourself, Mr. Minister, what you can ascertain at this time in regards to the wastes. There are wastes on base metals . . . I mean there are wastes from the heavy metals and there are also wastes in regards to the water. Could you provide for me the information that you were able to get from your staff at this time, and what the effects are in regards to the waste and also the water from the Namew Lake mine.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'd like to indicate to the hon. member that the mine that you refer to is in Manitoba, but they were proposing to pump salt water into Chocolate Lake which would in turn flow into Namew Lake and into the Saskatchewan water system.

I did meet with the Hudson Bay Mining Company. They came here to Regina and met with us, and we indicated to them the concern that we would have with the amount of water and the amount of salt, that it was not acceptable to Saskatchewan.

I then went to Manitoba and met with the Minister of Environment in Manitoba and indicated to him the

concern that Saskatchewan had, and that the pumping of that type of water into the Chocolate Lake, and which would undoubtedly flow into Saskatchewan, was not acceptable. They were holding meetings in Manitoba at that time to . . . public hearings. I asked them to be sure and hold one public hearing in Saskatchewan. So they came to Saskatchewan and held that hearing, and we had people from our department attend and make a presentation at the meeting.

I might indicate to the hon. member that the association of chiefs have expressed, orally and in writing, their appreciation of the position that my department put forward at that public hearing. I haven't had any further word from Manitoba up to this point as to what their decision is going to be, but they certainly know the position of the Department of Environment from Saskatchewan, that we are not prepared to allow the pumping of that quantity of salt water into the river system that will come through Saskatchewan.

Mr. Goulet: — In regards to that salt water, Mr. Minister, could you provide for me some detail on how that salt water did get there, and so on? What were your environmental staff able to find out?

(1545)

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We're advised that the Hudson Bay Mining Company has to de-water its mine, and what they're doing at this point is pumping into holding ponds on their own property. It's not being put into the river system. Their request was to put it into Chocolate Lake, and that's the concern that we have because Chocolate connects to Namew, which in turn comes back into our river system. And at this point they're not putting salt water into that system. It's being held on their own property in ponds.

Mr. Goulet: — You've been mentioning salt water, and so on. There's problems also with heavy metals. Could you provide some information in regards to the content of the heavy metals and also what impact they have to the biological species, which include fish.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The information that you speak of, as it relates to the heavy metal, would be from the tailings side of the operation of that mine. And we've indicated to them that we don't want that tailings water to be pumped into the river system.

As far as the detailed information, it would be in the environmental impact statement that was produced by the mine and sent through to Manitoba. And I'm advised that the Prince Albert and district chiefs have a copy of that environmental impact statement. So if the member would like to access that impact statement, that's where you would find the information. We don't really have it.

Mr. Goulet: — Well first of all, I'm really surprised that your department who has gone in to the hearing in Cumberland on June 15, and so on, doesn't have on file, you know, the record of the statement so far.

But I want to get on to other aspects. I notice that you had taken a position. What I would like to know is to restate

your position very clearly in regards to the mine. If the mine continues the way it is, what type of action will you take if the Manitoba government decides to pursue the matter and take it upon themselves that they will not accept your recommendation; what type of specific action will you take in that regard if that indeed happens? If they do not have a comprehensive strategy in regards to the environmental impact on that area, what will the minister do in that case?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I don't like to answer questions on "what if," because that's pretty hypothetical. I believe that we have to cross one bridge at a time. So far the Manitoba government has been co-operative, and in meetings with the minister he has tried to co-operate completely with me. I think I'll continue to deal with the issue on a day-to-day basis and cross those bridges when I come to them. But I believe that the minister in Manitoba wants good relations with Saskatchewan, the same as we would with him, and would be prepared to control the operation of that mine in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. Goulet: — What I am worried about is that you will be overly co-operative and not worry about the fact that if indeed the wastes go through, and if indeed the salt water goes through into Sturgeon Landing, what will be affected will be the tourist industry in that area, because people do not want to go into areas that are heavily polluted.

The other thing that'll be affected is the fishing industry, that indeed Cumberland people and Sturgeon Landing people have used that for sports fishing and also for, in the past, in regards to commercial fishing. That will be affected.

The other thing that will be affected is indeed the aspect of water. We've got the polluted Saskatchewan River system that hits Cumberland House from the west; we have dioxins that are deposited from Weyerhaeuser; we have all kinds of things that are dumped into the Saskatchewan River system, and a lot of the water has already been polluted beyond drinking capacity when it reaches Cumberland House. So a lot of the people in Cumberland have built the weir to get clear water from the north end.

