

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Harper: — I give notice that I shall Tuesday next move:

Be it resolved that this Assembly support the government and its ministers of Finance and Economic Development in their efforts to restore financial freedom and revitalize Saskatchewan's economy by, on one hand, acting reasonably and courageously to address the current financial crisis; and on the other hand, by developing through partnership a cohesive, realistic, economic strategy.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I understand this is under rule 16.

The Speaker: — I'm told it really doesn't matter.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Appointment of President of SIAST

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A brief question to the Minister of Education. Madam Minister, can you tell this Assembly why it is that SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) is being forced to operate without a chief executive officer?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, the operations at SIAST are subject to the governance of the board of directors of SIAST. They have conducted a search over the last several months and a new president will be appointed soon. In the meantime, the board has taken the step of appointing the chairman of the board, Mr. Ian Wilson, as the acting president in the interim.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, Madam Minister, it's my understanding that this position has been offered as a patronage appointment to defeated NDP (New Democratic Party) Doug McArthur, and that he turned it down. He turned it down, Madam Minister.

I understand that you have also offered it to at least three other NDP supporters, who said, not a chance.

Madam Minister, is this not proof that the mismanagement at SIAST is so bad that you can't even give the job away to one of your own hacks?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, before the heat of raw politics burns away the foundations of rational thought . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — As I say, the engagement of a president for the operation of SIAST is the responsibility of the board of directors of SIAST. And in due course I'm sure that they will find someone who is appropriate to meet the very challenging circumstances of the operations of SIAST.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, Madam Minister, the students at SIAST are very concerned about the futures of their programing. Rather than blaming others, such as the directors, for your incompetence, rather than shopping around for NDP supporters to take over this mess for you, can you give the students of SIAST some assurance that the institution will get a qualified chief officer and that the future of the institution is secure?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member and I do have one area of agreement in that their administration left SIAST in a mess.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Of that there is no doubt. So we moved to appoint, pursuant to The Institute Act, which the previous administration passed to create SIAST, a committee of review which reviewed the operations and heard submissions from all parts of SIAST — the faculty, the students, the public, other institutions — and we are moving to do some reorganization there.

It is a very challenging job to head up that organization and try and clean up the mess that the previous administration left behind, but we are making progress. And the students and faculty at SIAST can be assured that the operations there are a high priority for us and they will be dealt with in a positive way.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Opting out of GRIP

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the minister . . . or Premier. Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, every action taken by this government has been . . . through your government has been there to design a method to destroy GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) and rob farmers of the protection they so desperately need.

In fact, in a recent survey of 1,800 people done at the Saskatoon farm rally, they said 93 per cent of them felt they wanted a new program, Mr. Premier, and 85 per cent wanted to be able to opt out of what you have for '92 GRIP. If you didn't have an . . . give them an opportunity to opt out — 85 per cent said they wanted

to if you didn't change it back to something that was reasonable.

Would you, Mr. Premier, at least give the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan the commitment that they have the option of opting out when you opt out of the program?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for that question. There certainly is a large desire by farmers to get out of GRIP. I've been talking to farmers at a rate . . . '91 GRIP, '92 GRIP, any GRIP, they want out of this damn program, and that's what they've been telling me.

I think it's a flawed program. I think if you look at what the neighbouring ministers of Agriculture have said about the GRIP program, you will tell . . . and remember this program is the one that's unchanged. Ernie Isley from Alberta is saying that provincial and federal government will . . . federal and provincial taxpayers will pay up to \$1 billion within the next four years.

He goes on further to say that the GRIP by the end of 1992 will have an accumulated deficit close to \$400 million. This is the Minister of Agriculture from Alberta. He said the plan will never be self-funded. So that tells you something about the total disaster design of this program in the very first place.

Manitoba's Minister of Agriculture — who incidentally are out of this program by 1995 — Manitoba Agriculture minister, Glen Findlay, told a farm group last month that the farm was designed as an interim measure that would not be necessary after 1995. So it's no wonder that farmers want to get out of this program which was a disaster from the very start.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, March 15 is the deadline. You have done nothing short of jamming every possible, conceivable method that you have been able to think about down the throats of farmers in order to get them to either be frightened about what you're going to do or to be intimidated by what you're going to do. And you have confused all of the issues in . . . as it relates to some protection for farmers in the province of Saskatchewan. That is what you have done, Mr. Minister.

Will you give them an option, before the 15th of March, of opting out before they have to take you to court for all of the things that you have done that have totally derailed all of agriculture in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, farmers have options for getting out of GRIP as was designed by the members opposite. They should well know the options for getting out of GRIP. And that was part of

the original program design, that the . . . And that, Mr. Speaker, has not changed.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier yesterday is apparently to have said, and quoted in the *Leader-Post* . . . or the *Star-Phoenix*, that he wants a new program and he wants it not based on universality.

Can you tell the farmers of Saskatchewan that they are going to get a program that isn't based on universality, where it will only be NDP farmers getting GRIP from now on? Is that what you're going to do?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, we are looking at new programs. The farmers are telling us they want a new program. We are talking to farmers about that. Unlike the former administration that designed the GRIP program without consulting with farmers, we are talking to farmers. They realize that GRIP is a disaster. They want a new program.

We have a 32-member committee of grass roots farmers looking at what's acceptable for a new program. We are looking at things like capping and commodity neutrality and all the rest of the things. We want a program that is fair, that producers can afford and that provinces can afford and it's national in scope. And that is the program they were working on. Meanwhile we are stuck with the disastrous program of GRIP which takes, even if we give notice, takes two years to get out of.

So yes, Mr. Speaker, we are designing a . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Premier supposedly has said it wasn't going to be based on acreage either. Are you going to tell the farmers in the province of Saskatchewan that the new GRIP that you're proposing for the March 15 deadline is not going to be based on acreage?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite well knows we're not proposing a new GRIP for 1993. GRIP will be the same as last year with one added option that we have negotiated with the federal government that farmers will be able to choose at no extra cost if they so desire.

We do not have, Mr. Speaker, the power in this province to unilaterally change and implement new programs. We are working towards a program and we're asking farmers to design the program for us, and we will have it designed and we will replace this disaster that we have now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, according to the *Star-Phoenix* yesterday, the Premier also said that it wasn't going to be based on production.

My question to you is: by March 15 what are you going to base it on? March 15 is the deadline. And have you sent out the statement of all of the conditions that exist for the farmers in 1993 GRIP? Have you sent that out to them?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, again, I explained to the member opposite, there are no changes to the program for this year. We are tied into this program for at least two more years. The letter has gone out to the farmers explaining to them what the program will be, which is basically no change with one option which they can choose. And that letter has gone out to producers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, the program that you have designed is not at all what the farmers had. You had to go to this Assembly and ask that all of the records be deemed not to have existed in the province of Saskatchewan. That's what you did, sir, and the member from Eston-Elrose . . . or Rosetown-Elrose. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why we're laying this before this Assembly today.

Are you prepared to do what your Premier said yesterday; that it is not going to be based on universality, it's not going to be based on acreage, it's not going to be based on production — is that what you're doing for the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, again I repeat, we are not changing the program. It is a program that we are committed to and tied into. There is one change that is being offered as an option. Farmers have received a letter explaining that. There's been a press release explaining that. If the members would read the newspaper occasionally, they would also know that.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, my question to you is this: are you going to give notice to the federal government by March 31 that you're out of GRIP and NISA (net income stabilization account)?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, again I reiterate, we've been talking to farmers, we're talking to a meeting with farm groups again today; that certainly is a topic for discussion. We have until March 31 to finalize that decision and we will notify the members opposite when we finalize that decision.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, the farmers in the province of Saskatchewan are making management decisions based on what they're going to get from you and from the federal government.

If you opt out, the federal government has to opt out too. That is what the program says and that's what it does. Are you going to tell the farmers before March 15 that you're going to opt out by March 31? And if you're going to do that then they should have the same right as you do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, the farmers do have the right to opt out of the program in the same manner that we do. They must give notice. And again I reiterate, if we opt out by March 31, we are not out for two more years. That's the design of the program.

So we have two years; two years notice is what's required. And if we decide, if we intend to opt out, we will opt out by the deadlines and they will have their two years notice that we are out of the program.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister. You have the right to opt out in two years; the farmers have the responsibility to maintain their integrity in the program for three. You, sir, are not even giving the farmers the benefit of the doubt in this province. Are you going to tell them by March 15 that they have the right to opt out this year, or before that you make the decision on March 31?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely the correct interpretation of the Act. The farmers have a three years . . . give three years notice; we have to give two years notice.

I might ask the member from Estevan why that was designed into the program. He's the one who was there when it was written. It wasn't my rules, and I think we will comply by the rules of the Act as we will have to.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier with respect to this program, and I'll just start very, very calmly and slowly.

You see, Mr. Premier, what you're putting the farmers through. You're asking the farmer to decide whether he or she should opt out by the 15th of this month. And then you are going to, in the next two weeks after that, decide whether you're going to opt out or not. And that's not fair. Now you have fired one cabinet minister over wrecking this program already. And it's universally understood in the province of Saskatchewan that nobody appreciated the changes you have made.

Now you're asking farmers to make up their mind by the 15th and your minister now, the new minister, is saying: but we don't have to make up our mind in the NDP benches until the end of March. That's not fair. Do you understand why that might not be fair? It has

nothing to do with the rules that were there before. It's your changes. Will you stand in your place, Mr. Premier, and allow the farmers the same luxury as the NDP government in the province of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Again, Mr. Speaker, if there are unfairnesses in the design of the agreement, they were there before we became government. And we will give the proper notice. If we do indeed withdraw from the program, we will give the required notice and do so.

Mr. Devine: — My question is again to the Premier. Why can't you make up your mind at the same timetable that you're asking farmers to make up their mind? You see how difficult it puts the average farm family in. They don't know whether you're going to stay with it for two years or not, yet you're asking them to make this commitment by the 15th. It's clearly unfair.

We've penalized them before. You've admitted that you shouldn't have touched it to start with. Even if you want to today, say, design a new one because you don't like the universality, you don't like it based on production, you don't like it based on acreage — and Lord knows what you'd base it on if you take out universal production and acres. I mean what else is there in agriculture production — but even if you want to change it, why don't you operate by the same rules that you're asking farmers to operate?

They have obligations to make, they have insurance to buy, and they don't know what in the world you're going to do with your part of the program until after they decide. Why don't you just back off and say: we will tell you before the 15th whether we're in or out. That would be just absolutely fair.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, again I reiterate farmers have the option to opt out at any time. I think if the rules are unfair, again the member opposite was involved in writing those rules, not us. This program has been a disaster from day one, and farmers are telling me it's a disaster. We will certainly comply by the agreement which was signed by the previous administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Premier again. Mr. Premier, you have admitted in Prince Albert that by making changes to GRIP you added problems in some ways. And I quote: I think that if I had to do it all over again I wouldn't have touched it.

Now in that admission, and knowing that it is complicated and that you admit that you've made mistakes, now you're asking farmers to make a serious decision about tens of thousands of dollars per farm and you haven't made up your mind whether you're going to stay with it or not.

You see the problem? You haven't made up your mind and you're asking the farmers to make up their mind. And you've admitted that you've made a serious, serious mistake. You caused this House to walk out for three weeks. You have changes in contracts. People had made decisions to buy land, to lease, to refinance, and now you're asking them, Mr. Premier, to guess on their basis, to guess what you might do when you've admitted you made a terrible mistake. You have changed the way the contracts were initiated and now, Mr. Premier, you have not even given them the courtesy of saying that you would play by the rules for the next two years.

On the admission that you have made . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Does the member have a question?

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Premier: on the fact that you admit you've made serious mistakes, would you not now agree to tell farmers what you plan to do in the future before you force them to make up their mind whether they're in or out? Please answer that question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, the mistake the Premier was referring to was trying to make a program out of a disaster. This program was a disaster.

It was poorly designed. It was admitted by the . . . If you read what the Manitoba Agriculture minister is saying, that it was designed as a temporary program. It was sold as a long-term answer to farm debt. It was designed as a temporary program to get through a couple of elections in the province and at the federal level. This program was flawed from beginning — the basic formula which gives us lower support each year. It was lower support in '92.

The IMAP (indexed moving average price) prices dropped in '92, are dropping again in '93, will drop again in '94. The pot that gets paid out is less and less. And any changes that you make which shifts the table on the Titanic . . . shifts the chairs on the Titanic and takes from one farmer and pays the other farmer does not address the inadequacies of this program.

And with a basic flawed program you cannot make an adequate support program out of a program that is basically flawed.

