

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 29, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall, on Thursday, March 31, 1983, move first reading of a bill to amend The Public Utilities Review Commission Act.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you, a number of smiling faces — the students from the grade 8 class of Weyburn Junior High School — another contingent today. They are accompanied by their teachers, Jim Nedelcov and Rick Warner, and as well, bus drivers Merv Waddell and Wayne Vilcu, and they are seated in the west gallery. I hope they have enjoyed their tour here, and I'll be meeting with them for pictures and refreshments at 2:30, and as well to hear their comments about the legislative process, and as well to answer any questions they may have. And I would ask all members of the Legislative Assembly to join with me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hepworth: — And as well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask to you and through you to welcome to the Assembly as well, 45 students on behalf of Mr. Pickering, from the Lyndale School and the Lake Alma School; Lyndale School being in Oungre, Saskatchewan and Lake Alma School, of course, in Lake Alma. These students are from grades 7 and 8, and they are seated in the Speaker's gallery, and are as well accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Singh. And I would ask all members of the legislature to join in welcoming them here as well today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Check-off Legislation

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I have a question to the Premier. The throne speech, Mr. Premier, hinted at check-off legislation, and the Minister of Agriculture stated that such legislation would be introduced. Could the Premier inform this House whether the government intends to proceed with such legislation during this current session?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — As far as I know, that's the case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Engel: — Has, has your government had a . . . New question, Mr. Speaker. Has your government consulted with farm organizations on this matter, or do you intend to have such consultations before you introduce this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, as the hon. member knows that we always consult with the people before we bring them in and clearly, in this case, we have.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, another new question. I received on my desk this morning a copy of a brief from the federation of agriculture, and they are very concerned that you didn't consult them regarding such check-off legislation. And they're concerned that you would convene a meeting with commodity organizations, general farm organizations, or alternately, develop a white paper before you introduced this legislation. Will the minister or the Premier consider this kind of a meeting? They suggested you didn't meet with either of those people.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the caucus — entire government caucus — set up meetings with that organization and some others, and if they haven't met with them all yet, they certainly will be in the near future.

Mr. Engel: — Is, are the marketing initiatives that this government is considering similar to those being developed in Alberta that are in place at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, I can't comment on specifically what the legislation is like in Alberta. I don't recall seeing it. We're hearing submissions and ideas from various groups, and the agricultural committee of caucus will be talking with them all and they'll be examining it. They may have some aspects of, of Alberta legislation, or Manitoba, or others. We're open to the suggestions of the individual groups.

Mr. Engel: — Just one, one final question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Premier assure this House that . . . and the farmers of this province, that legislation will not be introduced that will undermine or encroach on, encroach on the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board and the orderly marketing organizations and boards that are in place at this time? This is basically what our concern is.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this administration has the best interests of the farmers of Saskatchewan at heart, and if you look at the kinds of programs we've initiated in the last 10 or 11 months, that's the case. So I see nothing but positive benefits coming out of the suggestions that will be coming forth from all the groups; and not to the detriment of any type of marketing program or marketing plan.

Mr. Engel: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. You didn't answer my question. Are you going to assure the farmers that you will not erode authority that the Canadian Wheat Board has in the marketing boards that are in place at this time?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the members opposite that it was a Progressive Conservative government that brought the Canadian Wheat Board into service to start with . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — . . . at the suggestion of farmers, and the farmers today are asking for or want some initial funds for market development and all kinds of crops and commodities and so forth. We're going to give it our best attention. It's something the

previous administration didn't do, but we're prepared to do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier, who has just advised us of his support of the R.B. Bennett policies.

Mr. Speaker: — Does the member have a question?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — . . . (inaudible) . . . I suspect . . . (inaudible) . . . hon. members from the, over the name of the president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and referring to the proposed check-off legislation and the quote is as follows:

Our membership advises that they have not been consulted on this matter. We therefore wish to bring our policy position and recommendations to you. (And then at the end they say:) The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture is of the view that prior to legislation being introduced, the Saskatchewan government should convene a meeting of commodity organizations, or alternatively, the Saskatchewan government should develop a white paper for consideration by interested groups.

Would the Premier give us his assurance that before legislation is introduced the government will convene a meeting of commodity organizations, or alternatively publish a white paper?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe, I believe that I responded to the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, that we will be meeting in the near future, and I'm just advised that the meeting is set up with that organization on Thursday next at 5 o'clock, so if that's the case then I'll give the assurance that we'll meet with the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — A supplementary. I'm sorry I didn't make the question clear. The federation of agriculture, the federation of agriculture was not asking for a meeting with them. They were asking whether your government would convene a meeting of commodity organizations, or alternatively publish a white paper before introducing legislation. The question is: will you do that?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, we have met with a large number of commodity organizations and agricultural organizations. We haven't, perhaps, met with them all, but we're prepared to meet with any agricultural group or commodity organization to discuss the potential legislation. So certainly we'll meet with them.

Accessibility Legislation

Mr. Shillington: — A question to the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Labour for the second day in a row. The question, the question has to do, Mr. Premier, with the legislation introduced during the last session, which would make public buildings accessible to the handicapped. By way of background, let me remind you that your caucus voted in favour of it during the period of time they were in opposition, and your Minister of Labour indicated that he would practically guarantee such legislation would be introduced in this session.

My question to the Premier is: notwithstanding the fact that you had a long throne speech bloated with trivia, why was no mention made of the accessibility legislation in your throne speech?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what . . . Is this about the fourth day of this session or the third day of the session or a week into it? And there's, there's much, there's much to bring forward. And all I can say at this time is that the session is just beginning and if you hang in there with us till the end of it, you may find there are a lot of things coming forward with respect to several things the, the public is after. So I can't comment specifically on department by department, in terms of what's being prepared, but I'm sure that you will see many things over the course of events, of events of this, of this season.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Well, in a supplementary, do I understand the Premier to have just told us that the accessibility legislation was of such trivial nature that it did not merit even mention in a 40-minute throne speech?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — The hon. member may consider that that kind of legislation is trivial; that's what he calls it. So we'll remember who suggested that it's trivial. We didn't say that, and we're prepared to live up to the expectations of the people of Saskatchewan, the things they've asked for. And I'm sure that we will and you will see those things coming forth in this session.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Supplementary. Are you going to introduce accessibility legislation during the current session?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I've just asked the hon. member to attend every day and to hang in there and we . . . He'll find out when we bring it forward.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, one final supplementary to the Premier. I'm sorry; new question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. When you were in opposition, and during the last session, you had no doubt about the need for accessibility legislation. It appears now that you have a doubt because you refuse to put yourself on the record as being, as, as bringing it in. What is it that you knew in opposition that you don't know now? Why are you now backing off with this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, just for the record, Mr. Speaker, I never sat in opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — So when I did, when I did have the opportunity to sit in the legislature . . . When I did have my first opportunity to sit in the legislature, Mr. Speaker, it was with the opportunity to do some of the things that we said we were going to do in opposition. We are well known for the fact that we keep our promises. We've identified several that we've kept already, and I'm sure if the hon. member hangs in there and stays with us he'll be able to see that we'll deal with this one as well.

Saskoil Dismissals

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier, the minister in charge of Saskoil. My question deals with dismissals which have occurred in that company and the press reports with respect to those dismissals. And I direct it to the leader of a government which professedly is a government of compassion. When asked by reporters to explain who had been fired and why, the quote in the press is, ‘One or two people is now an awful lot to be concerned about.’ I wonder if the Premier can, can advise the public whether or not that is the view he is going to take with respect to persons who are dismissed from his government. Is it not a concern of the minister that some people are losing their job and their livelihood?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, it is clearly a concern to this administration when we’re dealing with individuals. We have something like 30,000 employees. All I commented on to the, to the members of the media was that I was just surprised that they would ask about one or two positions when there’s many, when there’s many departments, when there’s many departments that are going to be increasing, many departments that are going to be increasing, and some that will be changed, and even without reorganization there may be one or two positions move in an entire department or entire crown corporation.