Now what is going to happen is indeed that you're going to have not only pollution coming from the west, you'll have polluted water system coming in from the north. And I'm pretty sure that the chiefs already explained that to you, and I'm sure that the Cumberland people explained that to you also.

What I'm concerned about in your regard is that, what are you going to actually do? What is your stated position? What is your bottom line at the present time? It seems to me all you're saying is I'm going to co-operate with the Manitoba government. That may be good for you, but it's definitely not good for the community-level people. We want to know exactly what your position is right now, and what you're going to do in terms of action.

If that particular statement that you've already made in a letter and in public, if that is indeed not followed up, what are you going to do, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — This department has always taken

responsible action when it's needed, and if it comes a point in history where we need to take action because the Manitoba government isn't fulfilling its commitment to us, then we will take that action. But I'm not prepared to go into detail of what action. You take the action that's necessary.

Mr. Goulet: — Well, Mr. Minister, what we are worried about in this case, and it has become very clear in regards to the Rafferty-Alameda project, is that you will proceed to break laws in regards to not following the environmental standards that are created in Canada and that you've been forced to go to court and have to redo things through the federal level.

We well know that the Indian bands are a federal responsibility; that indeed the aspects of fisheries is also a federal responsibility. What aspect . . . so we already know that you have made errors in the past.

What I want to know from you is a greater and a stronger sense of statement in regards to exactly what your position is. Could you restate your position then, for the public record?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I've stated my position very clearly today, and I've stated to you and we have stated at the hearings in Cumberland and I've stated to the company and I've stated to the minister in Manitoba, that we do not want that waste water pumped into the Chocolate Lake to come back through to Namew Lake. I've told you that a number of times. I think that's as straightforward as anybody could put it.

If you would give questions as straightforward as that, we'd answer them very easily for you.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I want to go back to the nuclear reactor, because I indicated that you and the Premier were on different tracks. And I've sent over a copy of an article to you so that you would be aware of what the Premier has been saying.

Before I refer to that, Mr. Minister, I want to draw to your attention a report about the consequences of the incident at Chernobyl in which it says that — this is dealing with El Rona, Italy — spring in Italy, and no artichokes and no lettuce, no asparagus, no spinach. All were taken off the market for weeks after a fall-out from Chernobyl drifted over Italy.

Also you will know, Mr. Minister, that 90,000 reindeer had to be killed in Sweden because of the fall-out.

The Premier is on record as saying in this article in the *Star-Phoenix* in January, '89, I quote:

Premier Grant Devine says he supports the concept of developing a nuclear reactor, but only if it is built and run by the private sector.

Now, Mr. Minister, how can you justify a nuclear reactor in an agricultural province like Saskatchewan in light of what we saw happening all over Europe because of the Chernobyl incident?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — They are perhaps very different issues that you're trying to raise, and you throw them all in together. Before we would proceed with any nuclear reactor, I assure you that there will be very extensive environmental impact assessments and extensive public involvement. And that's as far as I'm going to go.

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Minister, could you elaborate your government's commitment to the toxicology centre at the University of Saskatchewan, and what kind of increased funding you plan on giving the toxicology centre for this year.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Since the inception of the Toxicology Research Centre we have been funding it at \$200,000 per year. We are looking at the possibility of additional funding. That isn't finalized at this point, so I can't give you a figure of any additional funding.

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Minister, it's now been over five years since the toxicology centre has operated at a base level of \$200,000 from the Government of Saskatchewan. Inflation alone would dictate that funding should be \$300,000. Can you make a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan that you will increase the base funding for the Toxicology Research Centre to \$300,000 a year? That's not asking a lot, given the concern that the public has over environmental questions and pesticides and herbicide use.

It's not a lot, given the fact that the toxicology centre in 1985 was recognized as one of the centres of excellence, and that it's one of the three toxicology centres in the country that have been designated as special toxicology centres. Can you not make a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan that you will increase the base funding to \$300,000?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We are looking very seriously at increasing that funding, but until I get approval from cabinet, I can't give you a guarantee of it. So I can simply say to the hon. member that we are looking at it, and hopefully we will be able to provide additional funding. Whether it'll be \$100,000 or a little less, I couldn't tell you at this point.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Gerich: — May I have leave to introduce some guests, Mr. Chairman.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Gerich: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Koenker.

In regards to some people that we have here in the gallery, I'd like to introduce Miss Helen Walsh and her driver, Louise Carriere. Helen Walsh is walking for the Journey of Life across Canada, and she has walked 4,800 kilometres so far, zero point mile being St. John's, Newfoundland.

