

Monday, March 22, 1976

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, the group now coming into the east gallery are a group of students from Marion McVeety School. They are with their Principal Miss Laidlaw and some people helping them, Mrs. Lee, Miss Bartlet and Mrs. Taylor. I am sure that in your name we all welcome this group to the Legislature and I hope they are enjoying their stay here and are having a learning experience as a result of coming.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce two groups of students who are with us this afternoon.

We have a group of 30 students from the Dover School in my constituency. They are Grade Eight students and they are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Dolman. I should like to extend to them a warm welcome and to express the hope that this afternoon for them will be an interesting and an enjoyable experience and that it will particularly add to their knowledge and experience in their social studies. On behalf of the Members of the Legislature I extend to you very warm welcome to the 30 students of Dover School.

Also, Mr. Speaker, seated in the west gallery are a group of 45 students from the Highland Park School. They are Grade Four and Grade Five students. They are accompanied here by their teachers, Mr. Calvin MacLeod and Larry Huber. Again, I extend to you a very warm welcome and express the hope that your stay with us this afternoon will be a rewarding experience and that you will remember it for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I do propose to meet both classes after 3:00 o'clock at the Members' dining room and perhaps they might be able to enjoy a drink of pop.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Answer to Question on Western Lottery Deficit

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Education):— Mr. Speaker, there was a question asked last week by the Member for Wascana with regard to the Western Canada Lottery. I was unable to give the reply on the day after as I was away, so I want to indicate to the Member in reply to his question, which was whether there had been a deficit in the last draw, quarterly draw, of the Western Canada Lottery. There

has not been a deficit and according to the financial statement which has been prepared by Clarkson and Gordon, in fact, there has been a net revenue available for distribution among the four western agents of \$1,501,443. So there, in fact, has not been a deficit but a net revenue.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we may not be, indeed, talking about — I am now looking at an article of March 16th in the Winnipeg Free Press. This indicates that a member of the Board of Directors has said there was an anticipated loss of \$427,328 on the last draw and the Minister may be aware that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! I wonder if the Member may phrase his question in the order of an original question from him and not requiring a comment on a newspaper article.

MR. MERCHANT: — My question to the Minister is: I wonder whether the Minister is telling me the progress to-date of the Western Canada Lottery or answering a specific question that was posed, namely, what were the losses on the last draw?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I was answering a specific question on the last draw and indicated that there were no losses. In fact there was a net revenue which was available for distribution of \$1.5 million. The press reports, I might add, were erroneous.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does that income suggested by the Minister include potential losses for supposed winners who are now being questioned as to whether or not they actually won the draw, as to whether or not, for example, the Western Canada Lottery is going to have to pay out twice for the same winner.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am not aware of the difficulty the Member talks about. I don't think there is any such problem with regard to the Western Canada Lottery of people whose names have been drawn not being able to claim the prizes. I don't think that is the case at all.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, if I might just refresh the Minister's memory. There is a case in my constituency in Nipawin of a gentleman who has been questioned as to whether or not he has won the lottery or has not won the lottery. There has been some small action taken in that regard and I wonder if the Minister is aware of that. Apparently there are one or two others who also were supposed winners and who have been questioned by Western Canada Lottery as to their potential for winning. Apparently the administration was a little loose on that lottery draw.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I don't know what the status of that might be. It would be something that would be dealt with by the Western Canada Lottery and I can undertake to make some inquiries to see what the status of it is. Offhand I am unable to give any reply to that one.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — A supplementary. Is the Minister prepared to file the Clarkson-Gordon Report to which he makes reference?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, I want to make it clear that the Government of Saskatchewan is not a partner in the Lottery. It is Sask Sport that is a partner in the Lottery and acts as the agent, who is from this province, a member of the Western Canada Lottery Corporation. So I do not have that report at hand. I am sure that there is no reason why the Sask Sport would not want to make it available if someone were to ask for it.

Exceptions to Wage and Price Controls

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance.

You have been quoted as saying that if a particular strike was crippling part of the economy that you would be prepared to make exceptions to the Price and Wage Guidelines and Controls. The Government opposite under the Premier has also stated a very broad interpretation of what constitutes a historical relationship to justify a breach of the controls.

Would the Minister of Finance not admit that these very broad interpretations, which in fact are broad enough to drive a truck through, are really a pay-off to the Saskatchewan . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! I think the Member is making a debate. If he could get to the point of the question.

MR. LANE: — Did the Minister make these wide policy decisions as part of the political payoff . . . with the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour for contributions made, substantial contributions made, prior to the last provincial election?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, as usual the Hon. Member wants to twist and turn and confuse and create false impressions.

Mr. Speaker, at no time have I said anywhere nor have I been quoted in the press that there is any situation that there will be exceptions because of a strike situation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a figment of the Liberal imagination. The terms of reference are quite clear. I refer the Hon. Members to Section 19 of the terms of reference, under what conditions there may be situations which create economic hardships and the way that the board would deal with it and in the way that it might be referred to Executive Council.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, by way of a table for the House the Report of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour political Education Committee wherein it lists 22 people assigned to various NDP candidates, nine candidates who received substantial contributions, five Cabinet Ministers who received minor contributions, approximately \$20 some thousand has been expended to the NDP campaign, would the Minister not admit that in fact

the document that I am tabling and the contributions made by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to the New Democratic Party indicate that the very loose interpretation of the guidelines given by the Minister on historical perspective is really, as I say, a political payoff for contributions paid prior to the election?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Perhaps the Hon. Member might want to table with this the corporate donations the Liberal Party has received and the kind of a payoff and the kind of a commitment and dedication they have to the corporate elite. Mr. Speaker, for \$20,000 this political party or no Member on this side of the House is going to sell themselves. We welcome the contribution and the support of the trade union movement and we will continue to welcome it.

MR. LANE: — By way of further supplementary, is the deputy Premier aware whether or not all of these political contributions as stated by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour have been declared by all candidates who received the same?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

Vacant Space in Avord Towers

MR. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, on Friday, last, the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) raised a number of detailed questions with respect to vacant space in the Avord Towers. He asked, I believe, when the space would be vacated. He asked further the cost per day of that vacated space and when the move would be completed, and, I believe, finally, the cost of the space in the new quarters on College Ave., that is to say Parkview Place.

I think I have the detailed information he was searching for on Friday, last. There will be approximately 26,000 square feet vacated as of March 22, 1976 which is today, Mr. Speaker. The cost per day for that space works out at 1.5 cents per square foot per day, calculated by dividing \$158,800, the cost per year, by 28,692, multiplied by 365 and it works out at 1.5 cents per square foot per day. Now the agencies that will be occupying the vacated space in the Avord Towers will be the Youth Employment Service. They will be occupying it approximately, I am told, April 1 to 15, 1976. The Human Rights Commission will occupy some 1,100 square feet as of April 1st, 1976. The Employment Support Program some 1,500 square feet. And the Women's Division of the Department of Labour which has been recently rejuvenated and refurbished, will be occupying 1,500 square feet in the Avord Towers. Somewhat later the Land Titles Office and Culture and Youth will occupy something in excess of 22,000 square feet in the Avord Towers somewhere around July 1, 1976.

The final answer I believe with respect to the cost per square foot in the Parkview premises on College Avenue is \$9.50 per square foot.

MR. MERCHANT: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether this is not a matter of a specific nature whether he is aware that in 1972 the Department of Government Services over that self same lease neglected to forward the renewal papers with the resulting cost to the Government of almost \$500,000 over the course of the five years.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! I don't put that in the category of being urgent public concern.

Written Off SGIO Vehicles

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — A question directed to the Minister responsible for SGIO. Is it the Government's intention to begin an extensive public advertising program to tender SGIO vehicles that have been written off?

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Not that I know of. No.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, if I may suggest to the Minister that he had better check with his staff because I have been informed that is what is going to happen shortly.

Cost of Potash Ads

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General. Are the cost of potash ads in the paper now concerning the potash takeover being kept track of and in his opinion will these be considered as an election expense under The Elections Act? Pardon me, I have got a cold and I hope I got through on that.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have no personal knowledge of whether or not those expenses will be kept track of since those are not Government expenses. I assume that the individuals or the party that is incurring the expenses will indeed be keeping track of them. As to whether or not they are expenses under The Elections Act, this I think is open to interpretation under The Elections Act. I don't know the particular provisions myself so I can't answer that specifically.

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Therefore, you are saying because a party, not naming the party, but it being yours in this case, if we were to do the same then we could be interpreted the same way, could we? If we put the same type of ads, if we had the money, that is.

MR. ROMANOW: — So far as I know, the law applies to everybody equally. I'm not trying to say that the amount expended on advertising will not be chargeable as against election expenses as The Elections Act is currently written. I am simply saying that I do not have an opinion at hand which would allow me to say to the House one way or the other. And, furthermore, it is three and a half years down the road before an election and maybe even more and I think Members will know that I have indicated publicly my

intention to have a total rewrite of The Elections Act, so I can't answer that in terms of the next provincial election.

Mill Rate Limit for School Units

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question for the Minister of Education. Has the Department of Education set a mill rate limit as in previous years, either an increase or decrease, as applied to the Department's recognized expenditure for school units in this province?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, that's a question that relates to the Budget and I think probably we should be answering that after the Budget Speech comes down.

MR. BAILEY: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Department, as in previous years, pay extra grants to each jurisdiction to prevent the mill rate from going over the Department's set limit?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Under the Foundation Grant Formula, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of aspects involved to take into consideration such things as sparsity factors and other factors as well. As it has applied in the past the Foundation Grant Formula will again apply in the same way this year.

MR. BAILEY: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister prepared at this time to let the jurisdictions of the province know what that mill rate figure is, six, seven, eight, that surely won't hurt the Budget any?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The mill rates are going to be determined by the school jurisdictions, Mr. Speaker. As soon as it is possible after the Budget Speech is delivered we'll be notifying the school jurisdictions as to the amount of grant that is available based on the Foundation Formula.

MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek): — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

How many days after the Budget is brought down will it take before school boards are notified of the amount of grant that they will be receiving?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I hope it will be a matter of hours if possible.

Response to Question at Press Conference

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek).

Does the Minister deny that in response to a question at the press conference called to announce the so-called anti-inflation program of the Provincial Government that you said

that you would consider the facing an "economically crippling strike", and those are the three words that I quote, that you used those words as one of the justifications for an exception to the guidelines?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I believe it was during the press conference a question was asked of what might be the situations where the matter might be referred to the Executive Council. As I recall it correctly, I answered that there might be a shortage of labor in the province and that might have a bearing in a particular case. There might be some disastrous situation such as a flood or a fire that in order to get workers, even for a temporary period, some guidelines might be exceeded. One of the press people said what about a major strike, that might have economic effects. I said, that might be one of the areas. How it was quoted in the press I am not sure, but I certainly did not say that would be the only condition.

MR. MERCHANT: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you saying, and the Minister may be aware you were quoted as saying and using these words, that in the event of an "economically crippling strike" (and that's the end of the quotation) it would be that that would be an exception, which certainly would seem to us to be waving a red flag almost in the face of labor.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to see the particular quote, whether it's my words or whether it's the statement that is a part of a report, rather than a quote.