So I found it, I found it rather interesting that they would be flagging one or two positions in a crown corporation that is fairly large. The, the point is that there will be changes. We have reorganization. Some departments may be growing and some may be declining. Overall balance — it may be neutral. That was my observation.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Or, Mr. Speaker, new question, new question to the Premier, with respect to dismissals at Saskoil. When an employer dismisses employees it is normal, I suggest, for the employer to attempt to find other positions for those employees in other organizations which are part of the same overall organization if such positions are available. I gather it was not done in this case, otherwise they wouldn’t have been fired; they would have been transferred. Can the minister advise why, when, as he says, other people are being hired and new positions are being created, steps were not taken to find employment for these two or three people, even though they are not an awful lot to be concerned about?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I believe it’s in the same category as our office in Calgary. We decided to close that office, and there was (I’m just going from memory) from six to a dozen, or 18 positions, or something like that. And we, we are looking at, we are looking at providing opportunities for those people in the private sector or in other parts of government, and we’re doing whatever we can, and I’m sure that that’s the case in this particular example.

Lay-offs in Women’s Division, Department of Labour

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Premier, again in the absence of the Minister of Labour. By way of background, let me remind you that yesterday a question was put to three of your ministers as to whether or not there would be any lay-offs in the transfer of the women’s division. Those ministers refused to answer the question; you took notice. And the media again, last night in the news, carried reports of five or six people who had been given lay-off notices. My question to the Premier is: have you informed yourself whether or not there’s any lay-offs, and if so,

what are the extent of the lay-offs in the women's division?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — The information that I have on the reorganization is as follows: one employee and one position will remain in the labour standards division of the women's division of the Department of Labour; four employees and two vacancies will move to public service commission; and at least eight new positions will be developed in the department of advanced education and manpower to allow any or all of these people to apply for them, and they will still have normal bumping rights. So as far as I can see, there will be no lay-offs at all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Surely, the . . . Mr. Speaker, a new question. Surely, Mr. Premier, you are not suggesting that the new positions in the department of manpower have anything to do with the women's division. Those are new positions created there for which the employees of the women's division have to apply, as does anyone else. What . . . Will you confirm that what you have told us is that there is one person being transferred to the labour standards in labour, six positions, as I understand it, going to the public service commission, and the rest of the positions in the women's division are being deleted, with five people laid off? Will you confirm that?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that isn't what I said. I said one employee and one position will remain in labour standards. I said four employees and two vacancies will move to the public service commission. And I said at least eight new positions will be developed in the department of advanced education and manpower, and anybody else, including the people in the women's division of the Department of Labour, can apply for those positions, and, at a minimum, have the standard bumping rights so that you have new positions and the opportunities available in the three new departments.

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Presumably they are free to apply, presumably the women are free to apply for any new positions in the department of rural development as well, just as sure as they're free to apply for positions there. How does the Premier . . . My question to the Premier is: in light of the fact that you are eliminating eight positions, by my calculations, from the women's division, eight to 12 positions, how do you, how do you suggest to this Assembly that that is in some manner of other beefing up your women's division program?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I don't think it's fair for the opposition to try to have it both ways. The Leader of the Opposition just said, 'Well, why, why don't you try to find some new positions for these one or two people that may be moved out of the crown corporation with respect to energy, Saskoil?' And he criticized for now having a new position, just like that. I've said there's going to be eight new positions in the new department of advanced education and manpower, and they're criticizing me because there's eight new positions. Now, you can't have it . . . you can't have it both ways. We are creating positions and people can apply for them, and I believe that's quite fair.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. I am not criticizing you because there are new positions in the, in the new department. I am criticizing you because you have apparently eliminated some 12, some 8 to 12 positions in the women's division.

Will you confirm that the new positions in the, in the department of, of manpower do not exclusively relate to women's programs, but are positions that are being created there to deal with new programs that department has taken on which don't exclusively relate to the women's division's work?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — No, I won't admit that at all. Those eight new positions may very well apply directly to women's programs.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier with respect to the women's division. As I understand the Premier's position, one of the employees of the, of the women's division will be with, transferred to labour standards; four will be transferred to the public service commission. Do I have that correct? What four employees and two vacancies to the public service commission? Why are no employees being similarly transferred to the department of advanced education?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we are creating eight new, eight new positions, brand new positions. And the individuals that are now in the women's division of the Department of Labour can apply for those eight brand new positions. In fact there's more positions, Mr. Speaker, there are more positions than there are people to apply for them, which seems to be a fairly optimistic situation if I was an employee, to have more positions than there were people to apply for them.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the persons who are going to the labour standards division of the Department of Labour and the employees who are going to the public service commission do not have to apply to new jobs, for new jobs, because they are being transferred, why do the other employees whose positions are being cut out have to apply for new jobs in competition with others if they want to go to the department of advanced education and manpower?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, for years and years and years in the Government of Saskatchewan, women, women's concerns were confined and isolated to the Department of Labour. It's my view, Mr. Speaker . . . It's my view, Mr. Speaker, that no longer should women's concerns and aspirations be isolated to one single department, let alone the Department of Labour.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — For the first time in Saskatchewan's history, we have two cabinet ministers, two cabinet ministers that are women and not because they're women but because they happen to be elected, and we elected more women than lawyers in the last election. And we're proud of that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — We have a higher percentage women on my staff, Mr. Speaker, than the former premier had on his staff. We have a higher percentage . . . we have a higher percentage of women on boards and commission than the previous administration had.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that taking the demands of the market-place and the concerns that we have in filling those, plus the skills and matching those, taking those concerns and stop isolating them under the Department of Labour, put them into the department of advanced education and manpower makes ultimate sense for women, and we

believe that they will appreciate it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the speech. I don't thank him for the answer to the question because I didn't get it. I'm going to ask it again. If in fact there was a transfer of employees from the women's division to the public service commission, why was there no similar transfer of employees to the department of advanced education?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Because Mr. Speaker, we see the new department of advanced education and manpower being so much more for women, so much more for women than having it isolated in the Department of Labour. It's a growth experience.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Is the Premier suggesting that the employees who are going to the public service commission could respond to the needs of that agency, which obviously will be so much more, but the other employees who are being terminated could not respond to the concerns of the department of advanced education, whose programs, obviously, will be, in the Premier's words, so much more? What was wrong with the employees whose employment was terminated as opposed to those employees whose employment was transferred?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, about 95 per cent, about 95 per cent of all the activities in the women's division of the Department of Labour will be handled and added to in the new department of advanced education and manpower, and as a result of that we are going to be expanding those responsibilities in the place where it belongs, which builds on the skills of individuals and doesn't confine them to one single department, and particularly, just to the Department of Labour. So in this growth experience, in this belief that there's so much more we can be, and women can be, we are building that department much bigger than we're going to build the public service commission, and much bigger than we're going to build another department, because it's extremely important for training, education, and skills, because education is important not only to men but, indeed, to women.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier on the issue of the women's division, and the dismantling of it. I wonder if he could explain how shifting the responsibility from one area to three or four or five, or however many he is going to have, makes any sense at all when on Friday last he gave an explanation of the Department of Health, how he was shifting responsibility from the Department of Social Services to Health, so everything would be in one spot. There seems to be a great deal of discrepancy in what you believe government's position should be, and I think the Premier could take a leaf from the book of Lloyd Axworthy in dealing with this issue and coming to a realization . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I've been listening patiently and I haven't heard a question and our time is up. I think we'll go to the next order of business.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Not Debatable

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the motions for return (not debatable) 1 through 34 be made debatable.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 1 — An Act to amend The Education Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I will deal with second readings of Bills 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 with the same second reading speech, if I can. It's basically a housekeeping bill.