And she's walked across the province of Newfoundland,

Nova Scotia, P.E.I., New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, and is in Saskatchewan today. She is visiting all major cities in the provinces trying to bring home to the people of Canada the Journey for Life continues, and I'd ask the members to please welcome her to the legislature.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Environment and Public Safety Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 9

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Minister, can you explain the propaganda in the *Challenges and Opportunities* book that was published with the March budget that says that funds will be provided in this budget to improve the Toxicology Research Centre's ability to analyse toxic substances. Obviously in March you could propagandize people with a commitment to increased funding. How is it that it's July now and you can't tell us what that funding will be?

(1600)

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The indications that we gave you is that we would be looking at it, and we are looking at it. The funding for it would likely come out of the Environment fund, so it isn't funding that I have to look for new money, it's money that's there. I just have to get approval for the expenditure of that amount of money, and hopefully I'll be able to do that soon.

Mr. Koenker: — Well I certainly hope that that would be the case as well, Mr. Minister. Can you explain, Mr. Minister, what kinds of moneys have been set aside for the study on the feasibility of the environmental trace organics laboratory for the province, a measure also announced in your budget documentation in March?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We're setting aside \$100,000 to do the study on the trace organics lab to see whether or not it's feasible to have one in the province, if there's enough work for it — that type of information.

Mr. Koenker: — And who is conducting that study, that feasibility study, and who is being consulted as to the feasibility of establishing such a lab?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We're in the initial stages of drawing up the terms of reference for that study, and then we will be selecting a person or a group of people to do the study. But we're just in the initial stages of drafting the terms of reference at this point.

Mr. Koenker: — Sounds like you're johnny-come-late by your own standards of announcing these things.

Perhaps you could tell us about your government's plans to undertake a research study on the impact of the greenhouse effect on Saskatchewan, and to develop a plan to mitigate any negative effects. Again I just quoted

from your own *Challenges and Opportunities* document of March '89. What kinds of funds have you set aside for that study on the greenhouse effect, and who will be conducting that study, and when will it commence?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We've set aside 150,000 for that study, and again they're in the process of drafting the terms of reference. There will be a number of departments that are working together to draft those terms of reference, because it impacts in a variety of different areas. So we're working on it. Hopefully we'll be able to award that contract in the near future.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you. Mr. Minister, I'm now prepared to . . . we're prepared to go subvote through subvote here. But before I do that, just so that I don't miss it, which subvote would I be asking questions on environmental impact studies? If I wanted to ask a question, would that be on subvote 2 or subvote 3? Page 35.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised it will be under item 2, environmental assessment.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you. Mr. Minister, there is a proposed Meadow Lake pulp mill that has been announced in the Meadow Lake area on the Waterhen-Beaver River system. Has an environmental impact study been done with regard to this pulp mill, Mr. Minister? And if not, at what stage is it?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that the study is being done and the company indicates it should be arriving at our department about the end of this month.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. And at what point in time will you be making it public?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Well it will take some time to do the public review within our department, and sometimes, when you get an environmental impact assessment, you find deficiencies where you have to send them back. So it's a little difficult to give you a time frame, but probably by the end of August or early September would likely be reasonable.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, with regard to the Husky Oil upgrader, the heavy oil upgrader that's being proposed at Lloydminster, has an environmental impact study been done in this particular case? Do you have it? Or at least tell us what stage this whole process is at.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We were just looking for the dates that the approval was given. It was about two years ago. I know it was prior to the time that I was minister, so it may be two and a half years ago that the study was done and approval was given. So we'll try and dig up that information and send it to you. I just don't have it here.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you. That would be quite okay, Mr. Minister.

Item 2 agreed to.

Items 3 and 4 agreed to.

Item 5

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, can you inform me the names — you don't have to give it to me verbally right now, but send it over — the names, the number of people, in other words the whole staff contingent in the Emergency Measures Organization? Do you have that with you? Can you send it over?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The department has three employees. There's Michael Hegan, Art Auser, and Patty Doroshenko. And then we have two men that work under the JEPP (joint emergency planning program) program that are under contract, and they work throughout the province — two other men, federally funded, under that JEPP program.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Can you indicate, Mr. Minister, who those two men are?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — John Woltman and John MacMillan.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, is there a Larry Birkbeck that is in any way associated with the Emergency Measures Organization, directly or indirectly, under contract, or a fee for service, or as an employee in any capacity?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We have a contract with Venus Consulting that Mr. Birkbeck works with. He's a co-ordinator between Saskatchewan and the federal government as a federal-provincial co-ordinator for emergency measures. It's his company though that is contracted to us. It's Venus Consulting.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — This is the Mr. Birkbeck who was the former MLA for the constituency of Souris-Cannington . . . or Moosomin. He is among the long list of Conservative MLAs who have been retired, either voluntarily or by the electorate, who have been well looked after, Mr. Minister.