MR. MERCHANT: — Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to the Minister, I am not asking whether the quote, I am asking whether you said those words. I am not interested in whether you were quoted properly. Did you say those words?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! I think the Minister has in fact answered the question, if I heard him correctly, he said he would like to see the statement.

Problems Faced by Deer in Southeastern Saskatchewan

HON. A. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) asked a question of me with respect to the action that my Department had taken to overcome the problems faced by deer as a consequence of heavy snowfall in the southeastern part of the province.

May I say at the outset that the severe conditions for wildlife in the southeastern part of Saskatchewan are causing concern to the officials in my Department. More than three times the normal amount of snow coupled with crusting is causing a scarcity of browse and feed for big game in that area. Aerial surveys conducted by my Department have shown the southeast to contain the highest white tailed deer population in the province,

with up to 100 deer per square mile using key wintering areas. The lack of food is causing large herds of deer to move into farm haystacks. It is essentially a change in the usual winter diet of twigs and buds, to say, hay or the like, must be done slowly over a period of several weeks.

Now where deer move into the farmer's stacks on their own, they will probably digest a good quality hay such as alfalfa and green oats without ill effects. Now steps are currently taken and are underway to identify those areas in the southeast where the deer, on their own, have switched to feeding on hay. Arrangements are being made with landowners to provide this type of food. This is the only low cost and effective way of handling the situation. Any other method may satisfy our desire to take action but is not satisfactory to the deer and in effect is a waste of funds and effort. Widespread distribution of hay or other feed would only hasten or increase . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I would remind the Minister that the answers have a condition on them, namely that they should be brief and to the point, the same as the questions. However, at the same time as I recall the question was the type of question that may have required a more lengthy answer since the Member I believe was asking what the Department is doing. Now I would ask the Minister to be as brief as possible.

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to complete my answer. The question as I recall it was to indicate what action the Department was taking. I would just like to make another point with respect to dog owners. We have advised the dog owners to keep their pets at home. And with respect to snowmobilers they are also urged not to venture into the deer wintering areas. The latest report is that we have purchased feed from four farmers in the area for the purpose of feeding wildlife there.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Yes, just to save the House any further lengthy reports from questions on this side of the House, I would just ask him one more question and ask him not to bring it to this House, but to just send it to my office . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! If the Member wants an answer privately, then he should ask the Minister privately.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Here is the question. Are you going to compensate the farmers in any way for the losses they have had in feeding those deer?

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, I have just remarked that we have already purchased feed from four farmers in the area, and any hay that is being provided by the farmers will be compensated for.

Government Policy in the Event of a Strike

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — A question to the Minister of Finance, further to other matters that we raised today.

What is the Government's policy in the event of an economically crippling strike and the application of the wage guidelines in that situation?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I refer the Hon. Member to the terms of reference for the Prices and Compensation Board. Section 19 states this:

The Board may request in writing to the Minister, The Executive Council review the ruling of the Board. However, in making such a request the Board shall certify to the Minister that it has considered the application of the national guidelines, including all modifications, exceptions and qualifications contained therein, and has concluded that the application of the guidelines in this specific instance is a matter of urgent public interest and would result in a ruling that would be highly inequitable, or would have a significant and detrimental impact on the Saskatchewan economy. Where the Board makes such a request it shall also forward, due to the consideration of the Executive Council, the recommendation that I would have made had it not been constrained by the national guidelines. The Executive Council may direct the Board:

- (a) not to alter its ruling, or;
- (b) to alter its ruling in the matter determined by the Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, no such a case has arisen and perhaps until such a case arises, the question may be hypothetical.

MR. LANE: — By way of supplementary. Would the Minister not, therefore, admit that that particular provision allows the Government to exempt unions in those particular circumstances from the wage guidelines and, in fact, has become as indicated really a red flag in front of the unions to go ahead and blackmail the government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! I had a question in my mind about whether the question that was raised by the Member was hypothetical or not, and I thought to a certain extent it was. The Minister has indicated that he would wait until the situation arises before he will do other than what is in the official document he read from. So, consequently, I am not going to permit further supplementaries at this time.

MR. SMISHEK: — The answer is "no" in any event.

New Regulations Re Expenses Act

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — In view of the fact that you are going to bring out new regulations on the Expenses Act, are you going to give any guidelines so that expenses that are taken in good faith now won't be considered an expense under the new Act, and expenses that would be interpreted as prohibited under this

Act could not be taken into and be replaced by the other Act?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! The question is not of an urgent nature. Next question.

Municipal Road Load Limits

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy), and that is: Does the Minister have the brief presented by SARM as it relates to this uniform municipal road weight limit, and will he be tabling it as asked?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, when will it be tabled?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order!

STATEMENTS

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

MR. SPEAKER: — Before the Orders of the Day I have a statement which I want to give to the House.

On Friday last a dispute over certain facts arose between the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) and the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Messer). I have checked the record and notice that the Minister did rise to correct a point. It is not the role of the Speaker to determine the point of fact. This is the purpose of the debate. A Member may make a correction at the end of another Member's statement, or in fact enter the debate to set the record straight. I rule that there was neither a breach of the rules or privileges of the Assembly in this case, but merely a point of clarification.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

POINT OF ORDER

QUESTION PERIOD

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Just a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of questioning of Government policy in a specific circumstance that had been raised previously, either publicly or by a Minister.

It would seem to me that that is not a hypothetical situation when we ask for policy in a specific set of circumstances. I'm not asking the Minister to hypothesize about circumstances. An extension of your ruling I would think, Mr. Speaker, would in effect mean that any question of Government policy would be a hypothetical position and I think with respect, Mr. Speaker, that that particular question was not a hypothetical one. It was asking for specific policy on a set of circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: — Any further comments?

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, might I also address myself to you on a Point of Order related to Question Period, which is a different Point of Order, and I am sorry to ...

MR. SPEAKER: — Are there any further comments on that Point of Order raised by the Member for Qu'Appelle?

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I should like to point out as well that I think the Member or Members made it perfectly clear that the question arose out of a remark by the Minister of Finance as to what the Government would do if there was, I believe his words, "an economically crippling strike", and that is if it is hypothetical at all it came as a result of a statement that the Minister of Finance allegedly made and which was covered by the newspaper. I would submit to you in view of the fact that he made the statement, or is quoted as making the statement, that it is perfectly proper then for us to question him on that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: — I might remind the Member that the recent interim report of the committee dealing with the Oral Question Period, specified some citations with regard to the operation of that Question Period. One of those citations is contained in Beauchesne, Chapter 5, sub-section (m) --:

A question, oral or written, must not ask solution of a legal proposition such as interpretation of a statute, a Minister's own powers, etc.

Since that is the process under which the Oral Question Period will be conducted, I think on that basis alone, I would be justified in ruling that the Member's question was out of order.

The other Point of Order?

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I have noted you tending towards a more strict interpretation of the question of urgency, and I wanted at some point to speak to you about it.

The question, for instance, that you found not urgent that I asked today had to do with a failure to renew a lease, which resulted in paying a higher lease rate over the period of term of the contract of five years, and the point that I wish to make with you is that as I read the House of Commons debates, which I read from time to time, though they have the same rule, their interpretation has been that a matter must be urgent per se or have only recently come to the attention of the people who are able to deal with the matter. In this specific instance, for instance, we, as an Opposition, had no knowledge until last week, and that was the supplementary that I intended to ask. So that even though it was some four years ago we now know that the Government has lost something in the half million dollar range over the course of the five years. Unless that question may be asked when it comes to the attention of the official

Opposition, it really makes it impossible to ferret out those kinds of pieces of information.

Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Commons does make those kinds of interpretations, and in fairness I think that it would have been necessary for me to say, it has come to my attention recently, or I now know, something to that effect which would put Mr. Speaker on notice of the receipt of the information. But any other interpretation of the rule of urgency might very seriously restrict the opportunity of the Opposition to deal in the Oral Question Period with matters which may well be urgent in the subjective way of the Opposition's test in putting those questions to the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: — Any further comments with regard to the definition of "urgency"?

There being none, I will take the Member's comments under advisement. For the time being I refer him to the Interim Committee which states on Page 9, Section 5(c):

Questions should be asked only in respect of matters of sufficient urgency and importance as to require an immediate answer.

I will consider the matter further myself.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address-In-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. D.G. Banda (Redberry) for an Address-in-Reply.

MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned debate on Friday I had made two points; one that this debate has been going on for some six days and we have seen the Opposition in pretty well a complete shambles. They really haven't said anything. It's very hard to debate when you have no points to debate against. However, I can ensure Members that I have a lot to say, a lot of reasons why I will be supporting this Throne Speech Debate.

Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I want to take some moments in this House to talk about the election of last year, June 11, as the constituency of Cutknife and all the workers that supported me saw it. I'm doing this because I really want the people of Saskatchewan to know the true workings of the backroom boys of the opposition political parties in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there were two opposition candidates in the constituency of Cutknife-Lloydminster. Both were businessmen, one was an implement dealer and the other was a manager of a newspaper. The implement dealer was a Liberal and the manager of the newspaper was the Conservative candidate.

Now, at the first all candidates meeting of the National Farmers Union in my riding, it became apparent that the Liberal candidate was smooth, well heeled, but didn't always tell the truth on the platform. The Conservative candidate was really

totally in the dark about government, totally in the dark about his party's policy and, in general, the needs of the people. So he would spend the first half hour or fifteen minutes of his speech telling old stale jokes which really didn't solve any of today's crucial problems of inflation or depressed cattle prices or problems of our senior citizens. But, be that as it may, Cutknife constituents witnessed one of the most vicious and underhanded campaigns by the opposition parties in the history of the riding.

My wife and family and I were subjected to harassment and smut only the old-line parties can perpetrate. I mean obscene phone calls, rumor-mill, cheap politics and even harassment of my wife and family on our farm home by a motorcycle gang when it was very well publicized that I was some seventy miles away campaigning. And, Mr. Speaker, this same motorcycle gang had the audacity to buzz a political rally which we were holding in Lloydminster shortly afterwards to the extent that we couldn't even hear the speakers.

We informed the Liberal publicity worker, about this particular issue and fortunately this kind of thing ceased forthwith.

Now, regarding the obscene phone calls, it's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, as soon as we had security put on the line the obscene calls stopped immediately. We found out later, Mr. Speaker, that the person in charge of putting the security on the line, for Alberta Government Telephones, was a Liberal Party worker. What a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, what a coincidence. And I want to say to the Member opposite who laughs and snickers that's the way you people operate and it's really quite nauseating and disgusting.

However, Mr. Speaker, the solidarity and the loyalty and the level headedness of our supporters and workers insured that the NDP would be re-elected with a fairly handsome plurality under the circumstances.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — We just dug in all the harder and worked harder.

What about my Liberal opposition in that campaign? Well, he went to the bottom of the heap in last place for his performance. And I want to take this opportunity to thank the people of Cutknife-Lloydminster constituency for being shrewd enough, understanding enough to sort out the garbage thrown by the opposition from the facts, and realize the soundness of the policies of the New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were a few other highlights in that campaign - like a Liberal-sponsored barbecue steak picnic in one of our three reserves. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate our native people for eating the Liberal steaks, (and I hope they didn't get indigestion) and voting NDP. They clobbered those opposition parties in those reserves for the first time in many years.