The purpose of this amendment is to change the government's method of accounting for and control over advances made from the consolidated fund to the working capital advance accounts. Presently, these advance accounts receive a statutory line of credit from the consolidated fund for purchase of equipment, supplies, and other operating costs that are used to provide goods and services to various users. The cost of such goods and services are then recovered from the users and deposited to reduce the advance, the advance outstanding. The method of accounting used by the advance account facilitates accurate program costing and recovery, based on the use of assets, use as assets are capitalized, and charged only as they are used.

Advance accounts are used for the purpose of, as the consolidated fund does not provide this capability. However, the consolidated fund's method of accounting for these advances resulting in deferred expenditures is an up-front advance, is shown as an asset in the consolidated fund rather than an expenditure.

Now, the Provincial Auditor, the Provincial Auditor felt this method of accounting for advances was inappropriate, as it was inconsistent with the government's stated basis of accounting. The auditor recommended that these advance accounts be written off and future advances shown as budgetary expenditures in the consolidated fund. Another reason for the change is that neither the legislature nor the treasury board had much control over the disbursements. As the expenditures were not displayed in the estimates, budgets were not . . . (inaudible) . . . scrutinized, and departments could change expenditure levels during the year without treasury board control.

The proposed amendments, therefore, eliminate the advance accounts and replace them with revolving funds, wherein any net cash outflow from the consolidated fund to the revolving fund will be a budgetary expenditure. While, in essence, the revolving fund will operate similar to advance accounts, the consolidated fund's method of accounting for cash outflows to the fund will change, and at the same time will allow the government to exercise greater degree of control over these funds. The net advances to the funds will now be shown in the estimates as a budgetary expenditure, and will compete with all other government expenditures for the revenues of the province. The total cash receipts, disbursements and net cash outflow of each

revolving fund will be disclosed in the *Public Accounts* under the responsible department, in the same manner as any other sub vote, along with the details of payment made by that revolving fund. The net cash outflow will be a budgetary expenditure of a responsible department.

This initiative was approved and started by the former government, February 1982, with policies effective beginning 1982-83 fiscal year. These amendments are therefore a housekeeping item, to give legislative authority for the changes. I should indicate that there are 18 advance accounts administered by eight departments. To date, four departmental bills have been passed, converting 10 advance accounts to revolving accounts. These bills will complete the policy change.

Accordingly, I propose that the amendments made to The Department of Continuing Education Act, The Department of Agriculture Act, The Education Act, The Family Farm Improvement Act and The Public Works Act be provided for this change.

With that short, brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Education Act.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister took very little time in his explanation of the bill. I want to have a clear look at the contents of what he has said. As Mr. Speaker will know, we previously dealt with a couple of bills similar in nature previously with a different minister and he, at that time, knew nothing about what he was talking about. And so, accordingly, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate, in order that we can evaluate what the minister so lightly took upon himself to read into the House as housekeeping.

It is my view that there is indeed a change in the concept being developed here and certainly I'll have further remarks to be made at a later date. So I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the same argument advanced before I would tend to advance now. The bills have been before the House for a short period of time; they were introduced shortly after the House opened. I would simply like to point out that it is in response, number one, to a request of the Provincial Auditor. That's number one. Point number two, the policy change was not brought on by our new government, but was proposed by the former government. Number three, that there has been several identical bills introduced and passed through the legislature, Mr. Speaker.

And I have no qualms with simply holding this up, if that's their wish, to simply hold the thing up. But I really don't see the reality of what they're trying to argue. I do concede to give that thing. If they want to hang up the agenda, fine and dandy.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act.

Mr. Koskie: — Again, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I want to move the adjournment of this bill also. I think that it's improper for the, for the minister to, to be indicating that we are holding up the, the proceedings of the House in adjourning it after his second speech

on second reading. We want to look at it carefully, and there are some very, indeed, some very serious concerns that we have, and we're going to bring it to the attention of this House, and I intend to do that at, if the adjournment is, is granted. I accordingly ask for an adjournment, leave.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Public Works Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I would also, in moving second reading of a bill to amend The Public Works Act, also make the point that these particular legislation is identical to the legislation that was before the House in the previous session, so it's, I can assure the members opposite, it's identical type of legislation simply reintroduced again, and with that I move second reading of the appropriate bill.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the same as the previous two bills, we will want to look closely at what the minister has said on Bill No., No. 3, and how it will impact on, on the accounting, and the movement of money within the various departments, in particular, The Public Works Act and how it affects it.

I would also like to make a comment that taking two or three days for the opposition to study the proposal of the minister, and to make people of the province aware, is in no means holding up the House, but is in fact doing the job that the opposition was sent here to do, and that is to analyse bills that are proposed by the government and allow input from those people who might see a bit of this bit of jiggery-pokery in moving money around, that we have a chance to discuss with the, with accountants, with lay people as well, the effect that this will have on, on deficit budgeting, and I'm sure that there will be a great deal of concern about that after the budget tonight. So that being another reason, we will want to look at how big the deficit is, and how this might impact on that, to give the minister some assistance and see if he come to, to some reasonable conclusion in dealing with deficits in this province. Therefore, I would ask the House leave to, to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the agriculture act applies the same way as before and I'm sure the agricultural critic will get up and say that it's some devious method by which we are going to change The Land Bank Act, or, or sell the Crow off to somebody, but without further comments, I would move second reading of Bill No. 4 — An Act, and a brilliant act, to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Mr. Engel: — Mr., Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister's flippant words when he introduced this bill, we really want to see how brilliant he is and if he has some devious methods of moving funds around. During agriculture estimates, it took a long time to find out what the minister had done, in spendings in FarmStart, for example. If he, they find a way of hiding this in the revolving fund and making it still harder to get at it, we

want to take some time and see just what are they planning on doing. How is this going to affect the expenditures of various departments like FarmStart, like loaning programs that were in place? How is this going to affect the administration of them? How is it going to affect our ability to find out where they're spending that kind of money? The Minister of Finance calls it a brilliant piece of legislation. We want to see if it's brilliant. I beg to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act, for the third time — once by them and now twice by us.

Mr. Engel: — I'm not sure what the Minister of Finance was talking about when he said, 'Once by them and twice by us.' They have served notice, Mr. Speaker, that they intend to pull out of The Family Farm Improvement Act. They, they are saying that they are going to discontinue selling supplies. 'Twice by them.' I'm not sure what he's talking about, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to adjourn debate. He's not giving us any information on this at all.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I would, with leave of the Assembly, ask that we now move to motions on page 11 of the blues, to return later in this day to government orders.

Leave granted.

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 1 — Schooling for Treaty Indians

Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think someone would like permission, Mr. Speaker, to introduce guests at this time, and I will yield my position if I may speak after the introduction of guests.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Ms. Zazelenchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, a group of 43 grade 7 and 8 students from Princess Alexandra School in Saskatoon. They're seated in the east gallery and are accompanied by their teacher, Dr. Joe Lozinski. I'll be meeting with them at 3 o'clock for pictures and refreshments. And, as they can maybe tell from my voice, I have somewhat of a cold, so I think I'll be looking forward to meeting with them more than they'll look forward to being with me. I would like, on behalf of all members, to wish you an enjoyable day in Regina and a safe trip home. And I would like all members to join with me now and welcome you to this Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 1 (continued)

Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the conclusion of the remarks I'm about to make, Mr. Speaker, I intend to move motion no. 1 as found in today's blues, namely:

That this Assembly condemns the decision of the federal government to terminate funding to the Northern Lights School District and urges the government to fulfil its obligation to provide schooling for Treaty Indians on and off the reserve.