Mr. Devine: — But, Mr. Speaker, with great respect to the hon. member, and I can go back to the Premier, all we're asking you to do, even if you believe it's complicated, tell them what your plan is before you force them to opt in or out of the program.

Leroy Larsen says in the paper today, as well as Hubert Esquirol, both of them say the farmers should know what the new program or the substitute is before you opt in or out. That's what it says. Larsen says: "The government should not abandon GRIP until another program is put in (its) place." Hubert Esquirol says the

same thing.

If you don't know what you're going to do, what the government's going to do, how can the farmer make up their minds. All we're asking you, is before the 15th tell them whether you're in or out.

If not, then move the deadline up to the time that you can make up your mind, or after the budget, or whenever it is. Give them the same benefit of the doubt or the political benefit of the doubt or whatever it is you're holding over there. Because if you plan to change it so it's not on the basis of universality and not on the basis of production and not on the basis of acreage, what in the world is this going to be based on? And if you can't answer that in this legislature, how are you going to answer it in the town hall? How are you going to answer it to the media?

It's very unfair. Will you give them the benefit of the doubt and extend the deadline till you make up your mind?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat my answer. The program for '93 will be the same as '92 with one option which is added, one feature which is added as an option.

Unfortunately because of the agreement, we cannot replace this program immediately. We have a two-year commitment to be into the program. We will give the proper notice . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I was very lenient with the member and I gave him one minute and twenty-one seconds to ask his question. I think he should have the courtesy of letting the minister answer.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Again, Mr. Speaker, farmers are telling us that this is a flawed program and they would like us to replace it with something better. We are talking to farmers, and we will replace it with a program that is designed by farmers.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. In your brochure that you sent around the province you said, and, Mr. Premier, you said: we are going to negotiate improvements to GRIP and NISA. You utterly, absolutely, totally eliminated all benefits that could accrue to individuals in the province of Saskatchewan in your '92 GRIP. That's what you did, Mr. Minister.

And now you're going to, on the basis of the speech that was made by the Premier of the province, you're going to cut out production, you're going to cut out acreage, you're going to cut out universality. What option are you going to give to the farmers by the March 15 to get out of the GRIP program?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, again the

farmers have the options that were in the program that was designed by the members opposite. And they continue to have those options.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, in the *Star-Phoenix* dated July 31, it says:

On the eve of a political showdown, Premier Roy Romanow swept into North Battleford Thursday to spread the gospel of good GRIP. But just a few kilometres away, farmers remained oblivious to the message.

"You don't have to have a sharp pencil to see the program isn't as good," said Stewart Mitchell, the owner of a mixed farm just south-west of the Battlefords.

That's what was going on at that time. It's no different today, Mr. Minister. It's because of you. Will you tell the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan that they have the right to opt out like you have the right to opt out, give them the same date-line as you have?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture from Alberta says that GRIP is no good. The Minister of Agriculture from Manitoba says that GRIP is no good. The farmers tell us that GRIP is no good. Yes we agree that it is no good. And yes, they have all the options that were in the program as it was designed.

Mr. Devine: — A question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, we're going to rephrase this question. In the event that you decide to opt out and some other jurisdictions don't, Saskatchewan farmers will have a much larger premium to pay. They would like to know if that's what they face when they make this decision by March 15. I quote the paper today. Hubert Esquirol says this:

All the premiums paid in the next two years would have to be high enough to cover the program payouts. This puts Saskatchewan farmers at a serious disadvantage compared with farmers in Alberta and Manitoba.

Now if that's the truth, if in fact you opt out and other jurisdictions get federal money because they pay the lion's share of it, Saskatchewan farmers by the 15th are going to have to decide to pay the lion's share of the premium. Now you have to tell them. You had better be fair to them and not have them sign up or be there while you scare them and frighten them with these headlines. You have to be fair to them. Will they pay higher premiums than you see in Manitoba and Alberta if they sign up on the 15th?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, our premiums this year will certainly be much lower than

Alberta's because of the design changes that we made to the program last year. The premiums will probably be somewhat comparable to Manitoba's. There will be no effect on the premiums regardless of our decision to opt in or out of the program.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1030)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 24 — An Act to repeal The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Act

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that a Bill to repeal The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Act be introduced and read for the first time.

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

Bill No. 25 — An Act to repeal The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to repeal The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act be now introduced and read for the first time.

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

Bill No. 26 — An Act to repeal The Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation Act

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to repeal The Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation Act be now introduced and read for the first time.

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

Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Association of School Business Officials of Saskatchewan Act

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, I move that The Association of School Business Officials of Saskatchewan Amendment Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation Act

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, I move that The Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation Amendment Act be now introduced and read a first time.

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

Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I move that An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984, be now introduced and read a first time.

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

Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act be now introduced and read a first time.

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

Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend The Heritage Property Act

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that An Act to amend The Heritage Property Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

MOTION UNDER RULE 42

Emergency Debate on GRIP

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, pursuant to rule 42 that a motion may, in case of urgent pressing necessity previously explained by the mover, be made by a unanimous consent of the Assembly without notice having been given under rule 41, I would like to say that I believe that it is an urgent matter that the people in the province of Saskatchewan who are involved in agriculture be involved in an opportunity to know by March 15 what the government's intentions are going to be in relation to the aspect of GRIP and the federal-provincial agreement that the province is going to make. And therefore I would move:

That this Assembly directs the government to announce its intentions today regarding continued participation in the federal-provincial GRIP program.

And I will move that, Mr. Speaker, and I will have the seconder the member from Estevan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Leave not granted.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order.

ROYAL RECOMMENDATION

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I wish to announce to the Assembly the

receipt of royal recommendation of Bill No. 6 which was not received in time to appear on the order paper. Therefore I beg to inform the Assembly that Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Prairie and Forest Fires Act, 1982, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

The Speaker: — The recommendation has been received.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, as it relates to questions I believe no. 82 and 83, I move they be converted to motions for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Motions for return (debatable).

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 13 — An Act to repeal The Mineral Taxation Act

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in this Assembly today to move second reading of The Mineral Taxation Repeal Act. The repeal of this Act is a housekeeping matter only.

In 1983 The Mineral Taxation Act was replaced by The Mineral Taxation Act, 1983. The Mineral Taxation Act was not repealed at that time because certain provisions relating to the potash resource payment arrangements needed to be continued for a period of time after the passage of The Mineral Taxation Act, 1983.

The potash resource payment arrangements have ended, so now, Mr. Speaker, The Mineral Taxation Act can in fact be repealed. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Mineral Taxation Repeal Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have a number of concerns about this Bill, and a number of concerns about the direction the government is taking with respect to mineral taxation in this province.

We expect, Mr. Speaker, that the government is going to be bringing in a number of measures in the budget upcoming with respect to the oil and gas sector of Saskatchewan, and we're quite concerned about that.

In my constituency, Mr. Speaker, there is a significant oil and gas sector, and I'd like to just touch on that a little bit and bring that concern to the floor here today, Mr. Speaker.

There is absolutely significant concern in my area about what might be proposed in the budget coming up, and all of these measures that the government is

proposing with regard to The Mineral Taxation Act, and what they may be replacing it with or what they may be bringing in as a result of, Mr. Speaker.

In the Kindersley field — Kindersley, Doddsland, Coleville, Smiley area of my constituency — there's a very large and excellent oilfield. However, Mr. Speaker, it's a low-producing field. It's a proven field, but it's a very low-producing field. It's a field that has about, on average, four to six oil . . . production of four to six barrels of oil per day, and that makes it, Mr. Speaker, a field that is marginal — marginal. And as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, because it's a marginal field they simply cannot stand any more additional taxation. They can't take it.

We've seen, Mr. Speaker, in that area almost all of the major companies have pulled out of there in spite of the fact that we've had relatively stable oil prices over the last two years. Something in the range of about 20, 21, \$22 per barrel, Mr. Speaker. And as a result of that, that's precisely the reason why the majors have decided to pull back and pull out of that part of the area, Mr. Speaker.

They're pulling out because they have a higher cost structure than the independents that are in the area. And the reason they have a higher cost structure than the independents that are in the area is because they bring in . . . as a rule you'll have one or two engineers for maybe 30, 40 wells, Mr. Speaker, and because of that, they have a significantly higher cost structure than you would find in other fields with a higher amount of production, Mr. Speaker.

So what's happened is is the independents have been buying up the fields generally from the majors, the majors like Esso, Imperial Oil, Gulf, ones like that have been cutting back significantly in exploration, has been cutting back quite a bit. So we've seen, Mr. Speaker, the independents buying up from the majors and as a result of that they have a lower cost structure and they're able to deal with this marginal field.

But, Mr. Speaker, they will not, they will not be able to deal with a well-head tax, and I think, Mr. Speaker, there's significant concern in my constituency about the possibility of a well-head tax in the upcoming budget. And we'd ask the Minister of Energy and Mines to at least consult with those people before you decide to push ahead with that.

I know in his speeches in the past, Mr. Speaker, he's talked about slapping it to the oil and gas sector in this province, taxing them, taxing them, taxing them. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, what will happen. In the Kindersley field, we will see immediately, absolutely immediately, there will be shut in wells. That's what will result from it. They will shut down that . . . they can just by turning off the tap, they shut her in. That's it — *adios*, I'm out of here, go back out to Alberta, start up production out there. Red Deer looks mighty attractive when they look at a socialist government in Saskatchewan, particularly in light of the kind of statements that the Minister of Energy and Mines has given to this Assembly in the past. That's the kind of

thing that worries them significantly.

We have now a Minister of Energy and Mines in this province, Mr. Speaker, that has been an absolutely, absolutely rabid with respect to the oil and gas sector in his speeches in the past. And, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that we will see that kind of thing happening in our field if we see a well-head tax. One can only wonder what kind of taxes they might be thinking about if it isn't a well-head tax. And we would ask the Minister of Energy and Mines to clarify that over the next little while.

What kinds of taxes are you going to be placing on the oil and gas sector in my constituency if you aren't looking at a well-head tax? What ones are you looking at? Everyone is wondering that. You're absolutely scaring them. You're scaring the living daylights out of the oil and gas sector in my constituency, Mr. Speaker.

And when we see this kind of thing . . . I talked to some of the oil and gas people out there just yesterday as a result of this Mineral Taxation Repeal Act, Mr. Speaker, and of course the obvious question was, if they're repealing this, what are they going to replace it with? What are they going to replace it with, Mr. Speaker? That's the question that they're asking in the oil and gas sector, particularly in my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, there's about 800 direct jobs in the Kindersley field as a result of the oil and gas sector. They generate absolutely millions of dollars for the area. They have families of course, Mr. Speaker. They have significant investment in dollars, Mr. Speaker.

We see just the other day, there was a land sale and there was something in the order of a million seven, I believe, of land sales in the Kindersley-Doddsland area, Mr. Speaker.

But what will happen, Mr. Speaker, is those oil and gas companies simply will not touch that at all, will not even go near those properties if we see a well-head tax. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's incumbent upon this government in the next days leading up to the budget to provide some kind of indication to the oil and gas sector what they're going to be doing.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, I haven't spoken to one single member of my constituency that are related to the oil and gas sector that they haven't heard a thing from this minister, this minister that they are afraid of in light of the kind of statements that he's made in the past with respect to the oil and gas sector.

(1045)

They're concerned that this minister will put them out of business, absolutely put them out of business. And as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, it's not just the oil and gas sector that will be affected in the Kindersley and surrounding area, it will be the business sector.

There's a large business sector, a large service industry that's been built up that is related to the oil and gas sector and they will be significantly impacted too, Mr.

Speaker.

I talked to car dealership owners here in the last few days and of course they're wondering about it. You look at large . . . we have a large General Motors dealer, a large Ford dealer in Kindersley and they're both very, very significant amount of business that they receive from the oil and gas sector and they are absolutely frightened of the prospect of a well-head tax or any other taxes that might be proposed by this minister who in the past has talked about the oil and gas sector being used as a cash cow to support other initiatives that they might want to speak about.

And, Mr. Speaker, also things that we are concerned about and the people in the oil and gas sector are concerned about are the kinds of statements that the member makes when he was at the Canadian Federation of Labour conference a couple of weeks back in Saskatoon, when he's talking about the possibility of looking at nationalizing industries once again, bringing them under the cabinet order once again in Saskatchewan.

This kind of socialist thinking can do nothing but drive away investment in this province, Mr. Speaker. These people do not want this kind of talk from a minister who is so intent on bringing in a higher tax regime on the oil and gas sector, Mr. Speaker.

We only can wonder, is this just the start? Is this just the start? This is a government that talks about bringing in industry. This is a government that talks about economic development. Well I can tell you, Mr. Minister, that the oil and gas sector is a significant employer in this province. They bring significant investment dollars into this province, Mr. Speaker, and they will not, I predict, will not look at Saskatchewan in the same way that they do now if you bring in a higher tax regime, Mr. Speaker.