Another revealing sidelight regarding our Conservative candidate in Cutknife-Lloydminster. When he was asked at a public meeting why his party chose to eliminate the five per

cent sales tax, he answered and I quote "Well, to tell you the truth we were looking for the cheapest thing that would attract votes and we thought that would do it." And, so, Mr. Speaker, that's the depth of the Conservative thinking in this province. A program hastily constructed to attract votes only. No philosophy and it's simply to attract votes, that's the kind of program.

A similar case was reported to me in the Wilkie constituency where the Conservative candidate there when asked during the question period after an all candidates meeting. Somebody asked him would you please enunciate your party's policy in this next election. And he replied, "I'm sorry we're not giving that out until after the election." And he was dead serious about it.

Mr. Speaker, this must bring me to the Conservative Party performance in this House. And I must say that I am disappointed and I know that the people of Saskatchewan are disappointed too with their fumbling and the lack of performance in this House. And I hope that they will stop their small games in this Legislature and get serious about their jobs.

A final word about the Leader of the Conservative Party the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) and his stand regarding MLA salaries, indemnities and research funds. He speaks one way to the press and public when he is out on the hustings but another way in this Assembly. And this is rather disturbing because we don't know where he stands. Let me prove my point. In the Leader-Post, November 17, 1975 there was an article there about the Leader of the Conservatives speaking to a \$100 a plate fund raising dinner in Regina and he said, speaking about MLA indemnities and I quote:

He said he will fight a pay raise, money for our caucus to pay for research staff and the like. We will vehemently oppose the pay raise even if it means we'll be getting less money for research and support staff. We'll just have to do without.

And I repeat:

We'll just have to do without.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who said that?

MR. KWASNICA: — The Leader of the Conservatives to the public, he said, "well just have to do without." So what does this same Leader do some four months later, Mr. Speaker, he pulls a complete turnaround. He delays the Budget for twelve days because he says the Government isn't giving him enough research money. And I thought he said he would do without, and he knows full well, as all Members do, that he can't get any more money than is in the Budget for opposition parties. It would be illegal for the Government to pay out more money to any Member in this Assembly than is in the Budget.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I must draw only one conclusion from this sort of small boy ploy that the Member for Nipawin and his colleagues are using. They are simply trying to gain public support by appearing to be nice guys browbeaten by a Government that won't give them any money for research. Mr. Speaker, this is a disappointing performance to say the least

and I don't think that this topic or this party deserves any more of my time in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word about MLA indemnities if I may. I would really like any Member in this House or anybody in the Province of Saskatchewan to name me, or name for us, one employed group of people who have had their salaries frozen since July 1st, 1972. Name one. Four years without a salary increase, all the time everything else is going up. Well, that's the only point I want to make, Mr. Speaker.

I now want to place on the records the many reasons why I'll be supporting this Speech from the Throne, read by the Hon. George Porteous on Friday last.

Mr. Speaker, I hear a sort of high shrill jabber once in awhile, it seems as if it's the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford). Reminds me of a junior high school student - I teach once in awhile, Mr. Speaker, in order to supplement the MLA indemnity. When the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) was first elected, she ran around her riding, - and there was a liquor strike on - she ran around her riding and mine trying to get booze for people. Going to private liquor vendors and saying there's a strike on and she thought her job was to get booze for people. And I would like to inform her that's not the job for an MLA and I think really I think that you should change your tactics, and then they turn around, Mr. Speaker, and . . .

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — On a Point of Order. The Member is taking a lot out of context and giving some insinuations that are totally out of context.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that it's questionable whether I can decide whether it's in order or out of order and I'm sure the Member will have a chance to enter the debate and debate the point that the Member has raised.

MR. KWASNICA: — Mr. Speaker, I don't normally talk about other Members but when they start to heckle me I get carried away, I'm sorry. But they got people booze and all that I can say is that people who got drunk or who got into an accident on account of her actions will remember her. And they turn around and they come into this House and say well let's raise the drinking age to nineteen. You can't have it both ways - what are you trying to do? Anyways that's so much for the Member for Wilkie who seems to pipe up once in awhile. I should like to see her enter this debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was about to begin to give reasons why I'm going to support this Throne Speech. And all I can say is that how can Members opposite oppose a Throne Speech delivered by a Government that has a record of performance that is the envy of every other province in Canada, and, indeed any state in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I mean we have one of the lowest power rates in North America and let me give you some examples. In Toronto a resident pays \$20.30 for thousand kilowatts of electricity. In Vancouver \$19.90, a Montreal resident for the same amount of

power \$16.20, a Boston resident would pay \$41.02. In New York for a thousand kilowatts you would pay \$75.39, residents in Nova Scotia, as you have just heard lately on television, \$250 a month for power bills, heating, and in wonderful Saskatchewan under an NDP Government and a Crown corporation. How much, Mr. Speaker, \$13.98 per thousand kilowatts, and I ask Members opposite you are going to vote against that - that kind of leadership.

Also, we have the largest increase in building permits issued in all of Canada. Building permits for the month of November in 1975 were valued at \$52 million approximately. For the same month in 1974, a year earlier, building permits valued at \$14.7 million. The difference was an increase of almost 400 per cent between 1974 and 1975. And who was second? Alberta was a distant second with increases of only 100 per cent. Mr. Speaker, will Members on the opposite side of this House vote against a Throne Speech presented by a Government which gives this kind of leadership and direction. I say it would be a shame if they did. I want to congratulate the Ministers of Municipal Affairs and Consumer Affairs for their farsighted direction in the field of housing.

Another reason I'll be supporting this Throne Speech is because the Government's fight against rail line abandonment and further erosion of our rail system. This is a hoax that is being perpetrated upon Saskatchewan people by the federal Liberals under the very negative leadership of Otto Lang.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has helped to organize the people of our province to prepare briefs to the Hall Commission. And our Attorney General, the Hon. Roy Romanow has spent many hours speaking to groups and organizing a special transportation branch in the Department.

And I ask the Members opposite, will you be voting against a Government that continues to fight to keep our rail lines or do you want our railway system to go down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP has looked after its senior citizens with the understanding and compassion that is rightfully due our pioneers and builders of our province. We have provided them with hearing aids at cost. We have a prescription drug plan, we have a provincial supplement plan which is helping some 38,000 Saskatchewan senior citizens with about \$610,000 a month in supplementary payments. We have provided some \$4.6 million to senior citizens for home repair, this represents about 70 per cent . . .

MISS CLIFFORD: — On a Point of Privilege . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — What is your Point of Privilege?

MISS CLIFFORD: — One thing, Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Privilege and I realize that the Member was saying things in a joking way. But because this is recorded in Hansard, I should like to clear up the accusation that I was getting liquor for people as were many MLAs here during the liquor employees' strike. I did get a ride back from the Liquor Board Commission to the Legislature Building with one of the Government Members. We were, however, trying to ensure that people for private functions such as weddings, were getting permits, during the liquor strike. We were not getting booze as insinuated and implied as boot-legging. I

insist the Member withdraw the statement and take it off the record. Just because that insinuation could imply we weren't just doing our proper duties as best we could as MLAs to help during the situation.

MR. KWASNICA: — Well, if she wants to enter the debate, that's fine, but I think her explanation has been accepted. It's on the record.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before I was rudely interrupted for a second time by the same Member, that we have provided some \$4.6 million . . .

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is quite good enough for him to lightly say that she can enter the debate. He has accused her of providing booze, which in any connotation is boot-legging, not providing permits. To leave that on the record is certainly an insult to anyone. You could have said what any Member did, which I agree, got permits for public functions..but we didn't supply booze!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! If the Member wants to review the situation with regard to this type of situation which has arisen recently, and now has arisen again. Members should have a look at the statement I made at the beginning of today's sitting and find that we have now complied with the intent of that statement with regard to this particular situation. I think the matter should drop and the Member for Cutknife-Lloydminster should proceed.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, may I address myself briefly to the matter of privilege that has been raised. I think there is a distinction to be drawn between a point of order and a point of personal privilege. The Member raised, Mr. Speaker, if I may suggest to you, a Point of Personal Privilege. The Point of Personal Privilege is that the Member in addressing his comments about the Member for Wilkie was involved in her capacity as a Member in some impropriety. That is clearly unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly a matter of privilege. The rules provide as I read them that one must raise a question of privilege immediately that the question comes up, that one can't wait and raise it later. I should like, Mr. Speaker, for you to consider the point that the Member for Wilkie takes in that context that it was a matter, a charge made of impropriety in the carrying out of her function as a Member of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am not prepared to accept any more comments on this because I think the matter has been adequately dealt with. The Member, who felt the statement was improper, has taken the opportunity to rise and state what were the correct facts as she states them with regard to the situation. That is the same situation that arose the other day and I just finished making a statement on it. I don't think it should so quickly escape the Members' minds that I have just made a statement with regard to that very matter. We should proceed with the debate.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Point of Order is, indeed, your handling then of this Point of Personal Privilege because there is a very real distinction between the allegation made which would be in the nature of a debating point that was made by my colleague Mr. Nelson and this suggestion. What is more troubling in some ways is that I think if we reconstruct what happened, the Hon. Member was really almost making a joke. It didn't come out as a joke. It left a far more serious impression . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! What is the Point of Order?

MR. MERCHANT: — The Point of Order is that it is not proper for you to rule that on a question of privilege that all the Member need do is say, "she's given her answer" and sit down. He must either withdraw or substantiate, and I think in this case, if he examines his own thoughts he would be apt to say, I really didn't mean it as a serious charge in any event. It just seemed to come out that way.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! In accordance with what I believe to be the rules of the Legislature, I did not make the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg withdraw any remarks he made with regard to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I at this time don't intend to have the Member for Cutknife-Lloydminster withdraw any remarks he may have made about the Member for Wilkie.

In each case, the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Member for Wilkie had an opportunity to set the record straight as they saw fit. I have no way of knowing whether the facts exist on one side of the case or the other. Each Member has an opportunity to set the record straight. I think as a result of that, we should proceed. I am not here to judge in what manner the remarks were made, whether they were made as a joke or whether they were made in dead seriousness. I am merely here to give the Member the opportunity as was given the Members the other day to state their point with regard to a correct interpretation of the facts.

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I was here listening to the discussion. The member for Cutknife said, "I accept the explanation of the Member for Wilkie", and I think that should end it there.

MR. KWASNICA: — Mr. Speaker, I was saying, I was giving reasons why Members opposite should be supporting this Throne Speech, because I haven't heard any reasons from over there why we should not. I was talking about senior citizens. I was saying that we have provided some \$4.6 million to senior citizens in the way of home repair grants, and that was about 70 per cent of all the eligible senior citizens in the province. I think that is a record that we should be proud of.

Not only that, since 1971, Mr. Speaker, we have provided

over 2,000 nursing home beds for Levels I, II and III care. Our latest program is the new SGIO insurance policy, the Pension Pak, which offers a 30 per cent discount on insurance to senior citizens who are receiving the supplement. We have, also, the reduced fares for senior citizens on the STC buses. Mr. Speaker, should our senior citizens wish to dangle their feet in the water on a hot summer's day, with a fishing rod in hand, we have granted them free angling licenses forever.