This is, I'm sure, not a very major task, the co-ordinator between federal-provincial . . . federal-provincial liaison or co-ordination. Mr. Minister, can you tell us what the terms and the remuneration involved with this contract are?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I maybe should just read this sheet to you. It's fairly extensive.

An Hon. Member: — Well if you have it, just send it over. Save time. Read it first so that you don't get caught.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No, I'll send this across. I think that'll provide the answer for the hon. member. It's a fairly lengthy list of duties and, I think, a fairly impressive list of duties.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I see, Mr. Minister, this is for professional services rendered, \$4,000 a month, and on top of that, travel and sustenance in connection with

performance of above duties in accordance with tariff of travel and sustenance rates approved by The Public Service Act. So this is not a very cheap contract. This gentleman is apparently doing very well.

How long, Mr. Minister, has . . . Oh, I see, started on April 1, 1989. Am I correct — the contract began on April 1, 1989? Or was there an arrangement with Mr. Birkbeck before that?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — It's an annual contract that was renewed on April 1.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, probably my final question on this. When did initial contract begin?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I don't have the exact date. It's approximately February of '87 — it might have been March — but it's approximately late February of '87.

Item 5 agreed to.

Item 6 agreed to.

Item 7

Mr. Tchorzewski: — One question to which the minister doesn't have to give the answer right now, but grants to organizations and persons concerned with environmental matters, can you provide me a list of the grants that were issued in the last fiscal year, and grants that will be issued in this fiscal year to the extent that you already know them? If you just provide that to me, either now or by letter later, I would be satisfied with that.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I have them. The Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers, 32,000; miscellaneous grants of 8,000. And that includes assisting other organizations when they're in the province, to host conferences, that sort of thing.

Item 7 agreed to.

(1615)

Items 8 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Item 11 — Statutory

Vote 9 agreed to.

Environmental Protection Fund 1989-90 Financial Summary

Mr. Chairman: — Page 119 for any questions? I'd like to thank the minister's officials.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'd like to thank the officials that are present with me today for their assistance through these estimates, and I thank the hon. members for their questions.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also would like to extend our appreciation to the officials for being so helpful in providing the information to the minister. And I know that in this particular area of

jurisdiction, times are not always easy and the pressures are great. And I simply want to say thanks, along with the minister, to the officials for being here and for providing the information that they did, and also to the minister for providing the answers that he provided, even though . . . I mean, it's no surprise to no one, we don't always are satisfied with the answers, but I think the minister performed relatively well.

The committee reported progress.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Lane that **Bill No. 20 — An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, colleagues. It's again my pleasure to join the great fertilizer debate, the debate that I was participating in last night, last evening, as the 10 o'clock was called and cut my remarks somewhat short. So be it.

I was checking the record subsequent to that to find out just what has been said in this Legislative Assembly on Bill 20, the Act to reorganize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, or as we say, the Act to privatize or give away the potash corporation. And it was interesting in that for the vast majority of the public they view the Legislative Assembly as something of a debating arena, a place where members on one side — in this case the opposition — state our view regarding a particular Bill, and members of the government put forward their views. And in the normal course of events, Mr. Speaker, that is, I submit to you, what should be taking place.

But I did a little bit of looking into the record, and what we see is that a grand total of three Conservative MLAs have spoken to this Bill, this very important Bill — three only. There has been quite a number of New Democrats, on the other hand, who have been up and speaking to this Bill. Then the question comes to mind: well why is it that government members don't stand up and try and defend the Bill? And of course the obvious answer is it's impossible to defend the indefensible. And that's the situation the government finds itself in now.

They tried the give-away of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and natural gas division of SaskPower. The people spoke loudly and clearly. The government, despite all their words, heard the message. That Bill to privatize SaskPower has been removed from the order paper, or will not be coming forward during this session. So they're caught between a rock and a hard place.

The second flagship, if you like, of privatization Tory style, is to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. For some of the same reasons, we are opposed. We think it's a bad, bad deal for the people of Saskatchewan.

I know that I would not be doing my job as the MLA for my

constituency if I were to lay down and allow this potash privatization to take place, but government members are unsure how to handle it. They don't want to be seen backing away yet again from their agenda, and yet they know that that's what the people of the province want is for the government that has gone too far in privatization to back away.