So as I said, Mr. Speaker, they can shut their industry down in a minute. They will shut their industry down in a minute. It's not scaremongering to suggest that they will do that sort of thing, Mr. Speaker. What they are telling me is a higher tax regime in the Kindersley field, in that low-producing field, will put them out of business and they'll move back to a more stable type of oil and gas sector economy in Alberta. That's what they'll do, Mr. Speaker.

And we would be asking the minister questions about this in upcoming days about what his plans are with respect to that sector, Mr. Speaker, and we would be hoping that he has contacted the oil and gas sector. I doubt that he has. We're hoping that he will at least take the time to tell them what he's going to be doing to them in the next few days leading up to the budget.

Take the time, Mr. Minister, to at least tell them what you're going to do to them so they can make some decisions about their future out there, Mr. Speaker. I think that it's incumbent upon him to provide that kind of leadership and direction. At least take the time to pick up the phone and give them a call and tell them what they're going to be doing.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions that have to be asked about this Mineral Taxation Repeal Act and what they're going to be replacing it with. There are other speakers from our side that are interested in talking about the field of the oil and gas sector as it relates to their area, Mr. Speaker.

I can only say in conclusion, I think it's important that this government consults with the oil and gas sector. I think it's important that they realize the damage and havoc that they can wreak on this sector if they decide to move ahead with a significantly higher tax regime. And keep in mind that they will and can and will pull out of this province if they are hit with significantly higher taxes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would certainly not be doing my job as the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) for the Maple Creek constituency, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't rise to speak on this important issue.

Even though it seems innocent on the surface, the mere fact that the oil and gas industry is the number two industry in our constituency — and I don't think I'll get any argument from anybody out in the area on that point — it's important to our community. Not each and every small town is directly affected by the oil and gas industry. But in a broad sense they all are simply by the mere fact, Mr. Speaker, that much of the revenue that comes in through taxation from that industry is used to offset in the municipal scheme of things the balance of payments that go to different municipalities.

So that in those formulas that the Department of Rural Development uses to equalize taxation throughout our province, every community in our constituency, as every community in the province of Saskatchewan, benefits from this important industry.

So if an industry as big as the oil and gas industry is shared throughout the province, as the potash industry is also shared throughout the province, then those industries become important to every person in the province, not just to the locality where they are located.

So the point that my colleague and friend from Kindersley makes about the fact that when you make a small, seemingly, change by repealing an Act, you send fright and fear throughout an entire industry. That is extremely important. Because those shock waves, once they begin, it's like throwing a rock in the water. They start out little and then they grow and they go and they go and they keep on and they keep on and they keep on and they affect hundreds and thousands of different things around you that you never expected were going to be affected. And so when you throw this rock in the water and cause these rippling effects throughout the industry, Mr. Minister, you are frightening the entire industry.

And let me tell you that my colleague is absolutely correct when he tells you that there are many, many

places that the petroleum industry can spend their dollars of investment other than Saskatchewan. Believe me. There's a hunger for money, for investment in the petroleum industry all around the world.

And as one fellow told me not so long ago, with Mobil Oil, he said: we don't need Saskatchewan. Offshore is waiting for us and our dollars. He said any place in the world you can go offshore now and almost be sure to get 100,000 barrels of oil where you might get 1,000 barrels in Saskatchewan for the same kinds of investment. He said the risks are great but the rewards are even greater, and that's what's important, Mr. Minister, is the fear that you put into people when you start withdrawing these Bills.

I see a pattern developing here, Mr. Minister, and Mr. Speaker, a pattern developing in the withdrawal of Bills that has us all very anxious about what is going to replace all of these things that are being withdrawn. It almost looks like there's a plan developing, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw all kinds of Bills and all kinds of the former administration's work in the direction of establishing some kind of comfort level, some kind of confidence in our province. And all through the industries, people are saying, what are they going to replace them with?

We know that they're going to be replaced with something. That is for certain. This government is too high bent on regulating and ruling people's lives. They are too bent on that kind of philosophy to just let this vacuum sit empty. And so what's coming?

You might wonder, Mr. Minister, how this rippling effect can work in some of the other areas. For example, when you change the labour laws in this province, all of the industries are affected when you change those laws and you threaten to change them or you talk about changing them.

Even though you may talk about one specific sphere within the province, for example the construction industry in relationship to government contracts, and you change those kinds of philosophies and directions of approach of how you're going to handle those situations there, you send out that rippling effect, Mr. Minister. You send out that rippling effect of fear throughout the entire industry of the private sector as well as those people that are working with government. Because they know that it's only one step more until you apply those principles that you've applied in one sector, to all other sectors.

And so they are watching very carefully and they are very, very nervous, Mr. Speaker. The people out in the petroleum industry are extremely, extremely worried about what this government is going to do.

The track record of socialist governments in this province, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, have not been conducive towards attracting outside investment, especially from the private sector. The only kind of investment that socialist governments have been able to attract is the borrowing of money to buy the

industries under the name of the government.

And that's the kind of principle and policy that has been applied in the past, and our industries are very fearful that the nationalization of industry is another thing that this government will dig up. As they start to cancel all of these Bills, they will go back to their old ways, their old philosophies, the Regina manifestos. Those kinds of principles and ideas are definitely the ones that they're going to be going back to.

The industry is asking the question: when you repeal a simple Bill like this, is this the start of something, or is this the finish of our industry? That's what they're asking out there.

Now you may say it's a bit strange for the member from Maple Creek to be defending the industry when in fact my own personal background is that of a farming background and not in the oil and gas industry. But let me point out to the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that over the years I have worked with the surface rights associations trying to help farmers and ranchers and property owners to get a good deal and a fair deal from the oil and gas industries and the people that were working with them and coming out onto the land and drilling.

We've worked long and hard for 30 years, and maybe longer, to develop a coexistence between the two industries — the industry of agriculture and the industry of gas and oil. And we've accomplished that. We've had major, major gains at learning how to live with one another, at learning how to appreciate one another and how to actually benefit from one another. They need us and we need them. It's as simple as that.

And it's come more and more to that as the economy of this province has tightened up. The jobs that are offered in the petroleum and gas industry in the Maple Creek constituency are absolutely essential to the people, to the survival of the farming industry. Many of the young people that help with the farming and ranching programs at home depend on the industry for their major source of income, Mr. Speaker. They're going out in the daytime, working in the petroleum industry, and after supper and on weekends they are investing those dollars into their farming and ranching operations and doing the work necessary to keep them going.

If it weren't for that supply of money, I shudder to think at how many farms and ranches would have gone under financially in the past 10 years in the Maple Creek constituency. But I will hazard a guess that probably half of them would be gone, more than what already are gone under and have disappeared.

It is my opinion that the petroleum industry has been directly linked to the financial cash flow that has helped at least half of our producers remain in business in the agricultural industry in our area. And even though agriculture remains the number one industry in my constituency, because simply of the fact of the size of the acreages involved and the amounts of dollars that are generated still from

livestock and even from grains, the reality is that most of them couldn't exist if there wasn't that coexistence of the two industries working together.

The concept, Mr. Speaker, that is developing where you start to take away all of the old Bills that are in place, has some merit. Some Bills obviously might be outdated. But when the government does this, shouldn't they perhaps take into account the rippling effect of fear that this might send out, and assure the industry that in fact they are not going to come with well-head taxes, or the other tax that I've heard about lately is a tax on the very pipes that go underground, the well stem itself. And that has really got the industry worried.

My colleague from Kindersley has pointed out that he lives in an area where oil wells are marginal. In the Maple Creek constituency, while oil is heavier in density and a heavier product, the reality is that the wells are not quite as marginal, but there certainly are a number of them that are. The gas wells of course have a different kind of potential return for the invested dollar and for the volumes of gas that come out of those wells.

But if you attach a new tax to the actual pipe underground, it seems to me that you can't do anything but frighten the industry some more. And those kinds of stories have been going around.

Now I suggest to the minister in charge, Mr. Speaker, that he ought to get out there and talk to the industry people directly. He may have talked to the Canadian Petroleum Association. I don't know. But the people out in the Maple Creek constituency, the people that I talked to that are running the sub-offices, most of the head offices — Saskoil for example, located here in the city of Regina, they will have a sub-office out in our area — those folks haven't heard a word.

Now maybe there is some communicating going on somewhere, but it's certainly not happening out at home where the people are. And it's the people that are scared stiff that these kind of changes are going to cost them their livelihood and their way of life.

We need reassurance, Mr. Speaker, in this province. We need some sense not only of purpose, but some sense of convincing people that there's a reason to get up in the morning, some sense that there is something good to look forward to.

(1100)

We've got so much doom and gloom going on with this budget that we're talking about. We've got so much fear in the people now that I've seen people just throw up their hands in frustration. And at the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) convention for example this past week, just throwing up their hands in frustration and saying, what's the use of trying any more. We might as well go out and party and forget it, and if we can give our land away and somebody will take it without loading us with responsibility that will follow us through our lives,

then get out of this province and leave and be gone and done with it. It was the most amazing thing how these rippling effects are taking effect on our people, Mr. Speaker.

The fact that only 45 resolutions came to that very convention, at the SARM convention in Saskatoon, has in it a very definite and distinct message for everyone in this government. And that message is that people are frustrated and anxious to the point that they've just simply given up.

I can remember a few years back, as a reeve attending those conventions, where you would see 110 or 120 resolutions. And people would stand on the floor of that assembly and they would argue and debate because they believed in this province. They believed in what they were doing. They believed what they were going to accomplish would do some good for them and their families.

And now, in a state of frustration they have given up. They have absolutely no confidence in this province, in themselves, in their ability, or the ability of this government to lead or to bring prosperity. And that is sad.

But it is clearly written in the fact that an organization, Mr. Speaker, of that size would only see 45 resolutions.

And what is even more frightening about that is the fact that most of those resolutions were voted on without any debate. People just simply are giving up. They wouldn't even take the time to stand on the floor to argue about the important issues that were being discussed.

That's a clear sign to any observer that the people in this province are frustrated and they are frightened and they are just giving up.

And we've got to turn that thing around, Mr. Speaker. And this government obviously is the government that's elected and they are the only ones that can build that kind of confidence and give the people that kind of assurance.

I can stand here and preach in opposition as long as you like, but the people are waiting for the government because they're the ones in control. They'll have to say it. They'll have to do it.

People want to know that the light at the end of the tunnel is not a train. And right now in rural Saskatchewan they believe it's a train and they believe that the Premier is running the train and aiming it deliberately at them.

A few weeks back, Mr. Speaker, I attended an appreciation night for the gas and oil industry in the town of Richmound, Saskatchewan. Richmound, Saskatchewan, is a small community that lies on the boundary of the Alberta border.

Those people so much appreciate in their agricultural

community the fact that the gas industry and the oil industry are located in their centre, that they put on a night of appreciation to show those folks how much they like them and how much they want them to stay. A nice roast beef supper, guest speakers — I myself was invited to be a speaker there — one of the happiest events that I was able to attend and one of the nicest jobs that an MLA will ever have to do: to be able to go out and tell people that we actually appreciate what you're doing; we want you to stay because you're doing something good for yourselves and for us. And we're willing to cooperate and work with you, and we're willing to admit to the world in public that you're good and that you do good things for your community and for the world around you.

We did that together, Mr. Speaker, in a small community hall that most people a couple of weeks before had indicated would likely be lucky to hold 50 or 75 folks — if you had to sell the tickets, that's probably all that would come out — many more than 200 were in that hall. The place had no empty tables. The caterers were scrambling to get all of the people fed, did a fantastic job.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's not only important to the people that showed their affection for that industry, it was important for the industry to know that they were being appreciated.

And I believe that in spite of this government, because of the feelings that have been expressed by those people, those industry folks will stay in that area and they will take some losses, economic losses

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The Speaker: — What's the member's point of order?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — We've been treated to a fairly exhaustive list of concerns in the Maple Creek area. I'm wondering if we could have a ruling on precisely what is germane to this Bill. It seems to me the member's getting a fair distance from the Bill, which after all simply repeals a Bill.

Mr. Toth: — In response to the point of order raised by the Government House Leader, it would seem to me that opposition members do have the opportunity to speak out and try and raise the questions and what the minister is indicating as being germane. It would also appear that there are concerns in our areas that we should bring forward. And certainly, I believe my colleague is trying to raise those concerns, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order, order. I did have a look at the new Bill that was brought in but the Act that is being repealed is an Act that covers a wide scope of taxation. And since it's repealing an Act of that wide a scope, I think we have to allow fairly wide-scope debate.