Mr. Speaker, these are small tokens for our senior citizens. We thank them for their years of hard work, dedication and confidence in Saskatchewan our province. Can the Opposition sit there and say they will be voting against the Government, a government that has helped their senior citizens to this extent?

Yet another reason why I will be supporting this Throne Speech, is because of the excellent job of the Minister of Social Services, the work that he has done and his predecessor as well. Largely because of work incentive programs, of the Government, Saskatchewan has the third lowest percentage per capita of people on social assistance in any province in Canada. The numbers of social welfare recipients have been dropping steadily since the NDP took office in 1971. I challenge any Member on the other side to say that is not the case.

In northern Saskatchewan \$400,000 budgeted for assistance was not needed last year. The department has tightened up its spending, has culled out much of the abuse and has given dignity back to many of our low income working people in the province. Are the Liberals and the Conservatives going to sit there and vote against the Throne Speech with a government of this record?

I will support this Throne Speech because of another reason, Mr. Speaker. And that is our Government's resource policy which will bring an end to that policy which is making Saskatchewan people what we call "hewers of wood and carriers of water". It is time that Saskatchewan people gain control of their natural non-renewable resources, or if not gain control, then make sure that they are getting a fair share of the wealth generated from these resources. I feel that we in Saskatchewan can do this, we can do things for ourselves by ourselves. This is not 1910 any more.

This logically, Mr. Speaker, brings us to our potash policy, a goal which will bring a good deal of financial security, job security and a hope for the future, perhaps some 3,000 years into the future, a chance of a lifetime and a challenge for every single citizen of Saskatchewan. Potash will become to Saskatchewan what oil is to Alberta, with two advantages. One, we will own our own potash resources by ourselves and secondly, a point often overlooked by anybody talking about a great Alberta, that our potash will last for some thousands of years, perhaps 3,000 or more, and Alberta's oil will run out within 20 years.

This is where, Mr. Speaker, the line is drawn very sharply and clearly between New Democrats and the old line parties. The old line parties want the private companies to control our potash, most of these companies foreign owned, they make decisions for us in their corporate board rooms in Houston,

Chicago, Paris, they skim off the profits and they won't pay their taxes. All of this aided, condoned and defended by Liberals and Tories in the name of freedom, Mr. Speaker, but really in the name of staggering sums of financial payoffs whenever elections roll around.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make a statement like that without necessary proof. Just so Members opposite can get the facts, let me point out that in the last federal election more individuals helped to finance the New Democratic Party than the Liberal and Conservative Parties combined. Individuals! Financial statements for the twelve months ending in 1975 filed in Ottawa by the parties showed the following figures: The Liberals received a total of \$2.1 million in contributions; 9,882 individuals contributed about \$1.1 million for an average of \$110 each per contributor. That leaves approximately \$1 million from multinational corporations.

The Conservatives received a total of \$1.6 million, about 6,400 some individuals contributed \$634,000 for an average of \$103 each. That leaves again approximately about \$1 million from some other sources, probably multinationals.

The Federal New Democrats received a total of \$1.5 million, 27,910 individuals contributed \$1.3 million at an average of \$53 each. This leaves some \$200,000 from other sources, small business, labor groups and other organizations of people.

Those same statements show that only 16,300 individuals put money into the old line parties, while some 27,910 individuals gave money to the NDP. This proves without a doubt that we are the party of the people and the true grassroots movement.

Like I said, I don't like to make statements without proof or support. The biggest contributors, Mr. Speaker, to the Liberals and the PCs are the banks. The banks! The Bank of Montreal gave them a mere \$100,000. The Canadian Imperial gave them about \$52,000. The Royal about \$50,000. Some of the other larger corporate donors to the old line parties were, and I want to put them on the record, because it is very interesting, Denison Mines, Eatons, Alberta Gas Trunk Line, Molson's, Dow Chemical, Noranda Mines, Gulf Oil and International Nickel and many, many others.

Noranda Mines, Mr. Speaker, that's the interesting one. It seems to me Noranda Mines owns a potash company in Saskatchewan or somehow by subsidiary there is some tie-in with Noranda Mines. Noranda Mines gave the old line parties \$30,000. Pretty nice little contribution. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is the reason and the only reason why the Opposition parties opposed our potash bills last session and not freedom as they so often repeated. These are the enemies of Saskatchewan people. It is for money that the Liberals and Tories come to the defence of the corporations at every turn. The drug companies, the oil companies, the mining companies, the potash companies and the banks. No wonder the Liberals have allowed the banks to raise their interest rates again without even a whisper of opposition or condemnation, Mr. Speaker. What more evidence to you need than this?

Mr. Speaker, there is one more reason for supporting this Throne Speech and that is leadership. We have in our leader,

Premier Allan Blakeney, the finest premier in all of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — A Rhodes Scholar, the best debater in this Assembly, a man who has gained the respect of all Canadians, a man who has caught the imagination of news reporters, and journalists across this vast country of ours.

Now coupled with this, is a program, a program that is carefully thought out, debated at the constituency level, debated and passed or rejected at our annual provincial conventions every year, by ordinary people from all walks of life. This is the program and the leadership that has brought us all a steady increase in Saskatchewan's population. I want Members opposite to stand up and deny that when they take part in the debate. A revitalized rural Saskatchewan, increased provincial productivity, highest minimum wage in Canada, second lowest unemployment in Canada, highest farm incomes in many years, and the highest benefits from resource royalties ever in this province. And also along with that, best conservation of land and forests and rivers and lakes, the best policies probably in all of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it, I am proud to be a Canadian, and I am prouder still to be a Saskatchewan New Democrat. I support this Throne Speech with enthusiasm and certainly a renewed hope for the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — Would the Hon. Member permit a question?

MR. KWASNICA: — No.

MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak on this reply to the Throne Speech, my remarks will be brief, because there is not a whole lot to talk about in the Speech. Those who know me know that it goes against my nature to be vicious or cutting. I give credit where credit is due. This Government should be commended for the content of this Throne Speech compared to the last one which was considerably negative, this one was elevated all the way to nothing.

The Throne Speech really is nothing, it offers nothing to solve the problems in my constituency at least and we have lots of problems. The two problems of most urgency are the flood hazard in the Souris River basin and the highway situation, especially Highway No. 8 and the south half of Highway No. 9. The SGIO premiums I think should be waived for that area and they should receive risk pay for driving over them.

As far as the Souris River basin goes, I know that there have been studies going on year after year, trying to find a place for the gophers and the birds, I think they'll find a place for themselves. There have been at least four studies in recent history and not one of these studies have been acted on. We still have an annual flood. This year with three times as much snow as average, we are going to have a far more serious

problem and still no action taken to alleviate the problem. In the interest of expediency and to hopefully get on with the business of the province, I will just say that it was a nothing Throne Speech. I, therefore, cannot support it. That I think puts the Conservative position in front of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I should like to say that there are a lot people saying that there is nothing in the Throne Speech. But yet I can find a lot of meat in it.

First of all I want to thank the Minister of Highways for the completion of number 20 to number 3 in the constituency and the beginning of the Wakaw cutoff, number 41 going to Wakaw which is in the old Rosthern constituency and which has now been started and, therefore, and I am sure the people in that area will appreciate it.

I noticed that in the Throne Speech they mentioned a Snowmobile Act would be brought in and I'm sure it is going to be a realistic piece of legislation that is going to protect the farmers from suits because it doesn't make any sense to me that the farmer who doesn't mind having a ski-doo on his farm enjoying himself, that he should be responsible for some miscreant who wants to go 80 miles an hour and leaves his hide on the harrow draw bar. I think that it should protect farmers against these things and I'm sure when the legislation is brought down that it will deal exactly with that.

Another part is the help question, where it will protect people who stop on the road to help people who are injured. This is a very important move in our society. I know across the way that people, even doctors will look the other way from an injured person because they are scared to be sued for malpractice. I say that it is really a good thing that our province is going to bring in this kind of legislation. But I say it doesn't go far enough, because if we expect people to help others who are injured then we should expect our society to be educated in the way that they can help others. Our school system does not have a First Aid course, which would only take about 20 hours in 15 years. They can do it if they want to, but it's not in the curriculum. It wouldn't be that important to me if I got racked up along the road if the person appearing on the scene of the accident knew how many wives Henry VIII had. It wouldn't be of much use to me. But I'd like him to know something about first aid.

In New Zealand we discovered that First Aid is taught starting at kindergarten. Little kids playing along the creeks and so on will save one another from drowning. You ask any graduate from university, ask him if he took First Aid. He might answer, yes, I took it at camp, but I didn't take it in school.

I think the Minister of Education is going to have a close look at this and hoping that 1977 will be traffic safety year and that we get something going in that area.

MR. ROLFES: — I'm taking notes for him.

MR. THIBAUT: — You're taking notes for him, good for you.

I'm not scolding him because other governments prior to that including the CCF government did not attend to this very important question.

At the International Conference in Toronto on Traffic Safety and Drugs, we were told that 20 per cent of the people who die in traffic accidents would have survived if the first person at the scene of the accident would have known what to do. I think it's very important that in our education system that First Aid be taught. The St. John's Ambulance course is only 20 hours. Certainly we can find 20 hours in the whole 15 years of a child's life in school.

The next thing that I should like to talk about is the statement made by the Minister in charge of transportation pertaining to grid roads. I want to tell you that the municipalities in my constituency are happy with this announcement. It may be possible that further south where you don't get the amount of precipitation that we get, that you don't run into the same problems, but we've got more frost than you have and all the period between the months of April to the end of June, the roads are soft and you put on a thousand bushels of grain on a 24 foot top road and the grade flattens out like pie dough with a rolling pin.

I want to say, Mr. MacMurchy, the Member for Last Mountain that he just stick to his guns.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — Because my municipalities are behind him. I visit my rural municipalities every fall before the spring session and one of the major requests is "get those big trucks off our grid roads." Now to prove the point, in 1974 the railroad went out west of Yellow Creek. They had to empty the grain elevators. The CNR could have backed a train in from Melfort into Yellow Creek and taken the grain out in two small train loads. Instead of that they chose to empty the elevators with tandem trucks. They took out 109 tandems over that newly oiled road. Mind you the elevators were filled on those grid roads and there was no sign of any damage with farm trucks, but after 80 tandem trucks went over it, this road was in a shambles. I was in the office of the elevator agent when he was phoning his head office, he says, can you give me another road to go on, this one is all smashed to hell.

Now I'm going to tell you I'm not against inland terminals, but let them move their grain on the railroad, the heavy cargoes, that's where it belongs, on those rails. Coming to Regina today, you see these hopper cars parked at the railway stations, sitting there doing nothing. What would it be to hook ten of them on a small locomotive and go down to Yellow Creek, go down to Domremy one day and haul it into Saskatoon instead of having a fleet of trucks going over roads that cannot stand it.

The municipalities are fighting this tooth and nail. Maybe further south where the ground is drier, maybe you have a

different condition. But I'm going to tell you I made the presentation to the Hall Commission and I'd like to state a few points that I made to the Hall Commission. I hope all of you have made a presentation to the Hall Commission.