So they're really between a rock and a hard place. Because of that we've seen a grand total of three Conservative MLAs having spoken to this potash Bill here in the legislature, here where the issues should be debated. Certainly you carry issues out to the electorate, certainly we have a responsibility to report to our constituencies, and certainly we have a responsibility as MLAs to listen and to talk to people all across the province. But the people of Regina North elected me to represent them in the legislature, to take part in debates.

Well we're seeing the biggest one-sided debate in a good many years, in a good many years, and it's a shame. I think that this institution suffers as a result of it, and I'm certain that the public would be better served, as would the government and the opposition be better served, if we had that full and free-flowing debate, if we could put forward our ideas on this Bill to reorganize the potash division and if the government would put forward their ideas.

Instead, we see an opposition that is obviously determined to do everything we can to prevent passage of this Bill, and we see a government that is determined to continue to stick their head in the sand — see no evil; hear no evil; speak no evil — and as a result of that none of them will get up and speak on this particular debate.

Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, are a heritage in Saskatchewan. They are the heritage of the people, shared equally. It matters not whether you're a pauper or a millionaire, you still own one millionth of a Crown corporation. And that's really part of what this debate is all about is who is going to have ownership and control of our great and vast potash resource. Is it going to be the people of Saskatchewan, or is it going to be a handful of multinationals, a handful of wealthy shareholders?

If this Bill 20 passes, the latter unfortunately is going to be the truth. It will be the wealthy shareholders, it will be the multinational corporations who will own Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. We will be going backwards into the future. We will be reverting to the situation as it stood up until 1976 when Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan came into existence.

The situation then — and all of the records are available at public libraries to confirm what I'm saying — but the history of potash in Saskatchewan is one of development through from the mid-'60s on. There was a royalty rate set at two and one-half per cent of the potash that was mined — two and one-half per cent only. It netted the province of Saskatchewan very minimal amounts of money. In fact we were generating many years in the neighbourhood of 20, \$25 million; hardly a grand sum when you consider that Saskatchewan has the richest potash reserves in the entire world — richest potash reserves in the world.

We were blessed with that here in Saskatchewan. None of us in this legislature put that potash there. It took a much greater power than that — much greater power than all of us collectively, indeed a much greater power than all the MLAs that have ever roamed the face of the earth.

But we now are charged with how do we best utilize that God-given natural resource. How do we utilize it for the people of Saskatchewan? How can we use our potash to keep taxes as low as we reasonably can? How do we use it to provide health care? How do we use it to provide education? How do we use it to build highways? How do we use it to provide social services? How do we use it to pay down the deficit?

And the question then is: are we better off having a Crown corporation, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, with its head office in Saskatoon, with all the major decisions made right here in Saskatchewan, by Saskatchewan people for Saskatchewan; or are we better off having multinational corporations based in Zurich or in New York or even in Toronto for that matter? Which way are the people of Saskatchewan better served?

We've already gone through that. From the mid-'60s to the mid-'70s, there was a whole decade where all of the potash mines were privately owned, and that experiment clearly failed to generate the revenues that we should have been able to expect from our potash resource.

It's certainly paled in comparison to the revenues that Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan paid to the people of Saskatchewan and to the Saskatchewan treasury from 1976 up until 1982 when the government changed. And indeed for a few years after that PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) continued to be a good thing, continued to be a cash cow for the Government of Saskatchewan.

So there is absolutely no way that giving away or selling off that part of our heritage, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, is in any way going to enhance public participation.

There is a handful of people in my constituency that have the capability or the desire to go out and buy shares in a Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there is only a handful of people, and I suspect it would be a small handful, probably one handful of people who have shares in any of the half dozen existing private potash companies in Saskatchewan.

(1630)

If you look at the numbers of investors in the private companies in Saskatchewan potash, in potash in Saskatchewan, the numbers would be alarmingly low. Indeed, if ownership of those half a dozen private potash companies were to approach 50 per cent Saskatchewan content, in other words, 50 per cent owned by the people of Saskatchewan through their purchase of shares on the open market, then you might have an argument. You might then have an argument to privatize the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, but only then, only after other available opportunities, investment opportunities

are being utilized.

But there is no reason that people will suddenly decide that they're going to invest in Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, as it's privatized, instead of an existing potash company. So why would we even try to go ahead with such an inane, foolish proposal such as is being proposed by the Conservative government opposite in this Bill 20, an Act to reorganize the potash?