But I was going to bring the member to order when he went in detail on the despair of people at the SARM convention and had really nothing to do with the Bill

itself.

But I think the member is in order. It is a wide . . . it's a Bill that has wide-scope effect and the member may continue.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Minister, I can understand your concerns about the opposition standing in this Assembly and expressing to the people of this province who don't live within the oil and gas fields, the problems of this rippling effect that I was talking about to you.

I can understand that you wouldn't want the rest of the people to hear about the problems that you are creating. Because you're afraid to have the people know what's the truth out in the country. And I can see how you would use whatever tactic you can to try to silence us. But the rippling effect is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

When you withdraw a Bill that has as deep-reaching effects as this Bill has, even though the title is short and seems to be quite simple, the spin-off ramifications of what will happen when you replace that Bill has got to worry people in that industry. How could it be any other way?

If your taxes are suddenly all taken off by the Bill that covered them, are you going to believe for one minute that that won't be replaced by this government?

I ask any one of you over there. Tell me that you believe that the oil and gas industry will no longer be taxed by this government. That if we repeal the Bills that affects taxation, that they won't be replaced. It's quiet as it's been in here in a long time, Mr. Speaker, and I can understand why.

Because the fact of the matter is that nobody will believe you if you say you're going to repeal a Bill on taxation and not replace it with something else. The logic is clear. And it is also clear to me that the logic here is that the petroleum industry had better brace themselves like the rest of the province, because all storm clouds are about to break loose in the province of Saskatchewan in the budget to come and in the Bills that will follow to replace these ones the are being repealed.

This government has no intention of repealing Bills in order to simplify the lives of people. They have absolutely no intention of taking away a lot of Bills and rules and regulations that would make life easier in the private sector because this is a socialist government. They don't do things that way. They absolutely don't believe in it.

They believe in ruling and controlling and contriving to manipulate people. That's what socialism is about, keeping control. Don't tell me that this doesn't have a rippling effect that's going to go far and deep throughout this province.

We've talked for a minute about the fears out there, Mr. Speaker, about this kind of rippling effect, the

jobs, the families. We've got all kinds of people out in our area who worry about this kind of thing because their families depend on these jobs in order to have a future. Half of the people along the west side of my constituency will be looking to send their children to universities or to training schools in Medicine Hat or Lethbridge, Red Deer, or perhaps Calgary and Edmonton. Without this industry secure, those children will never come back. Once they get to Alberta and see how good things are and with this kind of approach to government, they'll never come back.

The biggest drain we've got in this province today is our young people and this government is chasing them away as hard and as fast as they can. And they do it by not allowing some confidence to come back to our people, by saying to them when we repeal this Bill, here's what you can expect. Don't worry, we'll give you another list of things that we're going to do and you can be confident and you can have confidence in investment. Investor confidence is so absolutely important to the petroleum industry.

I am not one to advocate that anybody get into the stock market but the kind of things that trigger stock markets are very little and very dynamic. The petroleum industry runs on that same philosophy, Mr. Speaker, a little thing done by government has a massive effect on the quick movement of decision making in financial circles in the petroleum industry. If you want the petroleum industry in Saskatchewan, you have to build confidence with them and you have to convince them that you're not going to stick it to them with some kind of hidden tax or some kind of confiscation or nationalization after they've done the work and made the investments.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of confidence that these people do not have in this government. The member from Kindersley talked about the spin-off effects of the industry in our area and how that spin-off effect can benefit other areas besides the jobs and the families. And that of course, is in the purchase of consumer goods. That is especially true in towns like Richmond where we went and listened to the appreciation of the industry. That spin-off effect is being hurt by this government not telling the industry where they are going after they repeal this Bill.

I was talking to the Ford truck dealer. He told me that his business is surviving not too badly. His main sales are in trucks, the smaller kinds that they use for checking wells. In spite of the fact that there are some taxation problems between our province and the province of Alberta, he said he's still not doing too bad with gas industry in their community. If he were dependent on the agriculture industry, Mr. Speaker, he would not be there any more.

We have got to build confidence in this province for the petroleum industry, and we've got to do it now, Mr. Speaker, in order for people like our Ford truck dealer to stay in business so that his family can continue to live in rural Saskatchewan and in small-town Saskatchewan, towns like Richmond

and towns like Fox Valley and places like Leader and Maple Creek.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Premier of this province in days gone back. I almost shudder to admit how many years back this conversation took place because it will tend to date myself, and I'm sure that my grey hair will give it away anyway. But back in the 1970s when the present Premier was involved with government I had occasion to visit with him one day.

At that point I was representing a group of farmers who were, in fact, trying to get The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act rewritten and brought up to date and to bring into effect a better arbitration board process. A process that has been evolved into a dynamically good kind of organization and ability for people to resolve disputes and problems.

But at that time I met with the Premier and some of his . . . he wasn't the premier then, but the premier of that time and the Premier of this time in this government, the two of them, and they told me that the oil companies are no friends of ours. That was one of the statements they made that day.

(1115)

They also said we are not married to the petroleum industry. And being younger and not really understanding philosophy too much — I pay not enough attention to that, I guess — but it stuck in my mind because it seemed very significant to them to say this. But obviously, as the years have gone by, I have grown to understand that what they were saying is that they don't believe in private industry; they really believe in taking it over and owning it and controlling it through the government.

And I've come to study and learn and understand what the socialist philosophy is really all about, and I'm saying to this government that you're out of tune.

The Speaker: — Order. Why is the member on her feet?

Ms. Murray: — With leave, to introduce a guest, Mr. Speaker, please.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Murray: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just noticed in your gallery there that a good friend and neighbour, George Hubick, has joined us and I would ask all of us to welcome him, and I thank the member opposite for allowing me leave to introduce him. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 13 (continued)

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was saying that the government is out of tune with what is reality in Saskatchewan. Their long-term objectives could work over a long enough period of time, but it can't work in Saskatchewan today. And for the sake of the people out there whose jobs are dependent upon getting along and surviving together, I want this government seriously to consider going out and talking to the industry and putting their cards on the table, face up.

Tell them exactly what to expect, and they'll pack their bags if it's no good and they'll go. And if it's decent and it's respectable, they'll make some plans. And the story I heard the other day about 150 gas wells that were planned for this summer being put on hold, those kind of stories can maybe be put to rest and maybe we can get people back to work feeling positive that things are going to happen.

Now there's just one more point I want to make here, Mr. Speaker. In Alberta a short time back, the royalty taxes were reduced. The government of the day said, we need to encourage industry in order to build our tax base, and they did that.

Last summer we brought this to the attention of the government here, and we suggested to them that they ought to do the very same kind of thing to build the confidence that will be necessary and to build the competitiveness into the system that would allow the industry to grow and expand here in Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, we've heard nothing of that. All we've heard is doom and gloom and more taxes, inventions of new kinds of taxes. And this is destroying the potential of the industry to move ahead. I honestly think that this province could have seven times as many oil and gas wells drilled this summer as what are planned now. It is not without the possibility.

I've looked through the Energy and Mines booklets that are sent out — I'm on their mailing lists — some of the other things that we get from the petroleum industry. There is potential here that is not being tapped right at the moment, and I want to encourage the government members to take a serious look at that.

We need employment in this province desperately. This industry is not famous for creating a lot of jobs for the amount of investment dollars, but they are here, they are real. Every job is important and we ought to be pursuing them.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage the government to take a serious look at this and try to build some confidence in our province. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this Bill. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if the minister in charge

of this Bill was living in an area where there was oil production, he would more likely understand why we must bring the attention of this Bill to the minister.

Well I hear the chirping going on again from the other side, and I appreciate the attention, but you don't know what you're talking about. That's your problem.

I know where the minister lives. I've had a reasonably good rapport with the minister, and I'm saying this with no disrespect intended. We must review this Bill. Our job on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, is to be very careful. The people that call us are asking, what's going on here? What are they doing? Why is this being repealed? So it's incumbent upon us to be very sure we can find out what's going on and tell them what's going on.

The oil patch, when you look at the taxes that have been levied on every . . . everything that moves almost, Mr. Speaker, the oil patch are nervous. They're saying, how can we be left out of the tax grab that's going on here in the province? That's why they're nervous. That's why we have to find out and be sure that this Bill is as redundant as we are led to believe it is.

Mr. Speaker, the detail of this Bill is acceptable to us. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe the principle needs some comment. The principle of the Bill looks very straightforward and very simple. And, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House hope that that is exactly what this Bill is all about.

We will not give up our responsibility without checking everything very carefully, just because on first glance, and in all due respect to the minister, has indicated that this Bill is now redundant. It doesn't mean anything. We accept that. But we will not accept it without research.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, there may be . . . It may seem to the minister that we're taking a bit of time. I believe it's our responsibility to do so.

The principle is that once a piece of legislation outlives its usefulness, get rid of it. Repeal it. Very acceptable to us too. Pretty simple and straightforward, Mr. Speaker. No quarrel with that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the government does not seem to understand the principle in reality. We have this Bill because some very astute and bright official understands that this Bill is redundant and he pushed it on the agenda. And we congratulate that official, if indeed this Bill is redundant. We congratulate him for doing that.

But if this government actually understood the principle, then it would not be opposing Bill 10 on the order paper, which exists based exactly on the same principle.

When a Bill has outlived its usefulness, get it off the books. We're not opposed to that, sir. The principle applies here, and it applies equally to The Hospital

Revenue Act, which we suggest is redundant. Yet when Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition tries to get the government to at least consider the principle of Bill 10, all we get is a blank stare. No respect for the very same underlying matters that are contained within this Mineral Taxation Repeal Act.

That's what I'm saying today, is there has to be consistency in your approach to repealing Bills.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we should expect the government to at least be consistent. At least provide some logical pattern of behaviour. And at least give a sound basis to the Bills you present by showing the principles to be consistent across the piece. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should give the government another opportunity, another chance, and I expect we will do so.

Mr. Speaker, the people in my area will be watching this Bill very closely. Our oil industry out in my area is just getting going good and we don't want anything, anything to disturb that progress, Mr. Speaker. Whether it is real or imagined, we don't want anything to interfere with that. So while we accept the principle of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we make no apologies for scrutinizing it very, very closely.

In order to give the government another chance to show their consistency in redundant Bills, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the Assembly now proceed to consideration of Bill 10, An Act to Protect Municipal Property Taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan through the repeal of The Hospital Revenue Act.

Seconded by my colleague, the member from Souris-Cannington.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 11:26 a.m. until 11:34 a.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Toth
Neudorf	Britton
Martens	D'Autremont
Boyd	Goohsen

Nays — 32

Van Mulligen	Hamilton
Thompson	Johnson
Wiens	Trew
Tchorzewski	Serby
Teichrob	Whitmore
Shillington	Sonntag
Koskie	Flavel
Anguish	Cline
Atkinson	Scott
Carson	McPherson

Penner	Crofford
Bradley	Knezacek
Koenker	Harper
Lyons	Keeping
Calvert	Kluz
Murray	Carlson

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It must be obvious by now that there are some concerns that the opposition has on this Bill. And although normally debate is adjourned after the first session on second readings, because three of our members have had the opportunity to debate and express their concerns I would recommend to you, sir, that you begin the machinery in motion to move this Bill into committee.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in the capacity of minister in charge of SaskTel. At the conclusion of my comments, I'll be moving second reading of this amending Bill.

As many members will be aware, this amendment is designed to enable SaskTel to respond to fiscal realities being caused by a number of challenges which are facing this Crown corporation in today's competitive market-place. Foremost among those changes is a rapidly changing technology which in turn has brought about competitive pressures, some increased operating costs of dramatically declining long-distance charges.

Although the corporation's present financial situation may look strong, in actual fact its core revenue base, that of long distance, is beginning to decline. SaskTel and its Stentor partners . . . Stentor, as I think members will be aware, is the new name for what used to be some time ago the TransCanada Telephone System and then was Telus and now is Stentor. All of the partners in this system are responding to a rapidly changing technology and a rapidly changing environment.

The impact of factors such as national long-distance competition have already had a significant impact on the revenues shared by all of the Stentor partners including SaskTel. These new realities dictate that they must meet the challenge of competition by increasing their focus on customer service and satisfaction and reducing long-distance rates.

Long-distance rates were in fact reduced in this province some weeks ago by a very considerable degree. This in turn reduces the ability to cross-subsidize local rates. In order to be able to continue to remain profitable and to provide a reasonable rate of return to their owners, which is the public of Saskatchewan who we in a direct way

represent, SaskTel's costs must be kept under control.

Salary costs represent approximately 40 per cent of SaskTel's operating expenses, so it's an obvious area of attention when trying to contain costs and reduce the cost structure. SaskTel's workforce, which numbered more than 4,500 at the end of 1988, today is approximately 3,800. These reductions have been achieved through attrition and retirement programs.