Now to prove one point a study in the Elrose area showed that trains can haul 278 tons of grain per mile on a gallon of diesel fuel while 300 bushel trucks were able to move only 29 tons per mile on the same gallon.

Well now I go down here to item No. 5, I don't want to read you the whole brief, it would take about half an hour.

I think it is morally wrong (and I'm quoting from the brief I presented to the Royal Hall Commission) to undertake a system that will burn five times more energy in a society that will soon be faced with a severe fuel shortage. With the continuous cry by all governments on the North American continent to reduce speeds, to turn out the lights, turn down the thermostat. The American Government is now gasifying coal for energy. And they are also revitalizing their railroads.

Why should we make the same mistake?

The cry for smaller cars. I think the shortage of fuel is real and I strongly condemn the suggestion to bringing in a system that's going to burn five times the amount of fuel. I think there is a strong case to retain most of these lines. I say rationalizing, fine. If you want inland terminals, move it over the rails using the local elevators. It would be a lot more profitable than ruining our highways, because 24 foot tops with an oiled road will not carry these tankers.

I'm sure that we'll get the co-operation of the northern municipalities to carry out what is proposed by the Minister of Transportation.

Now so much for that. I want to go back to a few other topics that I'd like to talk about and it's the question of traffic safety.

I'm pleased that the question of health in the Speech from the Throne is a start, but it's not enough. I believe that our court system should be changed. Our traffic court is almost an insult to the intelligence of our people. All the members of the Highway Safety Committee sat for one day in court. Many of them referred to it as an industry. Some called it supermarket justice.

MR. ROMANOW: — Get any specials that day, Art?

MR. THIBAUT: — You were getting specials that day. Another thing that we came to the conclusion was that the traffic court as we know it, is a breeding ground for disrespect of all of the laws of the land. You haul people into court to try and correct an attitude that they've got on the road, by taking \$25 out of their pockets. We interviewed people coming out of the courts. I'm going to tell you that there were no compliments and there were no crusaders for safety coming out of our court rooms.

MR. CAMERON: — Address your remarks to him.

MR. THIBAUT: — Just a minute, your Government didn't do a doggone bit better. In 1965, we brought in a report under the Thatcher Government requesting a study on the traffic safety issue and they brought in .08 and dropped everything else there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — Had they continued the study we would be there now. But they stopped it right there. There were no votes lost on .08. Any good traffic safety program should not lose any votes for any party. The last committee we had, we had three of the finest Liberal Members from the other side of the House and I would say three of the toughest ones and yet when they sat down on the Highway Safety Committee I've got to congratulate all members of that committee because they worked for one thing, safety on our highways. Last year we killed 318 and this year it's going up some more. Something has to be done.

You know the way we're handling the courts, reminds me of when I was a little kid. The municipality had a gopher problem, so they decided to buy the gopher tails and the kids went out catching the gophers. They brought the tails to the municipality and got two cents apiece for them and that's the way police are handing out tickets on the highway today, Mr. Attorney General. I say it doesn't do any more good than the time they were pulling the gopher tails off the gophers to clean up the gophers, they just yanked the tail off. I tell you the municipal council was in the tail business like you never saw them before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — Now your traffic tickets as you are doing it today and the way you are operating your court room today, doesn't make any more sense than when the municipal council was buying gopher tails to eliminate the gophers. So I hope when they come in with a new court system, and I've got high hopes you know, that something will be done.

Another question in this highway safety report. I'm sure all you people read it or at least some have read it, is the licensing. Today we give a kid about eight hours of driving then we give him a licence to commit murder. Takes off down the road with two tons of steel and a 350 horse power motor and a tank full of gasoline and off he goes. Then you blame the kid. Well we have studied many jurisdictions and in this report we recommend that on the first application that the child must complete a driver training course. And those who have taken a good driver training course are faring far better on the highways. We know that, the records show it.

The next thing, the first two years should be a probationary licence. This probationary licence would not have any fines attached to it, but would be a licence suspension, a day for every dollar that the fine should be. Now the parents wouldn't have to dish out the money because we interviewed youngsters coming out of the court room. We said, who's paying your fine today? Oh, daddy. Are you going to drive better now?

He said, "no damn chance." That's the answer you get. He is off for the races. But if he had had to sit in the court room and take a two hour class, it could help changes. We interviewed people coming out of the Cook County court room and interviewed people coming out of the Phoenix court room and believe you me, the attitude is altogether different. We need a little change here.

Now after two years of probation, during that period they could take a defensive driving course and a defensive driving course cannot really be given before the child has at least one year of driving under his belt.

We asked youngsters what would hurt you the most? What would be the biggest punishment. They said, if you took the toy away for Saturday night, was one of the best answers we got. These are the youngsters answering themselves. Don't blame the youngsters altogether because you know, it's the grownups who make the boo boos and so on.

I have an article here I'd like to read into the records. Are the Kids Really to Blame?

We read in the paper
 We hear on the air
 Of killing and stealing and crime everywhere
 We sigh and say and we noted the trend
 This young generation, where will it end?
 But can we be sure that it's their fault alone
 Too much money to spend and too much idle time
 Too many books not fit to be read
 Too much evil in what they hear said
 Too many parents who don't stay at home
 Youth don't make the movies
 They don't write the books
 That paint the gay picture of gangsters and crooks
 They don't make the liquor and they don't run the bars
 And they don't make the laws and they don't build the cars
 They don't make the drugs that idle the brain
 It's all done by old folks, greedy for gain
 How many cases we find, that is true
 The label, delinquents, fits older folks too.

Now I think in this whole question of traffic safety that very well applies. You know if we are going to succeed we are going to have to attack this problem from another angle. The best information that we could get is that only one out of every 100 drunks were brought to court. So I am going to tell you, if you want to double up the police force and catch two out of every 7,000, or four drunks out of every 100, do you believe you would have it made? I think we have to get down into kindergarten in the schools and teach respect for the rule of law in our society and that is where we are going to get results.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't written out a speech, I just have a few notes here and if the news media wants a copy of my speech, well, they will have to read the transcripts.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How about seatbelts?

MR. THIBAUT: — Seatbelts, I will give it to you this way. It would be a good thing to have seatbelts, but to try to enforce it in a society which is not quite ready for it, I don't know how successful it is going to be.

At the International Conference in Toronto we met the Australian people and we asked them: how come you are able to have 80 per cent compliance with seatbelt legislation? It will cut the death rate down by at least 30 per cent if we had full compliance. But when you have rejection, unless all the Members would wholeheartedly support seatbelts, just like we supported .08 when the Thatcher Government was in power. They came to us and said, every drunk came to me and said, "Why do you do this?" "Don't come to me," I said, because we were right with the Premier on that one. So it worked for a couple of years but they soon found out that they wouldn't get caught anyway.

Now the seatbelt legislation would be very much the same thing. The Australian people told me why they had such good results. Well, they said, it is the law! I said, "Do you know in our country what we say to the law. We say, to hell with the law."

But there, that is taught in school to have respect for the laws of the land. Out here in this country we have Members of Parliament, Members of the Legislature who openly say, not in this province, I heard it from the Province of Ontario some time ago, that they would defy the law. Any Member who wants to defy the laws of the land has no business sitting in the Legislature. I think when a country can say, it is the law that we should abide by it. If we don't like it we will obey it and we will get it changed. That is the way it should work in a democracy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — And until it is changed we will live by it. I hope that before too long we have seatbelt legislation, but that it be introduced in such a way that we have to do a good selling job.

The Australian seatbelt legislation, if a person for medical reasons cannot wear a seatbelt he can get a certificate and he doesn't have to wear it. The milkman delivering milk from house to house doesn't have to snap his seatbelt every time. There are exceptions. In some countries in the world the seatbelt have to be worn if the speed exceeds 30 miles per hour. But we have to remember that a great number, the majority of our accidents are in the urban centres, therefore, perhaps there is some merit to wearing seatbelts in the urban centres. I wear my seatbelt and I can tell you this much, that out of the nine Members who sat on the Legislative Committee, when we started I am sure there weren't two wearing their seatbelts; when we were finished I am sure that eight out of the nine were wearing their seatbelts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — They did not need any legislation. The first thing we did was we took a defensive driving course and then we

said that every Member of the Committee will go sit in the courtroom and see what is going on and that is when they really got flabbergasted. Some had better results. I am not blaming our judges, I want to make that clear, but the judges in the traffic court, in the new traffic court that I am hoping for should be an expert in traffic, as well, as an expert in law. Because sometimes it is practical to break the law of the road to avoid an accident. In your traffic safety programs they will say that you will do all that is in your power to avoid an accident.

If we obey all the other rules, if the speed limit is 55 miles per hour I wouldn't like to see it go down, but if it becomes law I will abide by it and I think the MLAs and all those G cars that are on the road, we will have to tell them something, that they had better slow down because I don't like them passing me at 80 miles per hour. G cars, those Government cars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — Because they should be an example as the leaders in our society if they have a government job, to drive their cars sensibly, park right and not always be in the police court. Of course, the chance of getting caught is one out of 7,000 so it is hardly existing.

Therefore, I think that I have taken up enough time. I could never time my speech as one time I went for one and a half hours, but I think I have held you up long enough. I want to thank you for listening and I also want to say, that there is enough good stuff in the Speech from the Throne that I am going to support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. N. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Co-operation): — Mr. Speaker, I guess it was Thursday that I was speaking on the Speech from the Throne when 5:30 was called. I was then in the middle of reporting to this House on how I thought the Rent Control Program was going and in a very few moments I want to continue with that. There are just a couple of things that I want to say first though, Mr. Speaker.

I can't help remarking how things in this House seem to be complicated by the Liberal bar across the way. We had a remark made by the Member for Cutknife-Lloydminster (Mr. Kwasnica) a reply by the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) and I think under normal circumstances that would probably would have been the end of it. But the bar-room lawyers across the way had to get into it and . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — . . . an incident that should have lasted a couple of minutes long, took 15 minutes. I can't help also commenting on the liquor permits.

During the period that the liquor strike was on we were dealing with quite a number of important issues - such as potash, the anti-inflation program. But the number one issue

that came to me and by far the largest amount of calls, was from people who wanted to get a liquor permit. I can't help thinking of the remark of the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) that he was frustrated being a politician. I can understand that. I think that people just don't understand how difficult a role a politician plays. When you are concerned with potash and anti-inflation, the people are concerned with getting a liquor permit. And it makes your job very difficult. For a period of six weeks that was the number one issue in my office - how do we get a liquor permit?

MRS. EDWARDS: — Live in a temperance area like Saskatoon.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, that would be the answer wouldn't it, to live in an area where no liquor permits are required.

I also want in a very personal sort of way and not in any sense as a Member of Cabinet, I want to give my endorsement of seatbelt legislation. I can appreciate that it may well be worthwhile to educate the public first, but I think that that kind of law would make a real contribution to traffic safety in Saskatchewan.

