

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eighteenth Legislature
33rd Day

Friday, January 9, 1976

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

MEAT DELIVERY POLICIES OF INTERCONTINENTAL PACKERS

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Is the Minister aware that Intercontinental Packers has instituted a rather discriminatory policy for meat deliveries to small businesses and restaurants in that they will not deliver meat in an order of under 100 pounds and that for every order under 200 pounds there is a \$5 delivery charge, or if the small businessman goes to pick it up there is a \$3 charge? He usually picks it up himself. Now in view of this, would the Minister not agree that this is hurting the small restaurants which do not have big storage facilities? I should like to direct this question and hope that maybe the Minister can provide us with an answer.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Industry): — Mr. Speaker, this is the first I have heard of any such policy. I feel unable adequately to respond because I don't know whether or not it would be, in fact, a discriminatory action of Intercon or whether it has something to do with freight rates and changes in the rates of those goods that Intercon is delivering to the restaurants and the retail outlets that the Member for Rosetown-Elrose makes mention of. However, I will undertake to investigate it. I don't know whether the Member was talking about delivery of goods from Intercon within an urban centre or whether it is a delivery of goods from Intercon's operations throughout the province. There have been, on a number of occasions in the recent past, changes in freight rates on some commodities shipped and it may be that this is a charge to cover them. I don't know, perhaps the Member for Rosetown-Elrose has investigated that. But as I prefaced my remarks earlier, I am not aware of any such charge. If the Member can give me further information I would be more than pleased to undertake some investigation of it.

Mr. Bailey: — My first supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I have every reason to believe, Mr. Minister, that this new policy is in fact true, and will the Minister, in the interest of the small business people within Saskatchewan once this becomes evident to him, would he then encourage the Intercon Packers, in which the Government has a stake itself, to withdraw this discriminatory policy? Because otherwise we will find that the only alternative that these people have is to order meat from Edmonton, probably from Burns. I found that they will deliver this at no charge and, of course, once the pork supplies

in Alberta improve, then many of the restaurants and businessmen in Saskatchewan will order directly from there in order to get around this charge of Intercontinental Packers.

Mr. Messer: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to investigate this accusation that the Member makes and upon the evidence that is found I will then undertake to make a decision as to what action should be taken, if any.

Mr. Bailey: — The final supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister agree that this is a further example of the kind of service that the people of this province can expect from Government intervention into business?

Mr. Messer: — No, Mr. Speaker, because the Member should be well aware that it is highly unlikely that Intercon would even be operating in the province had not the Government purchased the shares that it now holds in the company.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

EXEMPTION OF FEDERAL TAX

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a couple of questions to the same Minister, the Minister of Sask Power. The Hon. Mr. E.P. Taylor, the Minister of Alberta and multi-national corporations and other good things.

A couple of tax-related questions about the Many Islands purchase and the consumers purchase. Does the Government intend to try to present these companies, they are wholly-owned provincial companies, does the Government think that it may be possible to exempt them as quasi corporations? Do you think that you may be able to avoid federal tax on them and the same thing, of course, is true of Saskoil where you do believe you can avoid federal taxes. Part (b) of the question: when you moved into British Columbia on your brother socialists, did you advise them that you were moving into that province, into the Grizzly Field and that you were now taking your exploration out of Alberta and into yet another jurisdiction?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer to the first question is no, I am not aware of any discussions that took place with the British Columbia Government in regard to the acquisition of the portion of the Consumer Oil holdings that are in the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the Minister answered the first part of the question, that part which asked whether they thought that Consumers Gas and Many Islands was a quasi Crown Corporation and perhaps when he answers the supplementary he might address himself to that problem.

The supplementary, again, deals with the tax situation for Saskoil and Sask Power operating in other jurisdictions. You

are exporting jobs. I wonder if you could indicate what kind of tax money you think you will be generating for the Alberta Government and for the British Columbia Government in a ball park way, and second, would the Minister indicate having gone into Alberta and British Columbia whether he might now be moving north into the Territories or south into the Dakotas following the rest of the oil industry that you have driven out of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Messer: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bit hypothetical to try and assume or predict what the tax revenues may be in regard to the undertakings that Consumers Oil provide us with. I guess it depends on the volumes of gas and the activity, the volumes of gas extracted and the activity in the developing of those fields, whether it be in Alberta, British Columbia or whether it be in the Territories. I don't think that I am in a position at this point of time to undertake any kind of prediction as to what levels of taxation — and there are a number of taxes, I guess, that we may be liable to pay because of our activity outside of the province.