Mr. Speaker, once again, as a province, we find ourselves being victimized by the federal government. And I hope this becomes clear to everyone, this victimization, as the debate progresses. And I may add, Mr. Speaker, that this is not, this is not a partisan issue. The federal government began their actions which led to the present situation when the NDP was the government in Saskatchewan. So this is not a partisan motion, Mr. Speaker, because those actions are being taken now against the Conservative government which were originally initiated against the former NDP government.

By way of information, Mr. Speaker, I should like to outline the problem. I'll state it in its simplest terms. One, Saskatchewan officials of the federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs have discontinued the payment of tuition fees for 370 Indian students who attend schools operated by the Northern Lights School Division. Two, this action has created serious financial problems for the Northern Lights School Division. This decision of the federal officials has resulted in a shortfall of approximately \$2 million in the school division's budget. Three, this shortfall coupled with late payment of tuition fee billings for other Indian students (that's not in dispute) has resulted in the school division having to borrow \$2.5 million to maintain its educational programs.

Now let's take a look at the background and the history of this situation, Mr. Speaker. Tuition fee payments to the Northern Lights School Division are paid by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs in support of Indian students who attend schools operated by the school division. Up to mid-1981 approximately 691 Indian students were supported in school division schools by Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

Prior to 1982, the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs paid tuition fees for all Indian students served by the Northern Light School Division, regardless of place of residence.

In November 1981, the Saskatchewan region office of DINA (Department of Indian and Northern Affairs) indicated to the Northern Lights School Division that it did not have any legal authority to pay tuition fees in support of Indian children who were not resident on crown land or resident on reserves. But this support was provided under the terms of a tuition fee agreement signed in 1968 by officials of DINA and the school division and the province of Saskatchewan.

Two significant clauses form a part of this agreement, Mr. Speaker. Section 10(b) of the agreements requires that two full years of notice must be given by any of the parties to the agreement who wish to terminate the agreement — two full years of notice. I'll quote the section:

This agreement will be terminable by either party hereto at the end of the second full year (at the end of the second full year) following the date of

written notice to that effect, sent by the party desiring termination and the terms thereof to the other party.

End of quote.

The Northern Lights School Division took the position that the existing tuition fee agreement signed by the division and the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs required that that two years of notice is a requirement before the terms of the agreement can be changed. Officials of DINA in Saskatchewan responded that the agreement affected only those Indian students who were resident on crown lands or reserve lands and therefore no notice was required.

Section 3 of the agreement states:

The number of Indian students for whom tuition fees will be paid shall be the number of registered Indian students listed in the school registers of the northern schools as of October 1st each year.

As of October 1st . . . Yet in August of 1981, a Saskatchewan official of DINA notified the Northern Lights School Division that tuition fees would not be paid for a number of students who had traditionally been supported under the terms of the 1968 tuition fee agreement. Also, DINA officials have been unwilling or unable to provide the school division with a specific list of the names of the students the department is no longer supporting. This makes it impossible for the school division to evaluate or discuss the decisions made by federal officials.

This argument continued until October the 4th, 1982 when DINA formally indicated to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan that as of January 1, 1982, that is retroactively, Saskatchewan, it would not assume responsibility for any Indian students who are not resident on crown land or on reserves.

The financial position of the Northern Lights School Division is continuing to deteriorate. This school division is continuing to provide education services to the 370 students in question, but must borrow the necessary funds to do so. The province of Saskatchewan has agreed to assist the school division in meeting the interest costs of its \$2.5 million loan in an effort to ensure that the school division can continue to operate.

In December of 1982, the Hon. Gary Lane, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, wrote Hon. John Munro, Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, protesting the action which has been taken by DINA officials. To date, Mr. Speaker, (and this is since December) no reply has been received.

At issue here, Mr. Speaker, are the actions taken by federal officials. Significant changes were made in the number of students supported by DINA under the terms of the 1968 tuition fee agreement, and without the required two years' notice to which I referred in section 10(b) of the tuition fee agreement.

At no time have DINA officials requested discussions to be held to renegotiate the terms of the agreement. Official notification of the DINA position, that a significant number of students would not be supported, was not received by the province of Saskatchewan until October the 4th, 1982. Now, under the existing agreement, Mr. Speaker, we should have had this notice by October of 1980, had they contemplated changes. That

notification stated the decision was even retroactive to January the 1st, adding insult to injury, Mr. Speaker.

Actions of local DINA officials have not been consistent. In support of this contention, I'd like to cite the following:

In 1981 officials of the Prince Albert district office of DINA began to refuse tuition fee payments on the basis that no support would be provided for Indian students not residing on reserve or crown land. Sixty-five students were not supported in the spring term; 72 students in the fall term. In 1982 the number was increased to 280 students. But officials of the Meadow Lake district of DINA, presumably operating under the same rules, the same department and making tuition fee payments to the same school division, provided tuition fee payments on the basis of section 3 of the 1968 tuition fee agreement to the end of March 1982 — the same DINA, the same rules, the same school division, different application of the rules.

Let me describe the present situation, Mr. Speaker. No response has been received from the federal government to the letter sent by the Attorney General, the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs. The school division is continuing to operate, using short-term borrowing, and the Northern Lights division has submitted tuition fee billings for 423 students. DINA has indicated it will assume responsibility for only 143 students.

Our feeling is this, Mr. Speaker. Action taken by Department of Indian and Northern Affairs was unilateral. No discussion with the school division preceded the decision to discontinue payments to some students who had been supported by DINA. Formal notification of the DINA position was not received by the province until October 4, 1982. By agreement, therefore, that should not come into effect till October of 1984. The notification stated the change was retroactive to January 1, 1982, and this approach is contrary to the intent of the two-year notification clause in the tuition agreement. The province supports the position taken by the school division, and has written to the Hon. Mr. Munro to insist that the provisions of the tuition fee agreement be honoured. To date, as I said, no response has been received.

The federal government has a well-defined responsibility for the education of Indian children, and must honour that responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I should like to read into the record a letter sent by a Mr. Doug Zubko, acting district manager, Prince Albert district of Indian and northern affairs. It was to the acting assistant deputy minister of education, DNS. Mr. Speaker, please bear with the bad grammar. I did not compose the letter. I am merely reading what was said. The letter is dated October 4, 1982.

Dear Sir: — Re tuition urban Indians. Please be advised that as of January 1, 1982, the Department of Indian Affairs will not be responsible for tuition, school supplies, etc. for those status Indians whom are considered as urban Indians. Urban Indians means those status Indians living off reserve, contributing directly or indirectly to the tax base that supports provincial educational institutions.

And further down.

Future tuition billings to the Department of Indian Affairs, Prince Albert district, should only reflect those students for which the department will assume responsibility.

As I said, sir, the grammar is not mine. On March 11, 1983 the provincial Minister of Education, the Minister of DNS, and officials from intergovernmental affairs met with officials from the Northern Lights School Division. Several important points emerged from the meeting. On the question of residency of natives, which was referred to in the letter which I quoted, firstly, it's pointed out natives are mobile. They spend time on and off the reserves, so there is a problem of establishing residency. And two, some northern bands, Mr. Speaker, have no reserves. Thus, defining an urban Indian, if that phrase is acceptable and personally to me it is not acceptable when it is applied to the North, it's extremely difficult. The teachers of the division were represented at the meeting held March 11th, and several of their concerns were heard.

First of all, and understandably, tense atmosphere. Will there be another pay cheque? Will their jobs be lost? Will, in fact, the schools be closed down? And morale was very low. Under the threat of closure, anyone's morale would have to sink, Mr. Speaker.

Teacher recruitment. Teacher recruitment for the next year poses tremendous problems, because of the uncertainty of the continuation of the schools and programs. And, of course, because of the lack of response and communication from the federal government.

But from our point of view, Mr. Speaker, the provincial government is concerned with the problem, and of course the, the lack of advance notice, of the federal government's intentions. The province is also concerned over the federal government making moves without provincial consultation. The federal government has taken a very narrow, legalistic approach to this situation and, in doing so, they are reneging, they are reneging on their traditional responsibility for the treaty students.