One of the features, Mr. Speaker, of present-day technology is it is often more reliable and requires less service than the line telephones which many of us remember as children — steel wires strung from one farmhouse to another. It was an important innovation for its age, but modern telecommunications is much more reliable and requires less servicing than those systems.

And so we've sought to achieve reductions through attrition and retirement programs. In the fall of 1991 SaskTel introduced a voluntary, enhanced retirement program. The program was favourably received by employees with 88 per cent of those who were eligible to choose the program taking it.

Retirement programs offer SaskTel a logical and humane approach to reduce its long-term salary costs. Mr. Speaker, that philosophy will again be evident with the amendments to The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act which we're proposing today.

Foremost among the new amendments is a provision allowing cabinet to approve new early retirement programs. This is a sound approach, allowing SaskTel to continue on its course of responsible cost reduction. And I'm confident that future such programs will have a favourable reception from eligible employees.

There are, Mr. Speaker, some other amendments which will improve the administration of The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act. The board will be granted the new power to administer non-pension payments granted to superannuates as part of a retirement package. This in fact is something which has been done in the past. The auditor, however, brought it to our attention the legislative provisions may not be as broad as what had always been assumed, and thus in a way the legislation is being broadened to bring the legislation into compliance with long-standing practice.

Second, the size of the superannuation board will rise from three to five members to reflect the increasing responsibility on operational issues and the management of pension funds. This new Bill will allow for one SaskTel superannuate to be appointed to the board to give retired employees a voice in the management of their pension assets.

Third, employees in SaskTel's defined-benefit plan, who leave the corporation, will be given pension portability. The employees will be given essentially the same rights that employees in the

money-purchase plan currently have by giving them the opportunity to transfer their pension earnings into the province's money-purchase plan.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments to The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act will help fulfil this government's commitment to keep SaskTel on a sound financial footing for the '90s so that it can continue its tradition of technological innovation and providing an affordable service to the people of Saskatchewan, all the while returning to its owners a reasonable rate of return. This is consistent with the logical and humane approach towards cost cutting which remains as a cornerstone to its future success.

At the same time, it lays a foundation for more effective administration of the Act and ensures that SaskTel's superannuation plan keeps pace with changing circumstances of the '90s.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move second reading of an Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1145)

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to the comments made by the minister regarding the presentation of this Bill, The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act, and I'd like to make a few comments regarding the Bill.

Even though the Bill in itself, I suppose on the face, would be a pretty straightforward Bill, I think there are a number of implications in this Bill, either directly or indirectly, that affect the superannuates and certainly the taxpayers of this province.

I find with interest the comment by the minister that the reason for the Bill is fiscally driven. And I wonder if indeed, when he talks about fiscally driven, if that was . . . finances were really taken into consideration when you're expanding a board and who then is the onus put on to cover the expenses of that board going from three members to five.

One of the major concerns I guess, Mr. Speaker, that we as an opposition have with this Bill is number one, I think the purpose of the Bill is to allow the cabinet to appoint more people to the board of directors of Saskatchewan Telecommunication superannuates board; so in the normal course of conduct of this government opposite, Mr. Speaker, gives the cabinet the power to do this or that has been portrayed as a perfectly routine thing — just go ahead and get it done.

And I think the major question and concern we have here is the fact that the government has talked about being open, it's talked about getting more involvement from individuals, and yet here again we see cabinet indeed has taken the authority, or the

power, to appoint members. And I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if indeed any consultation process had taken place with the superannuates regarding the appointment of these members.

It would seem to be that in light of what the government has been talking about — their openness and giving people more say and being more accountable — it probably would be more appropriate and fitting if the government and the Executive Council, rather than taking and accepting the power to appoint, would have given the superannuates, the people who will be affected by the Bill, the ability to elect or nominate and place forward the two individuals that they would feel more secure and more comfortable with to address their concerns on this board.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we as an opposition certainly must challenge that principle of bringing to the government's attention what they have . . . the promises they have made to the people of Saskatchewan regarding accountability and regarding the ability of people to have a more direct say in matters that concern them. I think certainly it is imperative that the superannuate do have the opportunity to be involved, and involved directly in the appointment of these individuals, and without interference from cabinet; that they should have the ability to put the names forward, they should have the ability to go to the superannuates, and superannuates themselves should have that ability to decide who they would like to have represent them on the board.

There's no doubt in my mind that the superannuates themselves would like to have someone on the board who has some experience in financial management; someone with possibly a commerce background so that as they look at this developing fund that is being built for them as superannuates, that indeed the monies would be expended wisely so that in the future when they come to the point of retirement — having the funds available — they indeed would have a pension that would be able to cover all the added costs that are being placed upon them as they are being placed upon people right across Saskatchewan.

Because SaskTel superannuates have been and are and continue to be hard-working individuals contributing to our communities, contributing to our economy. They're dealing in a business that technological change is taking place rapidly. They have to learn new ideas and new methods.

And I think the people of Saskatchewan really appreciate most of the individuals, if not all of the SaskTel employees, who so diligently carry out their duties, providing a service in guaranteeing the communications across this province, not only here in the city of Regina, but right across this province in giving us direct access and links across Canada and across North America and certainly to the world.

I think one of the major concerns that superannuates have is will the fund have adequate . . . will there be enough funds to adequately address the costs that they

will be facing in the future. And I raise that, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that we have seen, and the minister brought out the one area of, increases in utilities in this province.

And certainly SaskTel rates have increased. And I can expect the problems the government is facing in light of the CRTC (Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission) ruling and the long-distance funds that we are facing across . . . competition that we are facing across our country. But we've got rate increases in SaskTel. We've got rate increases in SaskPower. We've got rate increases in our gas bills, Mr. Speaker.

And there isn't a pensioner or an individual who is close to retirement, or even a person just starting out in the workforce, that isn't asking themselves, down the road and looking ahead, will there be enough funds in my pension plan to cover the added costs that I will be facing?

And there's no doubt that the superannuates here are certainly going to want to have a direct input and say into the financing and where these funds are invested so that in the future they will indeed have substantive funds available and their pension will be adequate enough to address the concerns and their ability to meet the everyday expenses that they face.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, as we look at the Bill before us and as we review the Bill, there are a number of areas that we must take a closer look at. We must take the time as well to just speak to superannuates regarding The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Superannuation Act and indeed address their concerns and bring them to the forefront.

I believe there should be, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the committee that is brought forward and in increasing the committee, I believe there should also not only be an ability of the superannuates to have a say in this, but this Assembly as well should have the ability to address any concerns that may arise regarding the appointment of members to this board.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would . . . even the Premier of the province believes that it's the real reason why this Assembly is here and why we as members are here, is that we all have the ability to speak out and address the concerns, and certainly speak out on the issues that are being raised.

And we also want to know about the new powers that are going to be granted to the board, and what kind of powers, and the questions that will be arising there in the consultative process that, I believe, has taken place — at least we hope has taken place — whether or not the superannuates really had, or will have any power or any ability to address the concerns and to raise concerns regarding the new powers given to the board through this Act today.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly are not against early retirement, and I think I commend the minister for suggesting the fact that early-retirement packages are

going to be made available again, is that something that through the past number of years that's been a practice, and I'm a firm believer in it. And the fact that by allowing long-term and long-time individuals to look at accepting and taking an early retirement, it certainly opens the door for the younger generation to find employment.

And if there's an area of concern in our province today, Mr. Speaker, and amongst our young people, amongst our university and high school students, it's the fact of, where am I going to find a job tomorrow when I get out of, whether it's high school or whether I get out of technical school or whether I get out of university, what jobs are there going to be available for me?

And the fact that Crown corporations and large companies are even looking at and giving long-term employees the opportunity to accept early and adequate — and I must add the word, adequate — retirements because an early retirement doesn't mean much if it isn't adequate, if it doesn't have the ability to meet the needs of the individual to address the costs of their livelihood and their ability to survive in our society. So we certainly want to commend the government and SaskTel for expanding on this early-retirement package.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, a friend I know quite well, who happens to be a SaskTel employee, was indicating to me that they just received notice in their district of the package that's just coming out and he said he just missed it by a month. And he wasn't sure whether he would . . . was hoping that that month would have been extended one month earlier, which would have given him the ability to choose to take the retirement package or not, or whether he's just as happy to maybe work for another two or three years or . . . as long as . . . or whatever period it takes before an early retirement package is offered to him. But certainly it opens up the door for the younger generation to find employment.

But I must add, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier's comments the other day about the fact that there would be a reduction in government by offering early-retirement packages, it also appears that it doesn't necessarily appear that there will be a lot more jobs available. Because this is possibly another avenue the government will be using to downsize and to cut people out of the employment force, cut people out of the workforce so that they don't indeed . . . can say, well they have cut the cost of government.

I guess the area, Mr. Speaker, when we review SaskTel as we go into estimates and as we review SaskTel in Crown Corporations, the question that will be arising, Mr. Speaker, is, we will be finding out how many people actually did accept the early-retirement package and then how many people were rehired. How were they rehired? Who rehired them, Mr. Speaker? And the minister assures me that they've already rehired them.

But I think that isn't appropriate for the minister to be

suggesting today that he has already made a decision on something that they're just bringing in, allowing people to accept and look at an early-retirement package.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is much more that we need to look at in the Bill. Even though it in a lot of ways . . . I think at the end of the day we will in general be in agreement on the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

But I believe that today we should . . . the few questions that I brought out, the few concerns I have raised, number one, we want the appointment to the boards to be open. We want the appointment of these board members to be something that the Assembly has the ability to question or to raise. We don't want to appoint board members to be appointed in secret behind cabinet doors. We want to be sure that the fiscal realities that the government is talking on aren't just another way of downsizing on one hand and yet back-filling, turning around and back-filling on the other hand. Mr. Speaker, I therefore move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 22 — An Act respecting the Manufacture, Sale, Use, Consumption, Collection, Storage, Recycling and Disposal of Ozone-depleting Substances and Products

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, after my remarks I will be moving the second reading of The Ozone-depleting Substances Control Act, 1993. The Act has been rewritten to correct an error in the existing Act, which made it impossible to pass the required regulations and to establish a broader range of substances and activities which are covered under the Act.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, ozone is a natural and vital gas of the upper atmosphere. It shields the earth from the sun's ultraviolet rays, which can burn skin, cause skin cancer, and cataracts, and decrease the productivity of forests and crops.

Recently scientists have discovered that the ozone layer is thinning. They've detected holes in the ozone above the Antarctic. As you know, Mr. Speaker, our concern is that these holes let increased amounts of ultraviolet radiation reach the earth's surface. This increased exposure poses a threat to both human health and many agricultural crops.

Man-made gases like chlorofluorocarbons and Halons seem to be major culprits in depleting the ozone layer. Because of this environmental and health threat, the Saskatchewan government is participating in a national program to phase out CFCs (chlorofluorocarbon) by the end of 1995.

The international Montreal Protocol Agreement of 1987 and subsequent amendments set timetables for phasing out the production of the major ozone-depleting substances. Canada was one of 86 countries that ratified this agreement. In response to

this global concern, the Canadian Council of Ministers of Environment accelerated our phase-out of CFCs by a year, to no later than December 31, 1995. This means by the end of 1995, Canada will cease to produce or import CFCs.

(1200)

The Ozone-depleting Substances Control Act, 1993, will replace the existing Ozone-depleting Substances Control Act. This new Act improves on the existing one. In addition to correcting our inability to pass regulations covering the manufacture, processing, and list of products that contain ozone-depleting substances, the new Act establishes a broader range of substances and activities which are covered under the Act.

Saskatchewan doesn't have any CFC or Halon manufacturing facilities or any significant manufacturing activities which require CFCs. But we do use these substances in our automobiles, refrigerators, air-conditioners, fire extinguishers, rigid and flexible foams, cleaners, and solvents. The gases from these devices travel slowly upward and break down the ozone. These CFCs contribute to global warming.

In many cases industry has found safe substitutes for these chemicals rather quickly and are currently developing further acceptable replacements. They no longer use CFCs in aerosol spray cans or foam container packaging. Companies that make insulation products have begun to find ways to make their products without CFCs.

Mr. Speaker, because of global concerns, ultimately these chemicals will be banned from total use. This Act will help us better manage the way we recharge, recycle, and dispose of these substances and make an acceptable phase-out process possible.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Ozone-depleting Substances Control Act, 1993.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House also have concerns about CFCs and ozone-depleting substances. And because of this, governments across Canada and around the world have taken action to try and correct the situation which has been developing with the ozone.