Some years back I took an interest in aviation and I have been a private pilot for a few years now. And no one would think of climbing into a small plane - some people wouldn't think of doing it anyway - but no one would think of climbing into a light plane and not doing up the seatbelt. But the same people get out of the plane and jump into a car, drive away without the seatbelt on. Statistically, you are safer in a light plane than you are in a private car. Somehow people just are not cognizant of the dangers of riding in a car.

I have some relatives who are in Ontario and I think it is fair to say that they never did up their seatbelts until the law was passed. Once the law was passed everybody had their seatbelt done up. It was partially because they didn't want to be fined. Apart from that, however, I think most people in our society would simply respond positively to a legal obligation. If the law says you must do it, I think the majority of people would do it. And that, I think, will make a very real contribution to traffic safety in Saskatchewan.

I was speaking the other day about the administrative problems that we had in the Rent Control Program and I was saying that we had about 600 telephone calls a week - that was three or four weeks ago. I suspect that it may have gone down since then not up. But we had about 600 calls a week. There were letters of inquiry as well - and they are time consuming as you have to answer them. In addition, of course, there are applications, applications not only for an exemption from the 10 per cent guideline, but applications for evictions and orders for possession and so on.

The Hon. Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) asked me when we would be dealing with the applications. I said that our goal was that we would deal with them by April 30th and that prompted the obvious follow-up, that may be your goal but when do you realistically expect to do it.

I still believe it will be possible for us to deal with those applications by April 30th, but I don't mind telling you

that the problem is of some concern to me. I think that the public generally has to be patient in this transitional period. In the first few weeks and months even, the staff are going to experience a very heavy workload. If all of their inquiries don't get all of the time that they think they should, if the applications are dealt with not in a hasty sort of a way, but perhaps with less attention to details than we would normally, I think the public are just simply going to have to try and understand that. I certainly know that the staff will be doing the very best they can to keep up with it. I discussed this with the staff the other day and told them that under no circumstances were there to be any applications left after April 30th. And when I said that by the look on their faces, you would think I had asked them to go and get the watch I left on the far side of the moon, because I think they felt that it wasn't realistic. We discussed it for awhile and there are some shortcuts that we make and certainly we are going to be doing everything we can to meet that date of dealing with those applications by April 30th. But, again, I call for patience and understanding on the part of the public. I also ask particularly on the part of landlords who are making application, every co-operation with the rental office. If they do co-operate with the rental office and provide the office with information that they need as soon as they ask for it, it will make the job of the rental office a lot easier. I make that appeal, Mr. Speaker, through you to the public in general.

One thing that I want to deal with rather quickly because we received quite a number of inquiries on it. There was an interpretation placed on Section D (b) and that Section reads:

Range of rents means the schedule of rents that may be applicable to residential premises at any time where the rent to be paid in respect of the premises will be determined from that schedule on the basis of the services that the landlord is to provide, or the number of persons that are to occupy the premises or on any other basis.

What the landlords are asking is, and they seem to place this interpretation on this Section: if I have a range of rents and it is \$100 for one person in it, \$110 for two people, \$130 if you have a furnished suite, does that mean that if I have a person in the suite who is paying less than the going rent, does that mean that when they move out I can move them into this range of rents.

The problem, I think, is illustrated by a letter and I will read it but I will not read the name as I don't have the permission to do it.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent to me by the Deputy Rentalsman and I am going to give you an excerpt of the Act and our reasons for using the schedule in effect on December 31, 1974.

And then he quotes the Section which I just read to you.

It appears that the architects of the Act used some good judgment in wording the above Section in the way that they did.

Because he assumes that it is going to be interpreted in his way.

He says:

Noting the underlined words

and he has underlined "to be paid"

. . . our interpretations are that "to be" means what was chargeable to that suite and not what was actually paid. If a long-term occupant was living in a particular suite the landlord in his or her good judgment would in most cases allow the tenant a reduction from the price as per the schedule. Don't you agree that if you do business with a certain company that after a certain length of time, the company manager gets to know you and gives you some consideration with your purchases over and above what someone off the street, for the first time, would be given.

The word "payable" according to Webster means that that may, can or should be paid. Using this interpretation I would suggest to you that the decision of our Deputy Rentalsman is wrong and that further, I am filing for an appeal unless something is done before the end of March.

Now, my short answer to him was that I don't sit in appeals on decision of the Rentalsman and that, in fact, if he doesn't like it he should go ahead and appeal.

I had a number of people ask me if that is in fact the correct interpretation. And the issue, again, is that under the Act a landlord is allowed to establish a range of rents. As I said, you may have a range of rents that go like this: \$100 for a single person; \$110 for a double. But if I make a practice of giving well-established good tenants a lower rate, is that part of the range, but when I move into a new unknown tenant, can I then up the price to \$100?

And the answer that the rental people have given, and I think it is the correct answer, is no, because there isn't any definite price that you charge an established tenant. You don't have a range which says \$90 for a tenant who has been there for more than four years; \$100 for a new tenant with just one person; \$110 for two people, and so on. It doesn't fit into a precise schedule. There is a practical reason as well, I think the Deputy Rentalsman in this case took the correct position. Because I think if you allow landlords to increase the rent when an older tenant moved out, you might encourage the landlords to move the tenants out so that they can get more rent. I think in a normal atmosphere, landlords wouldn't have done that. But these aren't normal times and I think landlords who are upset now would do things in the current atmosphere that they might not do under normal circumstances. I think practically that might well be the result, if you adopted that interpretation of a range of rents. Some of these established tenants might well find themselves on the way out. Because the landlords now feel that their backs are to the wall and needing every penny they can get, I think for that reason it is a practical interpretation.

A good deal was said in the House when we passed the Act about the regulations. I recall making a commitment to the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle when the regulations were passed

that I would table them. That didn't prove to be possible because they were passed when the session was prorogued. In any case I find since then that the regulations are a public document and anybody can get a copy of it simply by asking for it. So perhaps, strictly speaking, it is not necessary to table it.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with the kind of circumstances under which we do grant exemptions. I think that is the key to the Act. I have said from the beginning that what we want is a fair piece of legislation. I have also said that I agree that a system of rent controls which just simply establishes a ten per cent ceiling with no more would not be fair. Perhaps the key to how fairly the legislation works is in how the exemptions are handled. I think it is a very important kind of question. I will go through the regulations and paraphrase them for Members opposite.

The Rentalsman in considering - and I will read it and then perhaps discuss it for a moment.

The Rentalsman in considering applications (I am reading regulations that were passed in mid-February) pursuant to Section 34 A (IV), 34 B, 34 E, or 49 A of the Act and the Commission in considering appeals from the decision or ordered the Rentalsman on such application, may consider but is not limited to the following as they relate to the building in which the residential premises in respect of the application or appeal has been brought or located.

To make a long story short, the Rentalsman may consider but is not limited to the following considerations; operating costs. I will now list a number of operating costs that a Rentalsman may consider in granting exemptions.

1. Changes in property taxes, and related fees including ground rent for leased land.

It is fairly obvious that you would include property taxes.

2. Changes in insurance premiums.

Something that I think all landlords have faced or will face.

3. Changes in utility costs.

Another subject of vehement complaint by landlords. Many landlords have said to me that if it weren't for the SGIO increases or the tax increases, the SPC increases, I think ten per cent would be fine. What I tell them is that merely because some increases have gone up by more than ten per cent doesn't mean that all of their costs have averaged ten per cent.

4. Changes in the cost of servicing and maintaining the residential premises and its grounds.

Increases in the cost of the supervisor's salary would be an example.

5. Changes in the cost of repairs and maintenance.

6. Changes in administrative expenses.

It lists certain expenses. I think it is fair to say that anything that would be considered an operating cost for the purpose of the Income Tax Act could be considered here. I think that is generally a true statement.

7. Changes in interest payment on the landlord's financing of the building in which the residential premises are situated, where, (a) the principal amount of the financing has not increased, (b) the terms of payment and the rate of interest are reasonable.
8. Whether or not the financing of the building in which the residential premises are situated is an arm's length transaction or independent with other transactions.

What we are saying is that the Rentalsman will consider an increase in interest rates but only if it is at arm's length and only the interest rates. He will not consider any changes in the principal amount. It is an attempt to exclude the kind of abuses which were suggested during the debate in second reading by a number of Members including the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron). It would be possible using mortgages and second mortgages to strip the corporation or the affair of its profit. In order to try and prevent that what the regulations say are only changes in interest, only when it is done at arm's length and the Rentalsman will not consider a change in the principal amount. This means that if the landlord sells for a higher price, you cannot then come to the Rentalsman and say, I need an increase because my principal is higher and my payments are higher.

The obvious problem would be if you could do that, apartments would change hands to realize capital gains and just boost the rent.

So what we are attempting to do is recognize legitimate interest cost but prevent any abuses.

9. Changes in depreciation allowances for the cost of capital improvements, and the replacement of fixtures.

Inevitably when I mention this in the context of a discussion with a landlord, he says I just put a rug in, how long can I depreciate that? The rule is and I can't state it for you for any specific item, but the rule is that generally speaking we use the depreciation rates that are set out in the Income Tax Act. I don't know what category a rug would fit into, maybe it would be four years, I don't know. But the depreciation rates which we use are generally those set out in the Income Tax Act.

Now I get into the "iffy" areas. I think what I have heretofore referred to are those costs which I think everyone would expect to be included. They are easy to apply because all you do is add up the costs. The next two which are called hardships and adjustments are the really tough ones to apply. I will read the considerations which the Rentalsman is asked to make under hardship situations.

10. The fact that the residential remises were acquired by the landlord between January 1, 1974 and January 3, 1975, and there are insufficient payments to meet operating costs of the building as well as payments towards retiring the financing for the building.

I can tell Hon. Members that there have been a number of applications dealt with by the Rentalsman, and there have been a number of exemptions granted. I don't know the ratio. I am sorry, I tried to get the information but I wasn't able to do it. It is not easy to do because we are spread all over the province, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and so on. I can't tell you the ratio. I understand that the majority of them have been granted because they fall within this No. 10, they are newly acquired premises.

We have found that — and I think we anticipated this — that where you have an apartment that was bought in 1975, the former landlord isn't going to give it away. The former landlord is going to sell it to someone and he is going to give it to him at a price on which, considering the rents which could be charged, he could make a reasonable rate of return. That is the basis on which it is sold. It was not sold on the basis that the rents would be rolled back to 10 per cent above what they were in December 31, 1974. We have found that most, if not all of the apartments that were sold between December 31, 1974 and January 1, 1975 are required to be exempted. As they were sold on the assumption that higher rents could be charged, that was the price paid on that basis. To do anything other than exempt him would simply drive the landlord into bankruptcy. If you entertained the view that someone has made a lot of money and somebody is ripping someone off, I share that view in a sense. You are frustrated because you can't get at the person who did it. If it is the sort of apartment where unduly high rents were charged, that landlord is probably enjoying himself on the sands of Texas or Florida. You are not going to be able to get those capital gains back. It is absolutely pointless to punish the new purchaser for the sins of the old. We have, I think, granted a very large number of exemptions under that heading.

11. The fact that revenue from all residential premises in a building during 1974 was not sufficient to pay the costs of operating that part of the building which consists of the residential tenancies and the payments towards the financing of the building for that year.