If the federal government had intentions of withdrawing its obligations, then two years notice is clearly necessary. But as the Premier said, in Ottawa at the first ministers' conference, and I quote: 'Education of status Indians is clearly the responsibility of the federal government.' (Unquote). He also added that the federal government have not been living up to those responsibilities and that delegates to the conference on native rights emphasized that it was time that the federal government resumed that responsibility. And, of course, they received no satisfactory response.

I should also like to quote the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs, as found in *Hansard* of March the 2nd, 1983, and I quote:

We have again, over the last two days, made it abundantly clear to the Government of Canada that we believe they are reneging on their legal obligations as they attempt to abandon, basically, off-reserve Indians. That position has been supported by the Assembly of First Nations.

Notwithstanding this basic position, however, Mr. Speaker, the schools will be kept open. The Department of Education will back the request by the board to extend the bank credit. The Department of Education will recognize the boards interest costs during the period of negotiation with the federal government. We support the position of the Northern Lights School Division.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from an article which appeared in *Star-Phoenix* of March 4th, 1983, written by Jennie Morton, and I quote:

When money's tight, it's nice to find someone else to pay the bills.

And she goes on to say:

Northern Lights stretches across the general area administered by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. It operates 30 schools with 4,500 students. Many of those students are status Indians and the federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development formally agreed with the division to pay tuition fees for them. The fees were paid, regardless of whether the students lived on or off reserves or federal crown land, and they were crucial to the division's budget.

Now, here's where the buck gets passed. The department has decided that it will no longer pay tuition fees for status Indian students who don't live on reserves. Under its increasingly narrow interpretation of the Indian Act, it has decided that they are a provincial responsibility. The federal government is pressing its departments to keep their budgets tight and their spending down. If Indian affairs decides that some Indians are not its responsibility, that pares its 300 million-plus spending.

And, you know, she hits the nail right on the head, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The federal government has decided to pare its budget, but at the expense of both the provincial government and the status Indians in Saskatchewan. I submit that this is unfair pressure by the federal government — playing petty politics with the education of a group probably in the least able position to fight back. And the pressure is on the provincial government to pick up the tab for one of the federal government's responsibilities.

But we can't give in to this pressure, Mr. Speaker, for if we do, we set a precedent. And we will be picking up this particular tab forever more, and assuming their responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, once again we see unilateral action by the federal government. Once again, as in the proposed and unacceptable changes to the Crow rate, we see the federal government acting without consultation, reneging on a commitment. Mr. Speaker, the most significant part, and the most significant fact in all of this, we are the only province affected. We are the only province affected. Alberta and Manitoba are not affected. Only in Saskatchewan, only in Saskatchewan is this action being taken by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I contend that we as a province are being victimized by the federal government, so I would move, seconded by the member for Prince Albert:

That this Assembly condemns the decision of the federal government to terminate funding to the Northern Lights School District and urges the government to fulfil its obligation to provide schooling for treaty Indians on and off the reserve.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meagher: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to make a few comments on this motion. And I would like to begin by complimenting the member for

Turtleford for — and all the members of this Assembly — for supporting this very important motion at this time. I would like to urge all members to support this motion. I think that every . . . no good citizen of Saskatchewan could oppose this motion.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I think every member of this, this Assembly, has to question the priorities of the federal government. They're looking at a \$30 billion deficit, and they haven't made any substantial cuts in any of their pork-barrelling political programs in eastern Canada. They decide instead to cut spending for education — particular education for Indian people in Saskatchewan, thereby cutting off the best way for those people to get out of some of the social and economic problems many of them face.

This . . . Decisions such as this from the federal government, it affects northern Saskatchewan, affects Prince Albert. We are, of course, the supply centre for most of northern Saskatchewan, and the Northern Lights School District maintained their administration office in the city of Prince Albert. And rumours of their impending bankruptcy were very disconcerting to the people of Prince Albert.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the, that all of us have an obligation not to play party politics with this kind of motion. I think, in particular, in the province of Saskatchewan the press has an obligation as well to take off some of their ideological blinders and quit being used as they have been in this particular question. Immediately after some of these federal announcements, such as the one affecting the Northern Lights School Division, we see articles and news stories appearing immediately, attempting to lay the responsibility for some of the hardships that are sort of suffered by the people of northern Saskatchewan onto the provincial government, cartoons showing them not, not coming forward with the money to keep this, this school division operating.

I believe that that's a very dangerous approach for us to take, and that the press are being sort of used in a, in a exercise of deceit because the moment the federal authorities realize that we, the people of Saskatchewan, the Government of Saskatchewan are decent people and will not tolerate those kinds of results, such as in the case of Uranium City when they shut down the mine . . . And news stories again immediately appeared suggesting that the provincial government has a responsibility to step in immediately and bear the costs of some of those arrogant Ottawa decisions. I believe that it's dangerous because they then are not being held accountable. Knowing that we will step in, the people of Saskatchewan, and accept their responsibility, they become even more and more irresponsible.

It is for that reason, among others, that I suggest to this House that we have an obligation to be united in this question, and to demonstrate to the people of Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada that we do not accept that kind of irresponsibility on the part of the federal government. Because of this lack of responsibility we pay an enormous price here in this province. So, I think we should call on the Ottawa regime to step in, fill its responsibilities, and be unanimous here in the House. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Yew: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to say a few comments in respect to this motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have no prepared material with me, but I have noted some observations with regards to the ongoing process of negotiations and consultations. On the outset I want to say that the federal government should live up to its responsibilities, and I agree with the member from Turtleford that they should not

renege on their obligation. They should live up to their responsibilities and concur with the former agreements arrived at.

I also, at the outset, want to acknowledge that the, that Saskatchewan has indeed sent a protest letter by way of a letter that was sent by the Attorney General, and in courtesy was given to our opposition caucus. And I also want to acknowledge that the province has provided interim assistance, has resolved the crisis for the interim period, and that is, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be commended. I recognize that the province, at this point in time, has moved to try to resolve the immediate crisis at hand and that, Mr. Speaker, is commendable.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, though, that the motion as introduced before us at this point in time does not go far enough towards resolving the matter for an indefinite period of time. The, the budget that was presented last November, the throne speech presented last Thursday, gives me some reservations as to what the government of this province will do with respect to this issue. I noted that the former budget presented last November and the throne speech presented here last Thursday that there is little or no commitment or reference made to northern Saskatchewan residents, and in particular to native people. They didn't have no mention at all with respect to the economic development aspirations of northern people, no reference at all with respect to the proposed letter, the proposal that the minister himself, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, had sent to his civil service on July the 17th indicating that, indicating that he wanted to dismantle the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and replace it with an economic self-sufficiency policy program.

I had to question the minister at the meeting in Prince Albert just a few days ago, last Thursday, when he attended the meeting of local governments to address them with respect to local governments. The hon. Member for . . . His colleague for P.A. was present at this meeting, and I'm sure he can verify the fact that there was no presentation made with respect to an overall economic development strategy for northern Saskatchewan. The people at this meeting had very serious and sincere thoughts behind the questions that they raised with respect to local government, with respect to Bill 61, and the related clauses to that bill, related acts to that bill, such as The Planning and Development Act, the structure of the corporate boundaries. There were sincere questions and very serious questions that had to be resolved, and the people at that meeting were quite open-minded about it.

But did they get any answers from the minister, the minister that is there to advocate on their behalf, the minister that is there to answer and to push for the type of issues and concerns that those people have? I don't think I stand to be wrong. The minister's colleague that was present at this meeting may correct me later on, but I have my own self reflections of that meeting and I certainly, as I stated in my throne speech debate, I don't personally attack people — it's not my nature — but I saw that minister . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I saw that minister attacking that northern delegation. He, he was, he was not responding to the questions that were placed before him. He was not advocating on behalf of those people. Certainly not. And that, I say that for the record. If the government has sincerity to live up to its responsibilities, you are going to have to talk to that minister, and get him to respond appropriately to the people of northern Saskatchewan.