Some of this elimination process is scheduled to come in over the next period of time. The elimination of new CFCs is set for December 31, 1995. These are the Montreal accord agreements as signed by various nations across the world.

Also the elimination and importation of new Halons is set for December 31, 1994. The reduction of methyl chloroform as a non-feed-stock use is set for December 31, 1994 also. And the complete phase out of these chemicals in non-feed-stock use is set for the

year 2000. The elimination of non-feed-stock use of carbon tetra-chloride is set for December 31, 1994.

Also this accord limits the use of HCFCs (hydro-chlorofluorocarbons) as substitutes for CFCs or Halons.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not new legislation around the world. It's new perhaps in Saskatchewan, but not across the world. In fact the federal and provincial governments have agreed on some recycling procedures. A working group has been set up to harmonize the regulation approaches to the recycling and recovery. This group has been set up to develop a national plan for the recovery and recycling of all CFCs in Canada.

Perhaps we should stop and take a look at how CFCs and Freon came into play in various uses across this country. In particular they are used as refrigerants. And it was in 1928 that the U.S. (United States) chemist, Thomas Migley Jr., stumbled upon CFCs and Freon. He was asked to find a new coolant for the refrigeration industry, and Dr. Migley began his research for substances that would boil between 0 and minus 40 degrees Celsius. And he chose carbon tetra-chloride whose boiling point he mistakenly listed in his chemical tables as minus 15. In actual fact, it turned out to be minus 128 degrees C (Celsius). This error led him to investigate the potential of the related element fluorine.

Two years later he announced the invention — and I'm not going to say the chemical word, Mr. Speaker — but it's known as Freon. This was the first of the now-famous family of chlorofluorocarbons.

When you eliminate these products, Mr. Speaker, there will be a cost associated. It's estimated that in the U.S. this cost could reach \$36 billion between now and the latter part of the next century. That cost, \$36 billion, is just for the U.S. Those costs would be greatly increased across the entire world.

Recently in 1988, the electronics giant, Northern Telecom, came up with a new idea. They were using solvents which contain the chemical to remove sticky residues from their production of circuit boards. This company decided to use a new CFC-free solvent. Instead, it decided to do away with . . . instead of going to another chemical to use in this process, they decided to do away with solvents altogether. Today the flux is applied to the circuit boards in a fine mist that boils off during the manufacturing process. While the new process has cost Northern Telecom \$1 million to develop, it is expected to save the company \$50 million by the year 2000.

Another company in Canada has taken the initial steps to correct the use of CFCs. Lily Cups Inc. of Toronto was using CFCs to make polystyrene cups and containers. Earlier in their research, Lily researchers discovered that in 1960 scientists considered using carbon dioxide or oxygen as blowing agents in making their foams. These gases were rejected because the foam bubbles they produced dissipated

too quickly. But through some belt-and-braces tinkering with their process, including the adapting of temperature and speeds to the foam extrusion process, Lily was able to overcome the problem. Lily Cup in Canada stopped using HCFCs last April. This cost the company \$1.5 million over the last three years. But they have succeeded in eliminating the HCFCs from their process.

Success has not proved quite as available for other companies, especially in the refrigeration and air-conditioning industries which in 1988 accounted for 35 per cent of the CFC use in Canada. But now the federal regulations and the new legislation coming forward in Saskatchewan will require certain industries to phase-out of CFCs. The federal legislation is set for phase-out by 1997. Bans will take effect in 1993 for CFCs used in blowing agents in flexible foams, in 1994 in sensitive electronic equipment and hospital sterilants, and by 1995 for automobile air-conditioners.

But that's not the only areas that are affected, Mr. Speaker. The food industry is one of those areas that is affected by the reduction of these chemical uses, particularly in the container field. Christopher Kyte, the head of the Food Institute of Canada, recognizes that there will be additional costs involved here.

And one of the alternatives to using Freon in refrigeration is ammonia. While ammonia poses no atmospheric threats, it has costly safety precautions involved in that otherwise. Because ammonia is a flammable substance and if anybody has been around ammonia perhaps in applying ammonia nitrates on the soils as farmers, you know what it smells like. So it has other potentials involved with it.

Kyte says that the industry is in for a shock within the next few years when forced into a sudden change because the price of alternatives is going to rise 10 to 20 times over today's prices. So the food industry is looking at a major economic impact with the changes in the CFC regulations.

Why are we concerned about the changes in CFCs? What is our point? What are we trying to prove by eliminating these products? Well about three months ago, Mr. Speaker, as an example, the depletion level in the ozone layer in the upper atmosphere above the city of Toronto was 21 per cent greater than it was in 1980. That's a very significant increase, Mr. Speaker.

An alternative to the CFCs being considered are called HCFCs. But they, while they don't endanger the ozone layer, they have the potential, a much greater potential as greenhouse gases. They can cause much more global warming than what the CFCs do. And also with the HCFCs, they have a life expectancy or a life span of 50,000 years.

I received a book two days ago in the mail and it turned out to be quite appropriate with this legislation coming forward, because the title of the book, Mr. Speaker, is *Climbing Out of the Ozone Hole*. This book was sent to me by the Greenpeace organization

and it deals exactly with what this Bill deals with and what the federal government has been trying to do with the elimination of CFCs and other ozone-destroying substances.

And we know that the ozone is causing severe problems with . . . the ozone-depleting substances are causing great problems with the ozone as we have all heard about the ozone hole over the Antarctic. This allows ultraviolet light to enter onto the earth and can have a very severe impact on all life forms in the world.

What we need to do as a society, Mr. Speaker, is change our consumption patterns and our production processes to eliminate these CFCs. But when we do that, Mr. Speaker, we also have to find alternatives. And we should be considering all of the alternatives, Mr. Speaker.

When we consider alternatives, there are some that are currently available, but we also need to get involved in researching and developing other alternatives with industry. And government should also be involved in this and they should give this a very high priority.

We have two good universities in this province, Mr. Speaker. We also have a very large number of people who are technically able. And this government should be providing some encouragement to them to get involved into the fields of research to find alternatives to the use of CFCs and HCFCs.

When we start considering these alternatives, Mr. Speaker, we need to look at the subject of regulation and independent monitoring of what kind of effect these new alternatives will have on our environment. We need to look at the toxicity these elements may have, at how energy efficient they are if we're going to develop an alternative that is going to consume 2, 3, 4 — who knows how many times the energy that we are consuming today in developing CFCs; and in using CFCs, perhaps we're causing more damage in another area of the environment than we're already causing with the ozone.

We need to look at the chemical lifetimes of these alternatives, at the costs, the economic costs that will be associated with the transition period from CFCs to whatever new alternatives may come forward. We need to look at the volumes of the new alternatives of the CFCs and Halons that are currently in use, and what volumes will be necessary as alternatives.

And we need to look at how safe those systems will be that come forward as alternatives, in the sense, will they put out more emissions into the environment than what the Freon systems we're using today in refrigerations.

We still have to be able to meet those needs as society wants. The things that society wants, we still have to be able to provide for them.

The economic aspects of this legislation have not

been discussed, have not been brought forward by the minister. We need to look at all those areas where CFCs and Halons are currently in use. And one of those areas is in refrigeration. We all have refrigeration within our homes; we have it in our fridges, our deep-freeze, we have it as air-conditioners.

There are various other areas within our homes that use it. But perhaps what we need to be considering is whether or not all of this use of refrigerants, Freon, CFCs, is really necessary within our homes. And we as a society have to look at the costs we're imposing on the environment when we want to have our homes set at 72 degrees all year round.

And that's up to society to decide. Government can guide, but government cannot legislate that you will not be able to have an air-conditioner. But we need to take a look at that as a society to find out where our people really want to go to, what kind of a cost they're prepared to pay to accept the end solution that they desire.

So when we're talking about refrigeration we need to look at what kind of alternatives are available. Right now we're basically using a vapour compression system with Freon in developing our refrigeration. But there are other alternatives which basically use the same system, and one of those is the ammonia system.

(1215)

Some of the other areas that we are also using these chemicals in are in solvents, in aerosols and in fire-fighting. I mentioned the case of Northern Telecom which was using the solvents for cleaning some of their electrical equipment, but these are also used in developing . . . Any area of the electronics industry in particular is quite involved in that. The building of computers is one area. We should be developing fluxes that do not need to be cleaned so that we can control the atmosphere, or perhaps atmospheric soldering which would spray it on and it would be part of the system in a proper manner.

Another possible solution is aqueous or semi-aqueous cleaning methods or specialized cleaning methods, particularly ice particle sprays or pressurized gases such as air or oxygen.

Now most of the CFCs have been eliminated from aerosols. As a society we have gone to our Ban roll-on deodorants and this has eliminated the aerosol needs. But there are other types of things that we can do. There are mechanical sprays that can be used. There are compressed gases or hydrocarbon propellants that we could use in those cans rather than using CFCs.

Another area in which these chemicals are used is in the fire-fighting area. Alternatives could be carbon dioxide, water, foams, and powders. A new method of carbon dioxide-nitrogen-argon mixture could be a major breakthrough in replacing Halon-1301 in fixed systems. At present some of the applications which are using the Halon for fire-fighting are such as

protection of aircraft cabins which are still considered to be essential uses, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the use of Halons in aircraft is particularly important to me personally because I am a pilot. I fly a small airplane at times.

And if you consider the use of an ABC dry powder chemical within an aircraft cabin, you have the potential of fire to start off with, or else you would not be using your fire extinguisher. But beyond that point, you want to know that if you do put the fire out, what other effects will the use of that extinguisher have.

Well the most obvious example, Mr. Speaker, is that when you fire off a dry powder chemical extinguisher within the small space of an aircraft cabin, you're going to have the entire surface of the inside of the cabin covered with the powder. Now hopefully when you fired that off, you have indeed put the fire out. But you have also caused a problem with all of your equipment within that airplane. Now your equipment is not of any value to you if you don't put the fire out and it causes some alternatives you'd rather not consider.

But with Halon, Mr. Speaker, you don't have that problem. If you put the fire out, it has no effect on the rest of your equipment.

With the dry chemical powders we've all seen the effects of static electricity. Using a dry chemical powder inside the confinement of a small aircraft cabin the powder sticks to the windows. You run into a problem of not being able to see outside of the cabin of the aircraft that you're trying to fly. And this has a great deal of difficulty in controlling your airplane.

With Halon, Mr. Speaker, you do not have that problem as it is a clear, odourless gas and dissipates very quickly. You have to vent your aircraft cabin of the gas once the fire is out, but you are able then to control your aircraft in a proper manner. Which if your visibility is totally restricted by powder on your windows, you no longer have that control, Mr. Speaker, and the results are obvious if you cannot control your aircraft.

Some of the other items that we use these CFCs for is in packaging. Cushions, steering wheels, and head rests in automobiles. Those are some of the items that, Mr. Speaker, we need some time to also eliminate.

If Saskatchewan says today that you will not be able to bring any of these chemicals into Saskatchewan, does that indeed mean that you will not be able to bring any automobiles into Saskatchewan?

So we need to have a longer time frame involved. We need to work in conjunction and in tandem with the national government and with the governments of the rest of the provinces. Saskatchewan cannot be going off on their own in one particular direction, which we have seen in other pieces of legislation. Saskatchewan will have to move in tandem with the rest of the governments in this country.

Even Greenpeace, Mr. Speaker, advocates a precautionary approach towards protecting the ozone layer. They recognize the fact that there are indeed some essential uses although they would severely restrict just what those uses could be.

I'd like to go through some of the alternatives that are available for uses in the various areas of the economy that we use CFCs in. In the refrigeration and cooling area there are a number of alternatives. Right now we're using the vapour compression system in most of our units. But there's also absorption and evaporative cooling that are old technologies that we could use. They're fairly inefficient in a lot of cases; they're not practical particularly in a country like Canada. For the evaporative method you need to have a climate which is hot and dry. Well in the summertime we do have the hot and dry climate in this particular area, particularly the dry. But there are other times of the year where that type of a method would not serve us well, Mr. Speaker.

One of the new methods that has been talked about is called the Sterling method. And this method uses helium rather than Freon in its cycle. And it has some good potentials, Mr. Speaker. But one of the problems with using helium as an alternative to CFCs is that there is a very limited amount helium available in the world. So that would . . . if a large sector of society was to move towards a Sterling-type system, we would have a very economic impact on the helium and it could be very expensive because of the lack of supplies.

One of the other types is the water vapour recovery cycle in evaporative cooling systems. As I mentioned before, these have already been used years ago and are not necessarily that efficient.