That doesn't add that much to number 10. The last two adjustments are also, as I said, a little "iffy", in the sense that they defy a precise formula. The last heading is adjustments.

12. The fact that the rent charged for residential premises has been lower than that charged for comparable residential premises in the same building.
13. The total revenue from the residential premises in a building and any changes in that total.

What we have asked the Rentalsman to do here is to consider whether or not in fact a fair rent is being charged. You can't make that the sole determining factor of whether or not you grant an increase. We have asked the Rentalsman to look at that. If it is a good apartment that is being rented at a low price, then, the Rentalsman I think would take a more generous view of his application than an application from another landlord who had an apartment on which the rent was clearly in excess of what is charged on the market. It sounds very fair but it is extremely difficult to apply.

This is, I think, equally interesting, the regulations go on to point to some things that must not be considered by the Rentalsman. These are absolute exclusions. Section 4 says:

The Rentalsman in considering applications pursuant to Sections 34 A, 34 D, 34 E, and 49 A of the Act; and the Commission in considering appeals from the decision of order of the Rentalsman on such application shall not consider as grounds for allowing any rent increases;

(1) income taxes.

That raised a bit of a storm from landlords who said, why not, if it's a cost of doing business, it is not something you take home, it is my income tax. Why don't I get an increase? The answer isn't all that obvious. The answer is that income tax is a charge on your net revenue. It is not normally considered an operating expense or capital expense for any of these purposes. It doesn't really matter how high your income tax goes, it doesn't really affect what your profit should be. We are not going to be in a position of asking all the tenants to pay the taxes for the landlord. That would be the result, in fact, if the landlords were allowed to increase their rate by whatever their taxes went up. It would mean eventually that the tenants would pay all the taxes.

(2) corporate taxes.

Exactly the same explanation applies.

(3) property taxes other than those directly associated with the residential premises.

I had to ask my officials what was meant by that. What they were trying to exclude is any argument that if you have residential tenancies and commercial premises in the same block, somehow or other you might charge the business tax against the residential tenancies. I don't think under any view of what is proper accounting that would be a proper procedure. But just so the argument couldn't be made it was put in there.

(4) business expenses of the landlord except as described by Section 3.

That means that we exclude business expenses except those relating to the apartment. Again, that states the obvious to us. Some landlords, are only being normal and not being in any sense different from any other people, they will charge all the expenses they can. They make some rather fanciful arguments about why their 1976 Cadillac should be a depreciable item for their rental as they run around from one block to the other. What we attempt to do I suppose is point out the obvious, to point out to landlords that only those expenses which directly relate to the residential tenancies will be allowed.

(5) except in the circumstances described in sub-section 10 or 11 of Section 3, the appreciated capital value of the landlord's investment in the residential tenancies situated.

I mentioned that earlier, that we do not allow them to depreciate on the basis of what the building may be worth on the

market. Obviously you depreciate on the basis of what it cost you. That is the way it is done in the Income Tax Act. That, I think is generally accepted as a proper accounting method. That is what we are doing here, we are asking them to depreciate only what they paid for it and not what the property may be worth. In many cases there is a vast difference.

(6) except in the circumstances described in sub-section 10 or 11 of Section 3, the landlord's payments towards the principal amount of the financing of the residential premises or the building in which the residential premises are situated.

That is I suppose an exclusion that's honored more in the breach than the observance. What we are saying is that you cannot consider, how much he is paying on the principal amount, or how much he is paying for his mortgage. But with this exception, if your rent isn't sufficient for operating costs plus your payments on your mortgage, then the rent may be increased.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It is nice to know I have one fan who is listening closely. There was a very telling remark made there and only one person was sharp enough to catch it. That was very good.

There are a couple of other things I want to deal with as well. In part because I dealt with them yesterday in Moose Jaw in speaking to a crowd and I seem to have got some publicity on it. I will deal with it again.

I was asked there, why not just allow landlords to pass their costs? Why give them the higher of ten per cent or costs? That's not the way we're treating ordinary businessmen. And it is interesting that in that regard, there just landed on my desk a news report, I gather that is substantially what Manitoba is doing. Manitoba has said, and I am reading from a press release:

In general terms the Act (This is the Manitoba Act) limits rent increases in the period between July 1, 1975 and September 30, 1976 to ten per cent. Any increases which exceed this limit are to be paid back automatically to the tenants. After October 1, 1976, property owners can apply for higher than regulated increases based primarily on cost. A rent stabilization board will be set up to administer the Act and will determine the amount of such rent interests.

Mr. Turnbull said that essentially that these are the terms of the Act and reflect Manitoba's response.

The rollback features of the Act states in essence that where a landlord has increased rents by more than ten per cent since July 1st, 1975 he must begin refunding the difference within 60 days of the effective date of the Act. He can do this by rent abatement to tenants. And, I think this is important, "No appeal from a ten per cent ceiling in the initial period will be allowed." If their increase is more than ten per cent they pay it back and there is no appeal.

They have travelled the other route and it is a route which we at one time considered. Just allow them to pass on

costs with some sort of a rollback if you think that is appropriate. But basically you don't limit them to eight per cent or ten per cent by allowing them to pass on their costs. There is nothing really wrong with Manitoba not allowing for an exception because it is only for a very short period of time. They say that from July 1st to October 1st the rent cannot increase by more than ten per cent and if it does you must pay it back. Thereafter you can pass on any increase in costs.

Now the reason why we didn't go with that sort of system was really, I suppose, because of the bureaucracy that it would have entailed. I think it would have been an extremely expensive system to administer. Either that or you wouldn't have had any controls at all. What we could have done was to have said to the Rentalsman, as the Anti-inflation Board began doing, you may pass on increases in cost, no more, you don't have to get prior permission, but if someone complains we are going to investigate it. I think in a market that is as tight as ours in Saskatchewan that would have meant no controls at all. I think what would have happened in the Saskatchewan market is that most tenants would have been afraid to complain and landlords would have gone to tenants and persuaded them that the rent increase was reasonable and I think very few tenants would have complained. There are few disasters in Saskatchewan today, like getting kicked out of an apartment and having to find another one. I think it is different in Manitoba because they don't really have the shortage there that we have here. We have had a booming economy here and that economy has, I think, been largely responsible for our shortage. I suppose, what we need to cure the housing shortage is a bit of that good old Liberal prosperity that we experienced from 1964 to 1971, I think that would cure things nicely, right? It's a little harsh though. We think there is a better way.

I think it is worth dwelling on this for just a moment. I've had people say to me, oh yeah, if the weather was good, you NDP's would take credit for it. And that is about what you are doing when you take credit for the prosperity. And I think there is an element of truth in that but there is just enough truth and no more to cloud, I think, the very real achievements of the Blakeney administration. It is true that the prosperity was fuelled not by any magic wand we waved but by higher potash prices, higher oil prices and I think most significant of all, higher wheat prices. It is really the wheat that has fuelled the prosperity. No one is denying that. But I think the Blakeney administration can take credit for giving this boom a direction and a focus that it wouldn't have had under a laissez-faire type of government. The Blakeney administration and the Department of Industry and Commerce in particular have, I think, been very successful in dealing with businesses, some large, many small ones, and ensuring that the prosperity isn't enjoyed by a few people and the rest exported. They have seen to it that the prosperity in Saskatchewan has resulted in jobs here and prosperity for the people in Saskatchewan.

I think as well the Blakeney administration has given this prosperity another kind of a focus. I think they have ensured that the prosperity isn't just in Regina and Saskatoon, the big cities, they have seen to it that the prosperity has been shared by all parts of the province. There isn't just prosperity in Regina and Saskatoon, there is prosperity in Moose Jaw and Swift Current and Assiniboia and Weyburn as well.

And that comes about I think in a large part because of progressive programs such as Land Bank and the programs which assisted farmers in purchasing cattle. Although the purchase of cattle has not been an unmitigated success, I gather, in recent times. But nevertheless I think the Blakeney administration cannot claim credit for the boom but it can take credit for giving it focus and seeing that the benefits for Saskatchewan were maximized and that those benefits were spread as far as possible.

Now that has meant that the shortage of apartments exists not only in Regina and Saskatoon but it is equally severe elsewhere. It is just as severe in Wilkie and Maple Creek as it is in Regina. I really believe that statement and I wish I could prove it but unfortunately Statistics Canada only gives out statistics for Regina and Saskatoon individually. I have no way of proving the statement but I really believe that the shortage of apartments is as bad in the smaller centres as it is in the larger ones. But with the kind of a shortage we have here if we just allowed landlords to pass on costs I think we would have really no rent control at all because I think few tenants would complain and the landlords would have virtually a free hand.

Another system has been the one that the Federal Anti-inflation Board has moved begrudgingly but slowly towards, that is requiring prior notice of an increase or prior consent and I don't think it makes much difference. When you think about it that would have been a monstrous load for the provincial Rentalsman to carry. There are no statistics about how many landlords there are, we know there are about 80,000 suites somehow or other but we can't break that down into how many blocks there are or how many landlords there are. My guess is 20 suites per landlord. That is just a horseback guess. That means there are 4,000 apartment blocks or houses, 4,000 structures. Let's say there are 3,000 landlords. That means that we would have to deal with as many individuals as the Federal Anti-inflation Board, handle just as many cases with a much smaller staff and much smaller resources. Because the load of administering a system whereby you ask all landlords to get prior consent before any rent increase would just have been a horrendous job. We think we had problems in setting up an office of the Rentalsman with the system we have now, it would, I think, be just horrendous if we went the other system.

A very similar sort of suggestion has been made, that is why don't you set a fair rent for apartments. It has a nice ring to it, in theory it would be very fair. You would either go to one of two systems. You could say that we will appraise each apartment or you could go the other route and try and draw up a schedule which says for a one bedroom apartment it is worth so and so, with an air conditioner it is worth so and so, security doors and so on. We actually tried to do that at one point in time, the problem with it is that (a) you have all the problems of the appeals because you would be lowering a lot of rents and landlords would be unable to cope. The problem in the number of appeals would be far worse, that was part of the consideration. A part of the problem was that the schedule just got so incredibly complex that nobody could follow it, including our own staff. There are just so many variations in the type of apartments which you might have that it had to be discarded. The other suggestion which would have been possible I suppose,

would have been to appraise each apartment individually. And again you would have exactly the same problem, a very, very large number of units to appraise and a very heavy workload.

I think I would be remiss if I didn't mention the problem of condominiums because it has been a fairly warm issue around these parts recently. I thought and this is I suppose an admission of sorts, I thought the matter was covered in The Condominium Act, as I was informed, one time. The Condominium Act was broad enough to cover the problem that the municipalities had to give their consent to any condominium. The solution was, therefore, that if there aren't apartments the municipalities won't give their approval. The fallacy of that was pointed out in Regina a couple of weeks ago when an apartment was approved. I gather from the A. G. Department that the section isn't that broad. It just merely provides that if it's not in accordance with the zoning bylaws or it does not harmonize with the neighborhood then they shall not give their consent, but the section isn't broad enough to allow them to say, no, we are not going to consent because it is going to aggravate the shortage of apartments. I see a few problems with the system we have now. The problem wouldn't exist if there weren't such a terrible shortage of apartments. I think there is a danger in apartments being converted to condominiums which should never be converted to condominiums because there are unsuitable. You can conjure up an image of an eight suite apartment inhabited basically by people who are young and transient. They come in the front door and out the back door, three months later. Now someone has to sit on a board of directors. Someone has to be there to manage the place and make sure that the staff are hired and are doing the job. There has to be this kind of management. I think that this is with many small apartments that don't particularly cater to stable tenants. I think it's going to be a real problem in having enough people there to manage it. The other problem with condominiums is that it will aggravate the shortage of apartments because apartments and condominiums cater to two very different kind of people. The condominiums cater to a person who wants to own something and does not plan on moving soon and the apartment owner caters to someone who doesn't want to be tied down to an ownership of a building.