The dismantling process is another prime example, another prime example of the neglect, of the lack of consultation that the government of the day has with respect to

the people of the North. With respect to the dismantling process, there is no formal policy, there is no formal consultation process followed.

People of the northern administration district had hoped that when Mr. McLeod got appointed to the portfolio of the Minister for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan that here would be a reasonable man, a reasonable person to communicate with, to sit down and discuss those type of problems, those type of concerns. But certainly after last week's meeting, last Thursday's meeting, the opinion of the people at this particular meeting that I keep referring to have certainly got a different version of the minister and of the government present.

I say also that I have some qualms about the motion, although the members in caucus, my colleagues, support the objective of the motion, the recognition of the Northern Lights School Division via that motion, the problems that the Northern Lights School Division have with respect to the, to the controversy with the federal government.

We certainly recognize and support the Northern Lights School Division, and recognize the need for a sound policy and sound agreements, so that those type of problems will not crop up in later days, weeks, years perhaps. We certainly recognize the, the objective of this resolution, but again I have to state that it does not go far enough. I, I would like to see something more specific attached to the objective, to the objective of that motion, something more binding.

I noted that the federal, the first ministers' conference held just a few days ago, which was quite a significant conference in itself, had no . . . The throne speech presented here last Thursday had no reference with respect to the first ministers' conference on native self-government. And I again have to question the members in government: why, you know, why was there no recognition of this conference? Why was there no mention in the throne speech presentation?

Those are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I have some qualms about fully endorsing anything that's presented here. I, through past experience, have to really see quite specifically in detail, in writing, what the intentions of this government is with respect to native self-government, native self-government towards education, native self-government towards economic development, and the like.

I certainly agree with the member from Turtleford. There lies a problem: that the federal government is certainly shrinking away from its responsibility. But on the other hand too, I can see that the province has delayed, you know, in attacking this problem, but it's, it, it has, it has, it has taken time to, to jump, jump, jump to the, to the opportunity of resolving this problem. It has created a lot of, of frustration on the part of teachers at the local level. It has created a lot of frustration at the, on the part of the parents at the local level.

I've heard, I've, I've had discussions with many people throughout the North that phone here on a, on a continuing basis. They've inquired about the status of those, of the province's position, and rightfully so. I've had to tell them that the province and the federal government have been playing politics.

Some Hon. Members: — No, no.

Mr. Yew: — Oh, they have been playing politics with this very serious issue. They have. The member for, for Moosomin will, will know very clearly that, that you certainly lead,

you certainly lead the, lead the active political tones and implications of your government . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Now, the member for P.A. suggests that I let it go and support the motion. I'm afraid to say, Mr. Speaker, that at this point in time, I recognize the issue is very serious. It's very deep and it's very, it's a priority that should be, that should be given full consideration. But at this point in time, with ongoing discussions between the Northern Lights School Division, ongoing discussions between the Northern Lights School Division and the federal government, as well as the province. I would suggest that at this point in time that, that the province should initiate, seeing as how that they are the government of the, of the day, that they are the government of this province, should initiate some very serious co-ordinated discussions with the parent native organizations in question.

I have heard nothing referred to in terms of FSI (Federation of Saskatchewan Indians). I wonder why the government opposite doesn't want to bring the native organization into the picture and have them advocate and co-ordinate this, this very serious issue along with the government. I'm sure that they, I'm sure as advocates of the people that they represent, I'm sure that they would appreciate hearing from this government in terms of, in terms of co-operation, in terms of consultation. I'm sure that they would appreciate having some initiatives and recognition provided to them by the government of the day.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate . . .

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a very important subject to, to the native population in Saskatchewan and I realize that we have a serious situation that has taken place in northern Saskatchewan that has caused a lot of concerns, not only for the Northern Lights School Division and the bands involved, but also for the mothers and fathers and the students that were involved in this crisis that we've been facing. Most certainly it's a problem that has not been solved as of today and I know that ongoing negotiations are taking place between the Northern Lights School Division and I would sincerely hope that they're taking place not only with the Attorney General's department but the bands, the chief and council of the bands involved. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I cannot, I cannot accept a second motion to adjourn debate. A motion to adjourn the, the Assembly shall always be in order but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some immediate proceeding has been, has been had.

Mr. Dutchak: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to support the motion of my friend from Turtleford. The motion is clear, concise and, frankly, it surprises me at the extent of deviation that we saw in the speech from the member from Cumberland. And it appears that he intends to cloud the issue. Really the issue is very simple. And it fits into a general scheme of things that we've seen in treatment of Saskatchewan by the federal government. And I think we have to look at it in the context of this treatment.

I think it's important for us at this time to indicate to the federal government that this will not happen. We're saying no. I think it's, it's time that the federal government realized that we have a new government in the province of Saskatchewan and our Premier is not a yes-man as the former premier was. You know, with the former premier, premier, we saw oil agreements. We saw the metric commission. There wasn't much objection. He was a yes-man. The federal . . . The Liberal Party, the federal NDP party said, 'Let's turf

the Tories.' It was done. Now there's been an agreement between the former premier and the federal government. And I think it's time that we have to say no as we are doing with the Pepin proposal. This falls really in the same category. Because as the hon. member from Turtleford indicates, if we don't object at this time, where will it end? We've seen it here. We'll see it there in, in every area where the federal government can save some money. It's going to be placed on our shoulders.

Now I must commend the minister of the DNS for helping out financially in a serious problem that we faced in northern Saskatchewan. And I'm glad that the member from Cumberland also commended the DNS minister before he deviated from the motion which we're addressing our minds to.

Now, I think what we have to realize that the DNS isn't involved in this motion. I think if the hon. member from Cumberland wishes to discuss the DNS, we, we have another motion later on which we'll be speaking on which will deal with that issue appropriately. And the meeting in Prince Albert was discussed and again, I, I think it's not really an issue in this motion. And I wasn't present but I know who was present, and I think perhaps the DNS minister was a little hot with some of the people there because he recognized them as the same people that, for instance, carried placards at the Buffalo Narrows bridge blockade. And they were there indicating that they were speaking for the Northerners again.

We know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these people do not speak for the Northerners, and the DNS minister is doing a commendable job, and we are getting it said directly to us by the people of northern Saskatchewan that they now believe that they are truly represented in government and not by these political pressure groups that governed northern Saskatchewan with the former administration. Therefore, I support the motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and ask leave to adjourn debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — The member cannot adjourn debate because of that rule 4.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would move that the member for Pelly be heard now.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Speaker, I would . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. The question before us . . . Is it agreed that the member for Pelly be heard now?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lusney: — I would, at this point, like to move, or beg leave, to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 2 — Canagrex

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, today I have the pleasure of rising to speak on the opposing a bill that is in Ottawa, called Canagrex. Prior in the year I had the opportunity of appearing before the Senate committee on Canagrex on the same issue. As you are aware, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and as members are aware, the federal government, under a bill called Canagrex, is attempting to set up a corporation or

crown corporation to go into business competing with the private sector and all other sectors on the export market. That being the case is what their intent is, the Government of Saskatchewan opposing that idea suggested that we would send a representative to talk to the federal government on that concern. In the presentation that I made prior to the Senate, I referred to some of the objections we had and some of the concerns.

It was interesting to note, if you read the history of the Canagrex legislation, and if you read the statements and the comments made before the Senate committee on agriculture — and I would now refer to issue 21, January the 18th, 1983, when the Hon. Minister of Agriculture of the federal House, Mr. Whelan, was speaking. He said:

This agency is to have the power to underwrite risks in the development market, co-operate with producers and their marketing agency and the provincial governments.