A new type is the zeolite water absorption cycle. Zeolite is a naturally occurring mineral that is hygroscopic. It means it absorbs water, Mr. Speaker. And in tests in the U.S. with a heat pump using zeolite and natural gas as a heat source, it proved out to be quite a successful system. In fact a German automobile manufacturer is planning to install zeolite water air-conditioning units in their production of cars in early 1993.

Another possible system that could be used, Mr. Speaker, is the liquid carbon dioxide and nitrogen gas expansion systems. These systems are being looked at in highway freight trailers. We see the large refrigerator trucks that travel up and down the highway, and this type of system is being considered in there. And one of the advantages that this system has is that it's lighter than current systems and therefore would perhaps be more cost effective because you're hauling less weight up and down the highway. This system contains a storage container mounted under the trailer, a propane tank, heat exchangers, and controls. So it's a fairly simple system, Mr. Speaker.

I mentioned also that ammonia could be used in the

vapour compressor cycle. Research has shown that ammonia to be superior to HCFC-22 which is one of the alternatives being considered for CFCs. In terms of efficiency it's more effective at most temperatures. It is available, and at a competitive cost.

In other comparison studies, ammonia has been shown to be technically superior to HFC-134a and typically about 4 per cent of the cost of that system. So there are some alternatives out there for the refrigeration system.

Hydrocarbons such as ammonia can be used. Other hydrocarbons are also possible to use, pentanes and propanes. They have excellent refrigeration properties with thermo-dynamic efficiencies equal to the CFCs and their operating temperatures are also comparable. A domestic refrigerator using a propane-butane mixture as a refrigerant is being produced by one of Germany's leading manufacturers at the current time.

U.S. companies are also testing an air-conditioning unit with propane as the refrigerant and the test performance results are highly promising. Flammability should not present a problem because of the small amount of refrigerant charge used. It still presents some problem but it should not be an excessive problem if properly controlled and vented in a proper manner.

Ammonia-absorbing refrigerations are currently being used in such applications as mobile homes and hotels, mini-bars in hotels, and hospitals.

Lithium bromide water absorption cycle is another alternative. This system however has the distinct disadvantage in that it must be used at above-freezing temperatures, which in a country where we have 11 months of winter and one month of poor sledding that is not a very viable option.

So there are alternatives, Mr. Speaker, to the applications of refrigeration and cooling. The Sterling system using the helium is a good example for a short- to mid-term.

The decisions to produce commercially or expand the market of these systems are blocked, Mr. Speaker, not by technical barriers such as performance and efficiencies, but rather by political and economic ones. We as a society are just starting now to move in the direction that we are prepared to make some of the political choices necessary to make these changes. But we also have to take into account the economic costs that can be brought forward in this concern.

Aerosols in 1989, Mr. Speaker, accounted for approximately 20 per cent of the CFC consumption worldwide. And when we look at these aerosols we have to look at what do we consider to be essential in aerosols that need to have the CFCs. The only application which CFCs could still be considered essential would be in the use of metred-dosage inhalers for medical reasons. However even in this area, Mr. Speaker, dry powder inhalers, nebulizers,

and other inhalants and non-inhalant products can be used to replace this CFC use.

So that is one of the areas that we should still be looking at, Mr. Speaker, is our use within the medical system of the CFCs. We could use mechanical spray applicators to provide the medication to various patients. We could use compressed gas propellants such as carbon dioxide and nitrogen or even air to provide this to the patients that need to have metred doses.

Even dry powder inhalers, Mr. Speaker, can be used within this system. Nebulizers — nebulizers provide a non-irritating air-propelled delivery system for inhaling drugs. There are two disadvantages to the system, Mr. Speaker. The delivery time is long. Administration of the medication takes about 10 minutes as compared to 20 seconds with metred-dose inhalers or the dry-powder inhalers. Metred-dose inhalers are currently using the CFCs.

The nebulizers are also much more costly than the metred-dose inhalers and the dry-powdered inhalers as the system requires a compressor, which represent an extremely expensive one-off cost to the patient. Now with the cut-backs that we are seeing in health care, I'm sure that the government is not prepared to bring forward any assistance in this matter.

Fire fighting is one of the other areas in which CFCs are . . . in particular, Halons are used. And I already mentioned the use of Halons within the aircraft industry. They're generally used within confined spaces and closed-in areas where the chemical can be contained within one area, used as a suffocant on the fires.

But the new chemical mixture of carbon dioxide, nitrogen and argon, seems to be a major breakthrough in replacing Halon-1301 in fixed systems. At present some of these applications are, as I mentioned, the aircraft cabins, which are considered to be essential uses.

There are two types of fixed systems in which Halons are used in a total flood, where a uniform concentration of extinguishing agent is built up within the protected area and localized. The other is localized, where the agent is discharged directly onto the flammable materials.

Halons are used to combat specialized fire and explosive situations, including in the areas where computers and electronic equipment facilities are; in museums because they do not put a chemical onto whatever it is you are trying to protect; engine spaces on ships and aircraft; and the ground protection of aircraft and facilities for processing and pumping of flammable fluids.

(1230)

So when they're filling up your airplane while you're sitting on the runway in Regina, they will have Halon extinguishers nearby to prevent explosions.

The substitution of Halon in fixed systems is considered to be more difficult than that of portable system. So where you have an enclosed space in a confined area, it seems to be more difficult for industry to come up with some alternatives for the use of Halon in those areas.

Carbon dioxide is one of the chemicals that can be used as a replacement for Halons. But with carbon dioxide, when it does fire off, you do have some problems which result in that, as it comes out and freezes on whatever is in the area. In fact as I have seen it in my own, where I was employed before, where a carbon dioxide system fired off and it looked like somebody had left the building doors open during a blizzard, because the floor was all covered in frozen carbon dioxide. And actually in that particular time, there was no fire. It was an accidental firing of the system.

And carbon dioxides are less efficient than Halons. Therefore, when you have a system using carbon dioxide, you must have a larger system which weighs more and requires a greater storage area. And if you're using those systems on an aircraft, you do not want anything that creates added weight or takes up added space.

So carbon dioxide would take up a much greater space than one of the Halon systems. And they also have a shorter, what's called a throwing distance. You cannot project the carbon dioxide as far from you as you can with a Halon system.

I mentioned also the carbon dioxide-nitrogen-argon mixture system. When you convert a Halon system to this new gas, you have to change all of your release nozzles and your storage tanks, but you can use the existing Halon system, piping system, for the protection.

The other thing that is used in fire fighting is powders. Now some of these powders work very well. The Ansul powders are excellent materials. They rapidly knock down the fires and the flames that you are trying to prevent from progressing beyond the point that they are. They're considered to be more effective than Halons in this regard.

However, the disadvantages of powder are poor penetration behind obstacles, and possible secondary damage to equipment. If you were going to spray ABC powders on your computer equipment, your computer equipment is not going to be worth anything after you're done with it and you may as well let it burn up.

Mr. Speaker, when I look through the Act and we consider the name of this Act even, I find some contradictions within the Bill. The Act is entitled, The Manufacture, Sale, Use, Consumption, Collection, Storage, Recycling and Disposal of Ozone-depleting Substances and Products Act. And yet when you go through the Bill, it says that certain uses, without defining them as being essential, are exempted. And I

can understand that, Mr. Speaker, because there are some uses for which there are a viable reason to have these type of chemicals.

But it also says that nobody's allowed to sell them. So I'm just wondering, it's legal to use them but it's not legal to sell them. So what is this telling the consuming public? Is it telling them that if they want to use this particular brand or this particular chemical, that they're supposed to go cross-border shopping to acquire it? And if you do go cross-border shopping to acquire it, it's perfectly legal to use it.

But what do you do with it afterwards? Because when you go back further in the Bill you find out it's illegal to have it. So there seems to be some problems in here, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the government should be able to take a look at and correct.

Now I would hope that the minister would be amenable to some amendments later on in the process and would be prepared to listen to what I consider that the opposition will have some good ideas that may be very relevant on this type of legislation. Because it is important legislation, Mr. Speaker.

One of the other areas that I have a concern with in this Bill is when you deal with the penalties that may be given to a person if they do not follow the mandates of this Bill. And there are some very harsh penalties set out in this Bill.

And yet when you look at the court situation across this province and the results that we have been seeing in court decisions dealing with some very, very severe situations, it seems that it is worse to own an aerosol can full of CFC than it is to go out and kill somebody. And I think that there needs to be some proportion brought into here, Mr. Speaker. Either this is too heavy or the other is too light. And so perhaps the government should take some look at both of those areas.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I will take my place and allow some of my colleagues to make their comments. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased as well to join my colleague in making a few comments regarding the Bill No. 22, An Act respecting the Manufacture, Sale, Use, Consumption, Collection, Storage, Recycling and Disposal of Ozone-depleting Substances and Products.

And certainly I believe, Mr. Speaker, as I make my comments we'll find, I think I'll bring out the fact that there are . . . the Bill in itself, as people out in the rural areas of Saskatchewan and in fact across Saskatchewan, will probably go further than just the ozone-depleting substances. Because environment and the discussion of our environment is something that has become a major topic and discussion focus not only in our province, but certainly across our nation, across North America, and around the world.

From our teenagers, from our young people, to parents and adults right across this nation, the concerns regarding the environment are a major issue.

And when we talk about ozone-depleting substances, we are aware of the fact that there are many people who are very concerned today about the so-called ozone hole developing in our atmosphere and the consequences that can be faced by humanity if indeed we don't gain control or bring under control any of the substances that would destroy this atmosphere that is . . . and create such a delicate balance in our society to allow each and every one of us to even breathe and exist and live our daily lives.

I say the principles, Mr. Speaker, of this Bill and the content of the Bill and the idea of cleaning up our environment and making a cleaner world for us is a good idea. And most people would certainly agree with that. I don't think there is any argument out there.

And I believe even in our schools, many of our children are becoming more aware of consequences of many of the mechanizations and the economic activity that has taken place over the past number of years in the development of industry and the problems we are facing.

But as we stand together to address these concerns and to address the consequences, raise these issues . . . And indeed what we're doing today by bringing forward an Act is bringing forward some guidelines and some rules that are addressing the concerns and laying out a playing field for people to work with so that we can all work together to develop sound, solid policies and which we can pass on to future generations — a sound and beautiful world in which we can all live.

Mr. Speaker, I think as we look at the Bill before us today, we're all aware of many areas of the world, and certainly on the North American continent there are major cities that are facing very severe problems because of the environment and because of the pollution contributing factors that take place in their environment.

And I think of the city of Los Angeles. And I haven't had the privilege of visiting that city, but I'm aware of the fact and I've talked to a number of people who have been there. And certainly I guess there are times when people would like to be there, and there are other times when you'd prefer not to be there, especially on a sort of a cool, damp day and when the fog rolls in and the smog that builds up from vehicles and the problems it creates, and certainly for many people. And I would assume that especially people . . . it's difficult for people who are quite healthy and able to breathe quite freely. It must be awfully difficult for people who are asthmatics and people who have difficulty in breathing.

And I'm pleased to see that in the Bill that's before us today, the use of substances in inhalers is not going to be prohibited until they come up with new solutions

to address this concern. I think the questions that we raise here are . . . we must look at some of the health problems that are being created but we must take into consideration that as we go to try and address all the ozone-depleting substances that we presently use such as in our aerosol cans and inhalers, that there must be an alternative made available so that indeed the livelihood of people can be expanded on.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not opposing the main objective of Bill 22, but I certainly want my children, and I'm sure all members in this Assembly want their children and grandchildren of the future, to indeed be able to grow up in a more healthy atmosphere with clean water and clean air.

I think it's appropriate that here in Saskatchewan we have been discussing this over the past number of years. There has been a fair bit of discussion and consultation take place in trying to address the issue and trying to design a Bill, that in addressing the issues and the concerns out there regarding our environment, regarding ozone-depleting substances, that we are now at a point, Mr. Speaker, of being able to put forward a Bill that not only addresses the concerns, Mr. Speaker, but also creates the healthier environment that I'm talking about, that we can live in, because of the fact that our children are looking to us to set an example.

And I believe our children themselves would like to set an example, and as well possibly we in Saskatchewan can provide some leadership in this field. And in providing leadership — and I believe we are fortunate to live in an area, in a geographic area of this continent and of this globe where we are quite . . . we have the ability and we have ready access to clean water and actually very pure air supplies. And it's incumbent upon us, Mr. Speaker, that we indeed protect it. That we indeed take the time to protect the sources of clean air.

And I am pleased that we can, and possibly through the Bill, we can provide the leadership for other jurisdictions to follow as they address the problems of ozone-depleting substances.

I think, Mr. Speaker, as well that we need to listen to individuals. We need to take the time to listen to people on the street. We need to take the time to listen to housewives. And I think we must be aware of all the major concerns that people have. And the minister is giving me the nod that they have been. I know that when I had the privilege of being on Regulations Committee certainly there were a number of questions we were raising at the time too with the environment about the consultation process of talking to all the interest groups.