In regard to the latter part of the Member's supplementary question, in regard to the Territories, I think it is early to predict whether we will be undertaking any development in the Territories, I doubt whether we will with the Consumer purchase, but I think we attempted to with the announcement of the joint venture with our partners Soquir and Algas that we may well be exploring wherever our partners assume that there are reasonable chances of finding gas, which will acquire additional reserves for Saskatchewan. And again, I think that it is a bit early to say where we might be exploring and I don't think that one should assume that we will curtail the exploration of that company to simply the Province of Alberta or for that matter, Saskatchewan. If it seems legitimate to go elsewhere I would think it reasonable to assume that we would give consideration to also undertaking exploration in those other areas.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, possibly the Minister in answering my second supplementary could answer the question that I posed at first, of whether they think that these are quasi Crown Corporations and therefore may be exempt to federal tax? 2. Could he answer the question about the Dakotas. I would be very interested and I think the people of the Province of Saskatchewan would be interested in knowing of whether there is any possibility of Saskatchewan dollars going into the United States for exploration and my second supplementary . . . I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this involves something to pose the question, because this is the same problem that utilities companies faced with investors in the '50s.

How does the Minister expect, or does he not expect private companies which paid provincial, but particularly federal taxes, to compete with Saskoil and Sask Power in their explorations. And I wonder if the Minister would tell us which of the three possibilities the Minister thinks will emerge? One possibility is that the industry will just stay dead, if it is in Saskatchewan. The second possibility would be that the Federal Government . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think it

is sufficient for the Member to pose the question and let the Minister answer it.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the urgency in the content of the question.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I haven't finished posing the question.

Mr. Speaker: — On the Point of Order, the Member posed a question and then rhetorically began to answer the question and I suggest that is the responsibility of the Minister to answer the question.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the urgency in some of the continuing supplementary questions that the Member alludes to. I will undertake to answer the first portion of his supplementary — the third supplementary, I believe, in regard to the position that we find ourselves with in regard to federal tax and whether or not we assume that our Consumers Oil Company, even though it is a subsidiary of Sask Power and is somewhat independent of the Sask Power's operations and therefore the Government of Saskatchewan, is a quasi Crown Corporation. I suppose in a sense it is, but I don't know just what situation that puts that corporation in as far as federal tax is concerned and I think that that is a situation that certainly my advisors will have to give consideration to.

WINNIPEGOSIS FIELD

Mr. A.N. McMillan (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. I should like to know: if to the best of your information the deep well that was drilled in the Winnipegosis field near Estevan has been proven by the Dome Oil Corporation?

Hon. E. Whelan (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member's question, I understand that tests are still being undertaken both by the company and by our people, who are on the site, and the final decision as to the evaluation of the well and its capacity and the weight of the crude, and that sort of information, will be available in the next 30 days or so.

Mr. McMillan: — Would the Minister be prepared to indicate if it is true that the potential production capacity of that well is in the neighborhood of 60 barrels a day?

Mr. Whelan: — As I said in answer to the supplementary question, when the final tests are run and when the final decision is made I will be very pleased to make it available to the Hon. Member, but as yet the final decision has not been made. We don't have the final report on it. When it does become available you will be informed.

Mr. McMillan: — In way of supplementary. If the production capacity well proves to be in the neighborhood of 60 barrels a day and considering lifting costs from a field that deep, I would imagine that that would be a bit of a discouragement to oil companies. Will you be prepared, if that is the case, to offer new incentives in the exploration in the area of oil development in order that oil companies can maintain some sort of interest in the oil development in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, you will notice that the Hon. Member began his question with the word 'if' and this makes the entire question speculative and I don't think that it is possible to speculate on what might happen, or when it might happen; when we have the information we will give it to you.

KILBORN ENGINEERING — PROPOSED STUDY OF BREDENBURY MINE

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley): — I should like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Is it a fact, Mr. Minister, that Kilborn Engineering of Toronto conducted the engineering study of the proposed Bredenbury mine, the Saskatchewan potash mine? Is it also a fact that the study indicated that a mine of the capacity of 3.8 million tons would cost a minimum of \$3 billion and up to a maximum of \$6 billion depending on inflationary construction costs and in relation to increased capacity?

Hon. E.L. Cowley (Minister of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, the name of the engineering firm is correct. With respect to the cost, I am not prepared to comment as it is not in the public interest.