He doesn't talk about them being in business, he suggests that this will have the authority to co-operate.

In his legislation, section 21(2), Canagrex may, on behalf of Her Majesty, enter into contracts in the name of Her Majesty, or in its own name. Basically, that suggests — in its own name — it is going to be competing with all the rest of the sectors.

Now, as I indicated in my speech before the Senate (and I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, go into that speech before I continue into the rest of my remarks), as I said before the Senate, I appreciated the opportunity to be there, to present the Government of Saskatchewan's concerns on Bill C-85 — Canagrex. To come to the point, the Government of Saskatchewan is opposed to the passing of Bill C-85 as it is. In fact, the closure has been passed on this bill, another place, as indicate the Minister of Agriculture's pressure to have this legislation put through.

I would like to quote, at this opportunity, from an editorial from the *Toronto Globe and Mail*.

Perhaps the most damaging thing that can be said about Canagrex is the more that farmers have learnt about it, the greater the numbers of farmers opposing it becomes.

Basically, as the farmers have learned about this bill, they have come stronger and stronger opposed to it. As the hearings on Canagrex started, you found the groups that were in favour and, as the hearings continued, you found more and more groups opposing this type of legislation.

The interesting thing that developed through the Canagrex thing is that nobody disagreed with the federal government assisting in co-ordinating some things, that if they find the markets to let everybody in Canada know. You know, and as I commented before the committee, that Canagrex proposal was supposed to be that. What it has ended up to be is it looks like a corporation to do business the world over and to be a trading company.

It has advantages nobody else has. First of all, it borrows money at a government rate. Second of all, if the government so wishes to assist that corporation to, to make it look more profitable than any other, they obviously give them funds, no interest charged. Obviously, if you have no interest charged for any of the funds you are borrowing to develop markets with, it's easy to make a profit, or much easier, I should say.

As you go through the Canagrex legislation, the federal government then suggested, 'Okay fellows, we'll take out the right to do business in our own name.' Therefore, they can only do business in joint venture. Now what does that do for them?

Let's assume, Mr. Speaker, (or any other member of this House), that the federal government came to you and said, 'Sir, we would like to develop this project in agriculture, because somebody over there wants to buy it. Now, we will loan you the money, interest free, to develop the product. From there you will take, and we will market it. We will pay you a certain price for the marketed product, and anything that we lose in transporting it, once it's come to us at wherever point we collect it, we will lose and subsidize.' Obviously this would make an unfair competition problem.

We have, in the federal government, programs — it's called PEMD (Program for Export Market Development), under the Department of Industry and Commerce. They have a very small staff and they offer over a million each year to food companies and producer groups interested in tapping the market. The interesting thing about this is \$95 comes back in commodity sales and for the betterment.

It is interesting to note that the federal government has other programs in which they assist in agriculture. And what was said through most of the groups that appeared before Canagrex is the suggestion that, if you want to assist, be it the private enterprise or the producers, by finding markets and then assisting by letting everybody know that produces that kind of product that that market is available, will do more going the amount of bureaucracy you will create to just go into business and compete with them.

The day I happened to be there, presenting my arguments on behalf of the Saskatchewan government, also happened to be the same day that a group from Manitoba were there, called the prairie wheat grain group — sorry, Prairie Western Grains. This was a corporation that dealt with grains similar to what the wheat board does, but didn't deal in grains that the wheat board itself dealt in — example, canary seed and those kind of grains — and indicated the biggest problem they had was the amount of cash to lay out while they had bought the crop from the farmer and waiting for the payment to come in from the purchaser, and if they had more personal funds available or there was more guarantees that the other government buying or the other country buying the product, that they could then go ahead and produce a lot more sales. But they were restricted by the amount of cash flow they had available to them.

In reading the briefs from the other committees, the other groups, the same context came through: the Alberta government, the cattle producers, and several others were concerned. The consumers' groups were concerned with the legislation, and they all appeared before and spoke.

It's interesting to note that some of the marketing boards were in favour, but the majority of them were those, were that grouping that were in favour of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I was just going through the comments, prior to my rising on my feet, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Whelan, and he made references to the \$9.5 billion worth of agriculture exports in 1982 and where they went to: EEC accounted for 46 per cent; USSR and China, 28 per cent. And, further on it goes to say that approximately, in questioning by members of the Senate committee, it goes on to say that 40 per cent of the special crops, oil seeds and so forth, were involved in that 9.5

billion. Now, those are mostly handled by private traders. So, you know, that 40 per cent of \$9 billion is a few dollars. And it's done by private traders, and the private traders are saying that, rather than develop another crown corporation, which is Canagrex, they would better see them continue to use the present federal programs that are available, and, which I referred to earlier, the one that is done by the program for export market development, as well as the program under the industry, agriculture industry. Now, their concern, and as you read through all the concerns of the thing, is strictly one thing: we will create another bureaucracy to compete with a private structure there, and, in the end result, there will be no better service to the citizen or the producer.

The comments that went through in questioning by the Senate, was: what's the bottom line you can live with? You know, what's . . . If we don't pass . . . If we pass this bill, what power do you want removed? Well, when they asked me that question when I appeared before them, my comment was that if they promoted (and that was strictly their job, promoting on behalf of all the producers and all the provinces so that everybody knew what markets became available), that would be one of the best things they could do. And I suggested to them that by doing that, that there would be more sales and the producer would be able to . . . By lettering the producer know what other countries want, the producer will produce it, with this one condition upon it. The condition was if there's a profit in producing that product, and it's interesting to know that when some of the marketing groups spoke, they talked about fixing prices and how Canada was not compete-able. Example, potatoes and other things, with Holland, and they had some concerns about that.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we got to the bottom line, I was quite surprised to hear several senators say to me, 'Well, you know we don't like this bill either, but you know, what would you accept'? And I said, 'Well, if I had my druthers, my own opinion, as a person from Saskatchewan, was that if it was to promote and facilitate, I could live with that idea. The rest it should not have the power to do.' It was then indicated to me, if they took out certain portions of the bill, would that be acceptable? And I suggested to them that the joint venture proposal was still there, and it was big enough to drive a Mack truck through; it was such a big hole. Well, there's all kinds of ways to play games, and you know it's a standard joke among the farm industry: show me something and I'll show you a loophole, because that's the way a lot of the farmers look at a lot of the things.

The question was: if Canagrex were without the buy-sell clause, would it be acceptable? My comment: if the purposes were to promote and facilitate, we could accept it. That's Senate hearings, 2512, of a Senate hearing for the member opposite. I think he's got a copy of this.

As we went through it, I was asked another question, and it said, the senator said, 'How do you account for the fact that the National Farmers' Union is in favour of Canagrex, as a national organization is prominently from your province?' My answer to that was very simple. They believe in total control of the market, and every one is allowed a share of only so much. They don't believe in the true principles of supply and demand. They believe in artificial everything and, therefore, I can understand where they're coming from.

Question from the Senate: so the difference or a matter of philosophy. Myself, if one thinks like a socialist, one might like the bill, and I think that's why the . . . And that's how we can put the NFU in perspective. So I assume the colleagues across the floor,

from the NDP, the New Democratic Party will probably like this kind of legislation, but I suggest that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yeah, the member for Weyburn says they support all other Liberal legislation, and that's right. I think sometimes they are referred to as the red portion of the Liberal Party that follows the back of the anatomy of a horse.