Employees, Mr. Speaker, have a stake in what is going on right now, and perhaps their stake is greater than the stake that most other people in the public . . . it's certainly as great as the stake that anyone else has. Every one of those employees, in addition to that being their source of bread and water and meat and their source of income is what I'm saying, in addition to that, they also own one-millionth of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. They own as much as you or I or the first person that you meet on the street who happens to be a Saskatchewan resident.

Those workers are happy with the potash corporation as it is existing. They know that PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) has a history of treating them fairly. They know that as we meet with them from time to time they keep reiterating, look, we know that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has got all kinds of opportunities if we could just unsaddle it from the tired government that is holding it back. If we could just somehow free ourselves from the present government, we know that this Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is the most efficient potash company in the world, bar none — in the world. And that has taken place as it is a Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker.

Now I suspect that government members opposite don't like that for a number of reasons. One is this mad rush to privatization. But a second reason of course is that Crown corporations, in the view of the Conservative Party, certainly of Saskatchewan and indeed world-wide, the view is that Crown corporations do not work. And it's a wrong view. There is a list of Crown corporations longer than my arm in Saskatchewan alone that work, and work very well.

SaskPower has been an excellent example of a very good Crown corporation that has served the people of Saskatchewan very, very well. Members opposite should know by now that you get a hundred thousand signatures on a petition to save SaskPower only when the people of Saskatchewan are happy with that Crown corporation, only when they perceive a threat in privatization. The people were telling us and telling government members that they had gone too far.

And they're still saying it. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am astounded at the number of times that I get questioned by supporters of the New Democratic Party, but they question us, why on earth did you go back after that 17-day walk-out? Why didn't you stay out until the government was forced to call an election? And they're attacking us for coming back in here.

And it somewhat surprises me that the people were so solid and so firm in their belief that what we were doing,

what we were fighting was the good fight, the just cause. And that fight is very similar, Mr. Speaker, to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan reorganization Bill that we're debating today. People are telling us very clearly the government has gone too far with regards to its privatization plans.

The people, by and large, have lost faith in the Conservative administration. They see government members lining their friends' pockets, lining their own pockets. The people have lost the trust; they've lost the faith with this government. They know that it's just a matter of time when the election is called, the government will change.

I view it as particularly fortuitous that the New Democratic Party is the obvious successor. But I'll tell you that it's deeper than that with an awful lot of people. They would elect the devil just because . . . at least they'd know what the devil will do as opposed to re-electing a Conservative government for a third term.

And we . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I see I've touched a nerve. I wish the member for Regina Wascana would stand up and debate this Bill in the legislature. When we've had a total of three government MLAs stand up and try and defend this potash reorganization, this potash sell-off or give-away — only three — and yet there's no shortage of government members opposite willing to heckle from their seats. What a great bunch of cowboys when it comes to debate. Debate from your seats. Enter the debate . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is exactly tying in with the policies of the Premier and policies of the government, of cheap land and cheap labour.

Because we own roughly one-half of the productive capacity to produce potash in Saskatchewan, we have a direct say in what the salaries or wages and benefits that are paid to employees in the potash industry right here in Saskatchewan. Because of that there is no imminent pressure to reduce the salaries or reduce the wages from 15 or \$13 an hour, or whatever they may be; there's no pressure to reduce it to six or five or four.

But a privatized Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan will be pieced off and it would deal with the union in this manner. It would say, look, we have got to meet our competition, which is IMCC (International Minerals and Chemical Corporation (Canada) Ltd.), or we have got to meet our competition which is Potash Corporation of America. We've got to meet that competition. They are paying salaries and wages \$2 an hour lower than we are, so we're asking you to take a cut in pay so that we can be competitive. And that is a very real danger in a privatized Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, because private companies will want nothing more, nothing less, than to maximize the profits.

I see that a few of the government members are laughing about that. They're the same people that were laughing before the federal election when we were saying, the free

trade deal is going to cost jobs. I see in today's *Star-Phoenix*, 33,000 Canadian jobs have been lost directly because of that free trade deal with the United States — 33,000 Canadians have lost their jobs because of plant closures.

Point I'm making, Mr. Speaker — of course the free trade deal has I think little to do in the context of the potash Bill — but the point I am making is that government members were laughing at it before the federal election, when that election was largely about free trade. After the election, once the deal was signed, sealed, and delivered, we see in six months that what we were saying proved to be bang on. Thirty-three thousand jobs lost across Canada is nothing to sneeze at.

And we are predicting that with a privatized Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, that the workers will suffer. I have yet to see a private corporation just say, well gee, you know, time for an increase in salary or an increase in wages or an increase in benefits; we think that you can't exist on what you're earning right now.