Mr. MacDonald: — A supplementary question. Is it also a fact that Dominion Securities, a bonding company of Toronto, was given this study to do a financial assessment and could the Minister indicate what was their recommendation?

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, a part of the Kilborn study was financial analysis, which I believe Dominion Securities was involved in.

Mr. MacDonald: — A second supplementary. Could the Minister tell me, is it a fact that when the financial assessment was done of all the studies in relation to cost engineering on the Bredenbury mine, that the recommendation was to the Government that they would be much better off letting private investment develop the potash industry and they would obtain more out of the reserve tax than by proceeding with the Bredenbury mine itself?

Mr. Cowley: — No.

QUESTION ON CREIGHTON MEETING

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I believe yesterday a question was asked in the House about whether I was to be in Creighton, I think it was, on the 17th of January.

First, I am not scheduled to be in Creighton, or Flin Flon, or anywhere in that area at that time and so far as I can ascertain I have no invitation to be there and have not been asked to be there by anyone whom we can find.

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, if I might, pose then to the Premier, a supplementary question.

Is the Premier aware that the mayor and council of the village of Creighton are extremely concerned about the recent announcement in the Saskatchewan Gazette about the extent of DNS responsibilities and will the Premier give his categorical assurance to the councillors and to the mayor of Creighton that DNS, as the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan did in this House, that DNS has no intention whatsoever of taking over the administration of the municipality of Creighton, unless the municipal councillors request the DNS to do so?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the village of Creighton or the town of Creighton is concerned in the manner that is suggested by the Hon. Member. I think that if they are concerned they would probably write or communicate with me. So far as I am aware they haven't done so. That doesn't indicate a high degree of concern. But if they do communicate with me, asking for assurances that DNS does not propose to take over the administration of the town of Creighton, we would be more than happy to supply those assurances.

TABLING OF WHITE PAPER ON BUSINESS CORPORATION LAW OFFICE

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to place before this Assembly the White Paper on a new business corporation law office for Saskatchewan.

Those familiar with The Companies Act of Saskatchewan will recognize the need for revision. With this in mind a committee was struck consisting of the Registrar of Companies, the Chairman of the Securities Commission and a senior Crown solicitor.

The Committee has drafted and submitted its report and in order to stimulate discussion and consideration of the issues involved I am placing before the Legislature this report as a White Paper.

Any person, group of persons or organizations desirous of expressing their views on the proposals may do so by directing their comments and their submissions to the Registrar of Companies.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a rather long and

involved document. I am tabling it at this time because I understand the Law Society has at the end of January a meeting at which they wish to go through this and make comments to the Government. I am sure there will be many individuals and companies in Saskatchewan who will be interested in it. I may say, also, it is modelled on federal law, new federal law, in an attempt to bring some conformity to corporation law across Canada.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the official Opposition, we welcome the tabling of the White Paper. I have a question I should like to direct on the matter . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Would the Member give me a moment please.

Mr. Lane: — We welcome the proposals that the Provincial Secretary has given. Certainly company law in Canada and provincially is archaic to say the least. It doesn't reflect the realities. We find it somewhat strange though that here we have a White Paper on Business Corporations in the Province of Saskatchewan when the official Opposition has asked for two months for studies, white papers, reports, feasibility studies, marketing studies, financial studies on potash and we haven't been given one thing by that particular Minister or any other Member of the Treasury Benches.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 52

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 52 showing:

(1) The Number of people spending 14 or more days in the Saskatchewan institutions for the mentally ill in the 1974-75 fiscal year. (2) The number of people held in Saskatchewan institutions for the mentally ill as a result of having been found not guilty of some crime by reason of their insanity, in the 1974-75 fiscal year. (3) The number of people committed to a Saskatchewan institution for the mentally ill in each of the mental health regions pursuant to Section 12 of The Mental Health Act, the cumulative total for the Province, and the number of people so committed under Section 12 who were held in the institution for the mentally ill as a result of a further order or a renewal certificate, and the cumulative total thereof for the Province. (4) The number of people seen by psychiatrists in each of the mental health regions pursuant to Section 18(1) of The Mental Health Act, the cumulative total for the Province, the percentage of such persons seen who were thereafter admitted in each of the mental health regions, and the cumulative total thereof for the Province. (5) The number of people in each mental health region who requested reviews pursuant to Section 24 of The Mental Health Act in the 1974-75 fiscal year and the cumulative total for the Province. (6) The number of such reviews