You know the member from his chair on the other side indicates that the Conservative Party votes with the Liberals in Ottawa. Let me suggest to you, when it comes to legislation that's better for the people of western Canada and for the people of this province, you'll never see the Conservatives voting against something that's not good . . . sorry, voting in favour of something that's not good for us; only . . . (inaudible) . . . in favour of things that are good for the West. And I think the member's been here long enough to know that 90 per cent of all legislation that goes through any House is pretty well agreed to in principle by all parties. So let's not get playing the funny little games here. Let's talk about legislation that's good and bad for Saskatchewan, and this is a bad piece of legislation for Saskatchewan. It's that simple . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

You know, I enjoy, Mr. Speaker, when members from their seats throw in comments, because it always livens up the debate. The member from across in his seat suggests to me, 'How are we going to go with the Pepin thing?' And may I suggest to him that it was his party that suggested buying the rail, the CPR, and it was his party that always had the answer to buy, buy, buy. Never say, 'Guys, you're gouging and we ain't going to stand for it.' They never did that. No, they wanted to buy the CPR when they didn't like . . . (inaudible) . . . You know, it was never 'You're out of line, boys, and this is the way it is.' Not like our Minister of Agriculture, who's point-blank said, 'The farmers ain't paying another cent.' We've never come off that.

You guys have played over on this side of the fence, on this side of the fence, talking about producer, or the wheat pool. You know, it's very simple. The farmer ain't going to pay. So now I'd better get back to my topic before Mr. Speaker informs me I'm off the topic.

You know, as I said, it was my pleasure to be there and listen, and to present our brief on behalf. But it was interesting to note that the senators that were there that day had some major concerns about this legislation. And some of them said point-blank, and it's in the Senate *Hansard*, that they didn't like the bill. In fact, I was just looking for a quote here that, at this moment I, one of the senators speaking: 'At this moment I am not convinced that this is a good bill. That is all I wish to say at this moment.' That was one of the senators who was appearing on the committee. And that was his comment, not mine.

And as we went through, I appeared shortly after 2 in the afternoon, we finished about 3 o'clock with a question period. And it's interesting to know that when I left there, I had the feeling that this is a bill that's being pushed on the Senate by the Minister of Agriculture and his people, and not a mill, a bill that the Senate totally agree with. In fact, most of the members that were there, I think will turn the bill down. And I'm hoping for that.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I could stand on my feet and talk for, for lengths, by quoting all the verbatim that I have before me from all the other people that spoke; be it the Alberta government, the New Brunswick government, the producers of different crops. But rather than spell that all out, my comment would be to ask the members on the other

side to consider supporting this motion, and reject the federal proposal to establish Canagrex. It is not for the betterment of Saskatchewan or the prairie basin. What is it the benefit for? Are we going to see that big eastern government play their normal, usual game, as they have done in the Pepin proposal, and do the same old game, telling Quebec one thing and telling Saskatchewan something else?

Well, I got looking through some of my notes that I didn't use at that hearing. And I noticed that I had changed my attitude from when I left Saskatchewan till I got to Ottawa. And I was decided that maybe the best thing was to do was to be nice. Now, that's tough on the opposition. I realize that. But I tried to be positive and constructive, you know, not negative, when I spoke before them. And I suggested some good ideas.

But now I would like to look at my negative speech for a minute. You know, that's from being around them so long that every so often I have to get negative. And I started wondering. It'll create more bureaucrats, more regulations, that's for certain. Who will it help?

Well, unfortunately the history of the Liberal Party is that it will help eastern Canada. The real bread-basket of Canada is in the West; agriculture is based here. But, when you play with subsidies and all kinds of funny little games, you find cattle being fed in Quebec, and this is the natural reason. You play other games with freight and so forth, and you see other things happen. But the only people that will really benefit by Canagrex is the East, because that's their history. They always play where the votes are, not where the reasonable and right place to be is.

You will find the only people that will be offered the chance to export through Canagrex, if it should come ahead, will be Ontario and Quebec. The rest of Canada will get droppings every once in a while. Therefore, if they would facilitate and promote only, then everybody in Canada would benefit; we would all have the opportunity. And, basically, I am saying we must reject the present Canagrex bill in the form it is at for one special reason, because it will give special privileges to Ontario, Quebec, and not making it fair to all of us in Canada. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Weyburn, Mr. Hepworth:

That this Assembly reject the federal government's proposal, proposed legislation to establish Canagrex as an unnecessary inefficient interference with the orderly marketing of agricultural products.

Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a few brief remarks to the motion before the floor. First of all, I would like to congratulate the member for Rosthern for his lucid comments on the Canagrex legislation. As well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate him for an excellent presentation that he did make before the Senate of Canada, the standing committee on agriculture. I've had occasion to read through it, and it was an excellent job that he did on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan.

The bill before us, or the motion before us condemning the Canagrex bill, the member has pointed out: it is very true of the people in Saskatchewan and in western Canada that the more farmers found out about the Canagrex bill the more they feared it and the more they detested it, especially when they saw that it had powers to engage in farm production in the bill. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is an example of an unwarranted, an example of unwarranted government intervention into the business of agriculture, and, as well, into the exporting business. Any valid functions that one might like to defer or

refer to Canagrex could already, or is already taken up as the member previous has noted by agencies such as the Canadian Commercial Corporation or the Export Development but some time ago, last November, in fact, it was, and the byline read in the *Star-Phoenix*, '23 Farm Groups Oppose Canagrex.' And they opposed it because it was misdirected and because it was redundant, and these groups that opposed Canagrex, Mr. Speaker, came from all over western Canada and many, many of them were from Saskatchewan and have made representations before that committee.

Just briefly to re-enumerate once again some of the points about the, about Canagrex and the needlessness for the bill. Number one, as has been pointed out previously, it absolutely duplicates existing services already. We have trade people stationed in foreign countries. We have assistance and trade development programs already in place. And Canagrex just seems to be designed to duplicate these services which are already available. After that, there's absolutely no particular focus to Canagrex. If you take away buy-sell provisions, anything else could be picked up by these different agencies or corporations, so you're left with no clear focus of, in fact, what Canagrex is all about. It seems to me another example of typical Ottawa planning wherein they go: ready, fire, aim.

In traditional Ottawa style they're remote in assisting Saskatchewan producers and have lost touch with the grass roots out here in Saskatchewan. We don't need Canagrex competing with the private sector. We don't, we don't need another, another government-subsidized operation competing with private firms. It's absolutely ill-conceived. The bottom line seems to be to me, Mr. Speaker, that governments should be facilitators of trade, not the doers. Let private industry undertake trade and let governments help facilitate by market development and promotion.

And on more than one instance, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has telexed Hon. Eugene Whelan pointing out our opposition to Canagrex. And I can just read a couple of lines from these Telexes:

In view of the widespread and growing opposition to your Canagrex legislation in the House of Commons, I want to again urge you to withdraw this bill and start full-scale and meaningful discussions on its concept with provincial government officials, farm groups, and companies that will be affected by Canagrex.

And he further went on to say,

I implore you to reconsider your hasty actions and withdraw the legislation before further bitterness and damage is done.

Another one, sent last November as well, pointed out that we were very disturbed by their reports to intend to proceed with this contentious Canagrex legislation in the House of Commons, and once again, further on the telegraphs, we urged them to reconsider their plans, review your entire thrust in this direction and co-operate and consult with the vast majority of people this legislation will affect.

And, as a final note of opposition, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Berntson's Legislative Secretary, the member from Rosthern, made a most meaningful presentation to this Senate standing committee on agriculture as the culmination of our opposition to this bill.

I think, with that, Mr. Speaker, I would . . . Obviously, I support the motion, and I would at this time beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr., Mr. Speaker, I would suggest . . . I would, I would move that we move to government orders.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, given the fact that we have a budget coming down this evening, I would ask you to now call it 5 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.

ADDENDUM: On page 288 of *Hansard* for March 25, 1983, a procedural point was omitted.

Just prior to putting the question on the recorded division, Mr. Speaker requested those members who had entered the Chamber after the division bells stopped ringing, to leave.

After those members left, Mr. Speaker proceeded with the recorded division.

[NOTE: The online transcript for March 25, 1983 has been corrected.]