We see exactly the reverse of that with private corporations because every dollar that a private company doesn't pay in wages or salaries is another dollar that they have available to plough into their profits, pay dividends to their shareholders, the wealthy investors and the multinational corporations.

So every dollar that they can save in wages is a dollar more that they can have in profits, and that is simply not acceptable for the potash miners and the people who work in the potash mines throughout Saskatchewan. We think it's wrong that any government would follow a cheap land and a cheap labour policy such as this one.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — So if the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is sold, Mr. Speaker, who are the winners and who are the losers? The winners — the big corporations, the wealthy shareholders. Who are the losers on the other hand? The losers — the workers in the potash mines, the people of Saskatchewan, and the Government of Saskatchewan through its lost revenues.

Now the last two, you could argue, are the same, because the government of course is elected by the people for the people. We just simply conduct the business of the province for our constituents, for our province, not necessarily looking at our own constituency all the time. We look somewhat broader.

Certainly, in this potash issue, I would be fairly hard pressed to find a terribly big number of potash miners that reside in the constituency of Regina North, but I'll tell you, every one of my constituents benefits because we have potash corporation as a Crown corporation — every one of my constituents.

When in 1981 the Government of Saskatchewan took a \$50 million dividend from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, that meant there was \$50 million less that had to be extracted from the people of Saskatchewan. And \$50 million in today's terms may not sound like a

huge amount of money, but you know, it's \$50 for every man, woman and child — \$250 for a husband, wife and three children, \$250 that they didn't have to shell out because we got it from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. We got it from that heritage of Saskatchewan — the potash. The next year exactly the same thing happened again. Another \$50 million dividend taken from the potash corporation to the general revenues of the province of Saskatchewan.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we saw the long-term debt of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan being reduced to the point that when the New Democrats were defeated in the election in April, 1982, there was \$88 million debt in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — \$88 million. And that was it. All the rest of the assets owned by the people, owned by the government.

(1645)

Then what happened after that? Then we see a Conservative government getting elected and we saw decisions made. One year they took \$62 million in a dividend from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and in that year they took that \$62 million, despite the fact that PCS had a loss that year — a loss. They didn't take the \$62 million out of profit, but they . . . PCS had a loss, and they ran it further into the ground, a further \$62 million.

The government opposite piled up a fairly substantive debt in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and they have the audacity to say, oh, it's all the NDP; it's all the NDP's fault that we can't run — when I say we, I mean the Conservative government — that we can't run the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I really have to wonder why it is that from 1976 to 1982, in every one of those years, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan made a profit — made a profit in every one of those years — because we had some very able people running the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. We had the very best people in the industry.

And we have a government who took over in 1982 and decided that, well gee, you know, that's just not very good that we have the PCS the way it is. They thought there was too many socialists running it. Maybe there was just too many people that believed that Crown corporations could work.

Whatever the reason, they quickly changed some of the key people, and the rest has been history. Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has piled up a fairly massive debt under the Conservative administration. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that a reason to get rid of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? No. Is it a reason to get rid of the government? Yes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — And the people have decided that, too, and that's going to happen. It's going to happen just as soon as the government, as soon as the Premier screws up his courage and calls an election. As soon as that happens, we're going to then have a dynamic Premier in this

province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — We're going to have a Premier that cares about people, Mr. Speaker. We're going to have a Premier who believes that Saskatchewan people have the ability to make potash work for the people of Saskatchewan, by the people of Saskatchewan. We're going to have a rejuvenated potash corporation that is freed to do what it does best — that's to mine potash, to market potash, to develop new potash markets, new uses for potash, jobs for the people of Saskatchewan.

And when that happens, it's going to be a glorious day because the sons and daughters of Saskatchewan will no longer have to be fleeing in the record numbers that they are right now. They will have a future right here in Saskatchewan, a future that will be enhanced because we will still have the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan as a fairly significant tool at our disposal; a way of employing people, a way of raising revenue, a way of keeping the taxes that the people of Saskatchewan pay as low as we reasonably can.

The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is a corporation that has assets somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$2 billion; \$2 billion in assets — and it is a revenue generator. We want to use that to help buy down the deficit that the Conservative government has created since 1982, that deficit that they have turned from in 1982 when there was a \$139 million surplus, they've turned it into a nearly a \$4 billion deficit now.

We're going to have to deal with that because to not deal . . . Well, we deal with it one way or another, whether we buy it down or not. If we ignore the problem, we wind up paying continued excessive amounts of taxpayers' dollars just on the interest on our deficit.