Because, Mr. Speaker, one of the major areas of concern that people are going to . . . that is going to arise, even though this Bill really doesn't get into addressing that aspect and probably come at a later date, but one of the major areas of concern that arises out there as far as the business community and we talk about hazardous substances . . . When they hear of the

collection, storage, recycling, and disposal, the first question that arises for most people in the business community — specifically the gas service stations owners — is the fact of how they address the problem of their storage tanks.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is a question that I know that many people will be raising with me. And they're going to say, well is the government telling me today that I've got to dig up my storage tank? And really, Mr. Speaker, the question is and the suggestion is, the comment is, I really can't afford it.

And we're led to believe — in fact I'm quite positive — there's some 2 to 300 businesses in this province that would be very severely hampered and affected. And I believe my colleagues who travelled on the Environment Committee were made aware of that as well. It was brought to their attention, of the severe economic impact the very strong environment Bill would bring to many small businesses.

And there's no doubt in people's minds . . . In fact our service station owners and many people involved in the handling of hazardous substances such as fuel are more than willing and more than prepared to address some of the concerns and to make sure that they are providing a safe, healthy atmosphere and location for people to be involved in a workplace.

(1245)

And I think, Mr. Speaker, when we address the issue of storage tanks, and possibly digging up these storage tanks, we're going to have to look at ways of helping people through that process, of alleviating the cost of this storage and the recycling and the collection agencies. And certainly the Bill here talks about the use and collection.

I'm wondering as well what process the Bill is talking about when it talks about collection. The Act is talking about the manufacturing, about the sale, consumption, collection, storage, and recycling, and disposables, and depleting substances. When the minister talks about collection of these substances, does the minister or the does the department have in place a program or a process to help people?

I take it that they are talking of giving . . . offering a way in which people can bring in many of the harmful products they have on their shelves today that possibly they aren't using, giving them a safe and adequate way of disposing of these ozone-depleting substances.

And I think that . . . if indeed that is taking place. But certainly that's a question we will have to raise — what type of collection system is available. Is it going to be the type of system that is accessible to the public, that doesn't put an undue burden on the public, but indeed gives them a safe and adequate way of delivering their old cans, aerosol cans, or whatever, into a central collection agency.

And possibly, Mr. Speaker, I just toss out the fact that

we have a source right now, the SARCAN units, of collecting bottles and cans and plastic bottles. Right now that's an area that I think we could even utilize to help collect all these aerosol spray cans that are sitting out, and I know in many cases, Mr. Speaker, they're in the back corner in a garage or they're in the back corner of an old building and certainly the problems that can arise should a fire break out, it could be very drastic. So I think, Mr. Speaker, we want to know and follow up and see where the government has gone regarding this process of making a collection, a sound collection process available and accessible.

What about storage? Are we going to run into another situation as we had out here just west of the city? I think that's one of the major concerns. What about the storage of all these substances? How do we dispose of it? And I guess that is one of the . . . we can talk about . . . By limiting the manufacturing of the substance, Mr. Speaker, is I guess, the easiest way of taking care of ozone-depleting substances. But for the product that is already still out there and a lot of product that is still on the shelf, how do we dispose of that product once it's been manufactured, once it's made available to the public and just sitting out there?

And I'm certain we have seen over the past number of years some of the major problems that can take place when these substances are handled very, if I could use the word, carelessly or just not really, not really a lot of consideration isn't taken into the careful handling of these substances.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it's an area that we will be looking at and discussing with the department, is the storage process. What are they doing? What avenues have they looked at in developing a sound, solid storage program to indeed protect people as they collect these substances and bring them together.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas I guess we will get into and certainly as we get into the details in committee — the recycling process and certainly the disposal — there are a lot of questions that we can raise and I think my colleagues, a few of my other colleagues have some comments to make as well on second reading. But there are other concerns that we'll raise as we get into committee. So I'll at this time take my place. Thank you.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to add my questions and concerns to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 22, An Act respecting the Manufacture, Sale, Use, Consumption, Collection, Storage, Recycling and Disposal of Ozone-depleting Substances and Products.

The principle of this Bill is protection, protection of the ozone, of the atmosphere, Mr. Speaker. And we in the opposition feel that the Bill that's being brought forward to us in the last few days is an important Bill, Mr. Speaker, and we have virtually no objections to it.

We have a few concerns about it and a few questions that need to be addressed and answered and I'm sure the minister will be able to address those concerns

once we reach the Committee of the Whole. We look forward to raising our concerns with the minister, and indeed finding out whether the minister has taken the time to give some thought to all of those areas. There always is a question, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the minister is aware of what he is doing. And that's why — precisely the reason why — we'll be asking those types of questions when we get there.

This Bill will effectively halt the manufacture, sale, and use of any product containing an ozone-depleting substance. Mr. Speaker, that alone raises a couple of questions, and first of all, I would ask the minister to take into consideration the potential for job creation when we look at this type of Bill, Mr. Speaker. What technology is available for cleaning up substances of this nature? Are there any potential jobs that could be effected or potential jobs that could be created as a result of this piece of legislation? The disposal of these products as well offers some potential jobs or potential job effects. And I think it's important that the government give some consideration to what those job effects or creation of jobs could be.

There's also the concern and interest in the time frame for the implementation of this Bill. Is it just immediate, or is it phased in over a period of time, Mr. Speaker?

And the minister, I'm sure, will be able to address those types of concerns as well as federal implementation of any regulations and laws that they may have concerning this type of Bill might be of interest to the minister and I'm sure is of interest to the public of Saskatchewan — what consultation and what kind of phasing-in and what kind of cooperation there has been between the two levels of government with respect to a Bill of this nature.

I'm not sure if this is something that is happening right now in Saskatchewan, but I do plan . . . we do not plan on protesting the regulation of manufacturing of this sort. The minister maybe will be able to address that as well. Do we actively have companies in Saskatchewan that are producing CFCs and what kind of impact the closure — I suspect it would have to be closure of facilities of that nature — would be.

As I said though, Mr. Speaker, we want to make it clear that we agree with the principle of this Bill. We just have a number of concerns and questions. I'm sure the public has as well.

I think that many people will applaud the passage of this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Everyone we have seen over the past couple of years, Mr. Speaker, sort of an evolution of environmentalists throughout society. People in general, I think, all of us in society have become an environmentalist of one sort or another. All of us have certain areas of the economy or certain areas of public life or whatever that we feel are important and we also look at. You know, I'm, Mr. Speaker, involved in the agricultural field and we certainly have concerns about the agricultural field with respect to the environment as well. And we're all, as I said, becoming more and more conscious of the environment. I think we all in our personal lives are

beginning to take into consideration what kind of impact we are having on the environment, Mr. Speaker.

I had the pleasure, Mr. Speaker, of sitting on the Committee on the Environment that toured the province over the last few months, several months. And there were various concerns that were raised about the environment and the impact that society is having on the environment. And this was just another one of those types of things that came up.

I don't recall there being a great deal of discussion about the ozone, Mr. Speaker, and the effect that society and people are having on that. But there was . . . As I recall there were a number of areas in the environment that were brought forward before that committee. And I just want to touch on them. I think they illustrate the point, Mr. Speaker, of how important the environment is and how much it is on the timetable of society today, Mr. Speaker.

There was a great deal of discussion about waste disposal of all kinds, Mr. Speaker. Just the simple garbage that we throw out every day, Mr. Speaker, gave a great deal of concern to a lot of people and how society should be handling it.

We see, Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal of discussion about garbage dump sites in rural areas and how that's going to be handled by the Department of Environment and the Minister of Environment in the future. And that impacts on our environment as much as a lot of things.

The burning of these disposal sites is always a concern in rural Saskatchewan. I think it was an interesting comment at the public meeting in Maple Creek and I think it's an important point that we all have to consider.

There was a great deal of concern about burning of disposal sites. And yet the same people that are burning . . . or I mean are raising concerns about burning at disposal sites are also the same people that like to go down to the Cypress Hills Park and sit around in the evening at a camp fire and enjoy themselves that way, Mr. Speaker.

And those folks at Maple Creek are saying to the Committee on the Environment: why is it any different for several thousand people to come out from the major population centres of Saskatchewan and burn forest products at our camp, at the Cypress Hills Park? Is that any different than us burning our garbage dump sites, Mr. Speaker?

And those are, I think, very legitimate types of concerns. Is it any different for a small community to be burning, or is it any different than a larger centre to be burning? There's a concern about the disposal and the potential for rat infestations at garbage disposal sites, Mr. Speaker, and that's important as well.

There was a whole host of environmental concerns that came up over the past few months at those

Committee on the Environment meetings. Underground storage sites — the minister while he talks about . . . while we agree with him that this Bill is very important, I think it's important as well, Mr. Speaker, that he make some allowances for what is happening in the environment with the underground storage tank sites.

Mr. Speaker, there's something in the order of, we were told, 1,500 disposal sites in this province. And I think it's incumbent upon the minister, when we look at not only Bills like this on the ozone depletion, but we also have to look at the information that people are bringing at those committee meetings, Mr. Speaker.

The minister has extended the time frame for one year before those sites have to be cleaned up, Mr. Speaker. But I think it's important that people realize that putting it off for one more year really isn't going to be a whole lot of benefit to them. They're still going to have to go through the costly exercise of tearing those . . . digging up those sites and removing them.

There is also the concern, Mr. Speaker, about forestry and its impact on the environment, Mr. Speaker. And I think it's important that the Minister of Environment take into consideration all of the concerns associated with that industry, as well as uranium mining. We heard a great deal about that particular one when we were in the North, Mr. Speaker, about the impact on the environment.

We are happy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We should burn it. The member from Shaunavon says, we should burn them. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, if we want to get into burning of uranium sites just yet. I would think that that would have a fairly significant impact on the environment. And maybe the member from Shaunavon would want to take into consideration the impact on the environment before he makes such a . . . oh I was going to say, such a stupid statement, Mr. Speaker. I was close there for a moment.

Mr. Speaker, it's important this Bill . . . In the closing few minutes of the day, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that we recognize the importance of the environment and the ozone-depletion substances that are out there.

Mr. Speaker, environmental groups would say it is most important that this Bill of the legislature would be dealt with in this session. And we wholeheartedly agree with that.

As I said, we had some concerns about the Bill, Mr. Speaker. We think that it's important that the Bill goes forward. But we think it's important that there also be adequate consultation with the affected groups, Mr. Speaker.

We wonder whether the minister has taken the time to address those concerns. Has he found out what the economic impact of this Bill is. Has he taken into consideration the potential jobs or loss of jobs. And I think that's an important consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are a whole host of environmental groups out there that are wondering, Mr. Speaker, how quickly this Bill will be implemented and indeed industry is wondering how quickly this Bill will be implemented, Mr. Speaker. When we think back about the environment, Mr. Speaker, a lot of things that have happened in the past in Saskatchewan, we realize now were wrong, and we saw examples of that throughout the Environment Committee meetings around the province.

And I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of those things will be brought forward over the course of this session and I think that the people of Saskatchewan are counting on this government to do some things that would address those concerns, Mr. Speaker. We all think back, you know about . . . for example, in agriculture we can look at the spraying of crops and the spraying of different kinds of pesticides over the past number of years, Mr. Speaker, and their impact on the environment.

I can think of the chemical dieldrin and we all had experiences with that chemical for grasshopper control, and the potential impact and indeed, the impact that it did have on the environment, Mr. Speaker. And it was taken off the market and it should have been taken off the market, Mr. Speaker, because of its impact on the environment. And people were wondering at the time, why. And now I think they're seeing carefully and very importantly that those kinds of things were indeed hurting the environment and needed to be addressed, Mr. Speaker. But when we had the opportunity to travel with the Environment Committee, I think we found out that indeed people are conscious of the environment and want to deal with the environment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have a whole host of questions that we had about this Bill, Mr. Speaker. We would move to, because of the importance of it and the opportunity we feel is necessary and incumbent upon the government, we would move to adjourn debate on this until we have the opportunity to consult with the people in the industry.

Debate adjourned.

(1300)

BILL WITHDRAWN

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — With leave, Mr. Speaker, I'd like first of all to congratulate the member on an excellent speech and I may say a very timely adjournment of the Bill.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, with leave, for reasons I've discussed with the opposition, I seek leave to withdraw item no. 6, first reading of a Bill to amend The Urban Municipality Act.

Leave granted.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 29, An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984, be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

I so move, seconded by the member from Regina Churchill Downs.

Leave granted.

Bill withdrawn.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:04 p.m.