I want to get off that for a moment and I want to deal very briefly with the food price survey. It was mentioned earlier by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mrs. Edwards) in the last Legislature, the last session. I never got a chance to reply to her then and I want to do it now. The system was panned in the press unmercifully and it was the subject of a great deal of criticism. We don't have the computer analysis on the food price survey back yet, but, I am convinced that when we do, the survey is going to establish that it lowered prices, it had the effect of lowering prices in Regina and Saskatoon. It also had the effect of consumers changing stores when there was a comparable price change.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Awful, wasn't it?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, all the problems in the office came floating in. When we first started with the food price survey there was a spread of six points in the index. After the survey had been going on for six weeks or so the spread reduced to practically nothing and the higher priced stores came down to the lower priced stores. And that meant that the consumers were saving a

lot of money. Even if not a single consumer changed stores and continued to go to the high priced stores, the point remains that at the high priced stores they were paying far less. The survey paid for itself many times over. I am also convinced that when the analysis is in we will be able to establish that consumers changed stores where there was a significant price cut.

We had sort of verbal oral reports from owners of some of the low priced stores, in both Regina and Saskatoon there was at least one store that was consistently low and they informed us that their volume had increased dramatically.

The only other thing I want to mention, and then I will sit down, is something that was said by the Hon. Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) the other day. It was not really raised as a matter of personal privilege because I guess I don't feel all that terribly strongly about it, but he referred to the incident that occurred before Christmas and he suggested that somehow or other I had broken my word and then I had been cynical about it and laughed at him after I had done it. That wasn't what I did, that wasn't the interpretation that was placed on the incident by the newsmen who were present. I am frankly surprised that that is how the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) interpreted what happened. Now, what really happened was that it was important to us to get the Bill through the Legislature. I understood at 2:00 o'clock we had an agreement, all parties would allow the Bill to go through. I found out later on that the Conservative caucus wanted an amendment to the Bill. The interpretation I placed on that was that they were breaking their word. Now after I sat down, I realized that (a) I hadn't been talking to the Conservative caucus, I didn't know precisely what the agreement was and I was in no position to accuse them of being dishonest about it. But nevertheless the result of that asking for an amendment was that the Bill didn't go through, and there was all kinds of confusion caused to the public and we had to go with an amendment in January. But I finally agreed to go with the amendment asked for by the Hon. Member for Nipawin. I did not like the amendment, I told him I didn't like it. I told them when we met that I was agreeing to it just because I wanted to get the Bill through that afternoon and if I brought back a Bill in the spring which amended that Act, he should not feel himself aggrieved. I told him I didn't like it and I was just putting it in there to get the Bill through. I didn't want him under any allusions that I bought the idea. But anyway that satisfied him and he was prepared to accept it on that basis. Then the Liberal caucus felt that they wanted an amendment too and the whole thing fell down. But I was operating under the impression that the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) had broken his word. As I say, I realized afterwards, I am not in a position to make that allegation. But I met the Hon. Member for Nipawin outside the House in front of a newsman, and he said, "are you going to go with my amendment?" I said, "no, I'm not. For all the reasons I told you in the office, I'm not going to go with it, I don't like it." He said, "You are breaking your word." I said, "I am not, I told you in the office that I wasn't." So he then said, "my background is a businessman, and when a businessman gives you his word it's good." I was thinking he had broken his word to me as a politician, and I said to him, "Well, that may be the rule with the businessman, but when you shake hands with a politician you better count your fingers before you leave him." And I said that in jest and that was certainly

the way the press understood it and that was the way that it was intended. But somehow or another that wasn't the way it was interpreted the other day. I think perhaps unknowingly to the Member for Estevan those remarks were taken out of context.

For all of the reasons that I have outlined, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the record of this Government and I will be proud to support the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. G. BANDA (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in rising to close this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, numerous comments have been made in this debate regarding the Throne Speech and I am amazed at the Opposition saying that there was nothing to talk about in the debate. To me that would have been a good opportunity for both Opposition Parties to debate the problems related to the economy of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — I say they are afraid to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — They are afraid to because there is no comparison.

MISS CLIFFORD: — We keep our word.

MR. BANDA: — They could have taken the opportunity to debate the crisis the livestock producers are having in this province. They could have taken the opportunity to talk about the problems on rail line abandonment and its effect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — But this didn't happen. I am assuming that they didn't want the people of Saskatchewan to know where they stand on these issues, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we were forced into a debate because of the leader of the Tories. In an unprecedented breach of fair play and legislative decency, in order to try and blackmail this Government in supplying his caucus with greater research funds, funds they very well know could not be approved in any other place but in this Legislature.

One would have thought that the Leader of the Conservatives and his Members would have taken the opportunity to make their policies known on many subjects, especially since they decided in their wisdom to delay the Budget and force a Throne Speech Debate. Well, Mr. Speaker, on Monday, what did the Tory leader say in the debate?

Well, he tried to explain that there was no party agreement; he tried to justify his position, which the tabled letters

in this Legislature proved that he was wrong. Then he mumbled a little bit about some document he received from the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources (Mr. Matsalla) about moose. Then he made some other small remarks he said, and I quote:

It is pathetic, Mr. Speaker, I am having difficulty in collecting my thoughts, I have no more to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — And he sat down. This ended the Leader's speech on the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. He was correct when he said that it was pathetic.

Mr. Speaker, when he was interviewed by the Star Phoenix on Thursday, March 18th, he made other interesting comments and it reads:

Collver Speech Strange Spectacle, Thursday March 18th

and I quote:

I was mad and I was furious, he said later when he was asked to reconstruct the events. The madder I get, the quieter I get. What I really wanted to do was scream at them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, by this I would assume that he must be mad all the time because he is always quiet. Then he went on in that same interview and he said:

It is apparent that we cannot achieve what we want to achieve in the Legislature with the type of people who are in there now.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whom he was referring to in that last statement? I wonder if it was the Members of his caucus, the Hon. Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter)? I don't know. Maybe he was referring to the Members of the Liberal caucus or the Government side. That is debatable. One would have to question the statement with the performance of last Thursday afternoon, when the total caucus left the Legislature for the entire afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, he also made a little statement back on March 15th, where he said, after being questioned by someone, I don't know who:

No, I don't think that we have been too sparkling today, but it is difficult.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not just sure which day they have been sparkling.

Tories were practically a complete failure in this House, after asking for a debate and delaying the Budget. Our Government will do all we can to ease the burden on school boards and municipalities because of this move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, they only make statements out of the

Legislature and the people are beginning to realize that out in the country.

Mr. Speaker, both Opposition Parties in this House could have found a lot to debate on in the Throne Speech if they really wanted to. I say, like many of my colleagues in the House speaking in this debate, they have shown and have proven that there was a lot to talk about and there will be a lot more to talk about with our proposed legislation that is on the Blues now and when the Budget is brought down.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about cutting budgets, too much government and yet they forced us into a situation where we had to debate for six days, a Throne Speech which they say there was nothing in it. I disagree. I say that they could have taken the opportunity like the Members on our side of the House, to state their policies on many issues in this province, many issues that were brought out in the Throne Speech last session and in our Throne Speech here again.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when our Budget is brought down on Wednesday that we will have much more to say as Members of this Legislature and I want to say that it is with great pleasure that I have been able to take part in this debate and prove to the people of Saskatchewan and the Opposition that we have the greatest Leader in Canada and that the NDP will again keep Saskatchewan ahead in all areas of legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Members on our side of the House for a job well done and I urge all Members to support the motion before us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS - 27

Thibault	Bowerman	Smishek
Romanow	Messer	Snyder
Byers	Kramer	Baker
Lange	MacMurchy	Mostoway
Whelan	Kwasnica	McNeill
MacAuley	Shillington	Rolfes
Skoberg	Tchorzewski	Matsalla
Koskie	Vickar	Allen
Banda	Johnson	Thompson

NAYS - 16

Steuart	Stodalka	Lane
Wiebe	Malone	MacDonald
Cameron	Nelson	Clifford
	(Assiniboia-Gravelbourg)	
Anderson	Merchant	McMillan
Collver	Berntson	Ham
Katzman		

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Hon. Member for

Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer):

That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by such Members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance the Member for Regina Northeast (Mr. Smishek) that:

This Assembly will, at the next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of Finance to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty and to consider the Ways and Means of raising the Supply.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION ON ADJOURNMENT OF COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I will have one other Motion to move just before taking my place. Before moving it, this is the Motion which is on the Blues, page number six, top of seven, Government Motions. The Budget will be delivered on Wednesday, March 24th. Tomorrow is Private Members' Day. I don't anticipate we have too long a day for Private Members, but Crown Corporations sit in the morning, and the like. When we adjourn Private Members tomorrow we will go into the Budget Address on Wednesday, delivered by the Minister of Finance and then the tradition is that the financial critic for the Opposition Party in this case the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) will say a few words and adjourn the debate.

The effect of this Motion is that when we adjourn on Wednesday, we don't resume the Budget Debate until Friday of this coming week, namely the 26th, when the financial critic for the Liberal Party will have a chance to deliver his main remarks. This will give him a full day to prepare his remarks in light of the Budget and then we will continue in the usual fashion in the normal course of the Budget Debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those brief preliminary remarks, I move, seconded by my colleague, the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman):

Ordered, that when the debate on the Motion "That this Assembly do now resolve itself into a Committee of Finance" is adjourned on Wednesday, March 24, 1976, that it do stand adjourned until Friday, March 26, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, may I just beg the indulgence of the House. We will be sitting on Thursday, I meant to say that and I forgot. Thursday is Government Members' Day and I would propose, just to give a brief outline of the business of the House, we shall go into second readings and tend to normal business, such as second readings, as many as we can do keeping in mind the Budget and Budget Debate.

MR. COLLVER: — I just might question, is that the normal procedure of the Budget presentation in previous years?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I am in order or not, but I will answer the Member since Mr. Speaker is occupied elsewhere and time to get an extra speech in.

The normal procedure has been that the Budget comes down on a Friday. It is delivered on a Friday, Private Members' Day. The financial critic for the Opposition Party, the main official Opposition Party, speaks a few minutes or 20 minutes or so of rebuttal immediately and he adjourns the debate and he has over the weekend, Saturday, Sunday, to prepare himself before he comes up with the main address on Monday. Since the Budget is now going to be delivered on Wednesday we will be knocking off Thursday, going into ordinary Government business, giving the financial critic time to prepare for his remarks and rebuttal when we come back on Friday.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:23 o'clock p.m.