This year for the first time, I suspect, in Saskatchewan history, but certainly in many, many, many years — for the first time this year interest on the deficit became the third largest single budgetary item, third largest. It replaced Social Services, the whole social network of programs for people. Instead the money went to the bankers and the money agencies around the world. That's a shame when that has to happen, and so we have to deal with the deficit. Potash will be one of the ways of doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about profits that PCS made. In 1976, the first year of operation — it was actually a partial year; as you can appreciate, you don't always buy a company on the first day of January — but there was a half a million dollars profit; 1977, the second year, there was \$1.12 million profit; in 1978, that jumped to nearly \$25 million profit; in 1979, it jumped to \$78 million profit; in 1980, it jumped to \$167 million profit.

All the while, the long-term debt was being bought down. All the while, the bills were being paid. Profit, as you can appreciate, comes after you have paid your cost of doing business, and a part of that cost of doing business is the cost of borrowing.

Then we see 1981 — we had \$142 million profit. Six years of profit under the New Democrats that totalled \$413 million. Actually, it was a little better than that. You can add another \$510,000 to the number I just read. Over \$413 million profit for the people of Saskatchewan by their company, by our company, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Then we see 1982 and the wizards of finance opposite get into power. They were able to drop the profits to \$607,000 in 1982; followed that with an \$18 million loss in '83; a \$25 million profit in '84; then three successive losses in '85, '86, '87 — losses of 68 million, 103 million, and nearly 22 million; and then of course the last year, \$106 million profit.

But part of why that happened, Mr. Speaker, is that you will recall, sir, that in 1982 the Conservative Party, one of the election promises was that they were going to do away with Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan International, the marketing arm that had just been set up by the New Democratic government to sell Saskatchewan potash all around the world. Because we're the largest single potash company in the free world, it made sense that we should be looking out for the interests of the people of Saskatchewan; that we should set up our own marketing arm; that we should market the 4 billion tonnes of potash that we pull out of the ground every year.

But in 1982 the Conservatives said, no, we can't have any government involvement. We've got to go back to Canpotex, the marketing arm of the private corporations, and we want to be in with them.

I could develop an argument about price-fixing, but I won't do that. Instead, I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the election was in April of 1982. The election promise had been to do away with PCS International, the marketing arm.

Had the government at least had the courage to do it right away, we could have salvaged a year of markets.

Let me explain what I'm saying. With regards to potash, in March and April you can sell potash by the boat load. High demand — that's the gravy months, March and April. In May you can sell it by the train load. In June you can sell it by the truck load. In July you can't give away a wheelbarrow of potash. And yet despite that, the government was elected in April 1982. It took until June 28 before they formally announced that yes, the marketing arm of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was gone.

So the marketing arm was in limbo for all of those months — for four months, from the time of the election till the end of June, when the fertilizer season was gone. Canpotex, the marketing arm for the private companies, had been out there hustling fertilizer and selling fertilizer, filling the market. And they did it. They did a good job to sell half the potash of Saskatchewan.

After the markets had closed, Mr. Speaker, then PCS, who had been hamstrung, had been tied by the Conservative government so they could not sell potash, PCS had to go

to Canpotex, cap in hand, in July and say, gosh I'm sorry, Mr. Canpotex, we've been really bad; we would like it if you would share some of that market with us.

To their credit, Canpotex did give Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan some of the market that year. They shared some of it. I still haven't figured out exactly why they would do that, but they did share some of it.

But essentially PCS lost a year of sales, and that directly contributed to the first loss that Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan ever had, that \$18 million loss in 1983 suffered under the Conservative government opposite. And I want to tell you and the people of Saskatchewan, the reason was because of the gross incompetence of the government in the way they handled PCS International.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — So we see again another reason, not to get rid of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but a reason to get rid of a tired, old government.

Mr. Speaker, the government is fond of talking about public participation. But I can't for the life of me figure out how you can change from having a million people in this province owning equally in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and you change that to a handful of wealthy investors, and you call that public participation.

Makes not a whit of sense. It is the farthest thing removed from public participation that I ever heard of, and the people of Saskatchewan know that. They know it. Those who want to invest, I've pointed out earlier today, anyone who has money to invest in a potash company is totally free to invest in any one of the half a dozen private existing potash companies. They'll welcome your money. Invest it there. What's the difference? Private company mines potash. PCS mines potash. Why would you have to have PCS up for sale? Who is the government looking after?

I think I know, Mr. Speaker, and it sure isn't the people of Saskatchewan. It's the multinationals, and it's the wealthiest of the wealthy investors; it's the bankers, the international money-lenders — anyone with some money. And I'm talking not \$100, but significant money . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. It being 5 o'clock, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m.