pursuant to Section 24 of The Mental Health Act which were decided in favor of the patient and resulted in the patient's release from the mental institution shortly thereafter in each mental health region in the 1974-75 fiscal year, and the cumulative total for the Province. (7) The number of applications in each mental health region made to the Court of Queen's Bench pursuant to Section 26 of The Mental Health Act in the 1974-75 fiscal year and the cumulative total for the Province. (8) The number of such appeals in each mental health region which were granted pursuant to Section 26 of The Mental Health Act in the 1974-75 fiscal year and the cumulative total for the Province. (9) The number of applications made by people held by reason of their having been found not guilty of some crime by reason of their insanity for release to the review panel for the criminally insane in the 1974-75 fiscal year. (10) The number of patients taken into Saskatchewan institutions for the mentally ill without their permission who had not been found not guilty of some crime by reason of their insanity in the 1974-75 fiscal year. (11) The number of patients receiving ECT treatment (shock treatment) first with their consent and secondly without their consent in the 1974-75 fiscal year. (12) The names and addresses of the members of the review panels currently serving under Section 22 of The Mental Health Act. (13) The names and addresses of the members of the review panel for the criminally insane currently serving.

He said: I'd like to congratulate the Attorney General on finding so many Cabinet Ministers for today's question period. He must be digging them right out of the woodwork.

I will shortly be delivering to the Press a text of my remarks, a prepared text. I propose only to speak briefly about this matter . . .

Mr. Romanow: — The same text . . .

Mr. Merchant: — No, you will get a text and they will get a text. Part of the reason that I decided to do that is because in dealing with this matter I am concerned to a certain extent that the position that I have asked be fairly clearly understood. I am asking for information. Let me begin by saying I asked for all of this information on October 1, by way of a letter to the Ministry of Health. I didn't even receive a reply to that letter, there was no reaction whatsoever. Neither did I get the information, nor did I see the letter from the Minister or from the Department saying why that information would not be forthcoming.

I suggest again, to this House that that is really the way the Government operates when they receive questions, at least that is the way they operate with my questions. Nine out of ten questions, I get the answer, and I get the answer promptly, and when I ask a good question it is completely ignored. When I ask a question that the Government finds somewhat embarrassing they just ignore the question.

Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to read each of the motions. The questions are all the same, except they deal in different

years. Mr. Speaker, these are matters which I find it difficult to get information on. It is difficult for me to get this information. It is difficult for private psychiatrists to get this kind of information. Indeed, I have talked to private psychiatrists who have advised me that when they were in the Government service could and did get into a great deal of trouble when they attempted to take out of the mental health region in which they served copies of information or information which they thought might be of advantage to them for two purposes: (1) in treating patients thereafter, and (2) for proving the suspicion that some psychiatrists have that the mental health regions, if not acting improperly, certainly have the potential to act improperly, if you follow what I mean.

These questions will eventually be incorporated when I have the answers, into amendments to the legislation which I propose to make. Those are the only comments I have to make, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the information will be forthcoming. It is fairly straightforward. I so move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Cameron (Regina South).

Hon. W. Robbins (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I obviously took the opportunity to discuss with officials the implications of the requests made in the Order for Return. I am informed that the answers won't be readily available because it is a very difficult mass of material requested in the return. Also, they will have to do a considerable amount of investigation in relation to it. I have an idea that we should suggest it go before the anti-inflation board because the cost involved is going to be substantial. I assure you it is going to take many, many hours in order to tabulate all this information. I am informed that it is possible that some of the information may not be procurable at all, because it is requesting some information that is in the hands of private psychiatrists, which may not be available to the Department. Nevertheless we will be doing our utmost to answer all of the questions as best we can and I beg leave to adjourn debate on it.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 53

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 53 showing:

- (1) The number of people spending 14 or more days in Saskatchewan institutions for the mentally ill in the 1973-74 fiscal year.
- (2) The number of people held in Saskatchewan institutions for the mentally ill as a result of having been found not guilty of some crime by reason of their insanity, in the 1973-74 fiscal year.
- (3) The number of people committed to a Saskatchewan institution for the mentally ill in each of the mental health regions pursuant to Section 12 of The Mental Health Act, the cumulative total for the Province, and the number of people so committed under Section 12 who were held in the institution for the mentally ill in each of the mental health regions beyond 72 hours as a result of a further order or a renewal certificate, and the cumulative total thereof for the Province.
- (4) The

number of people seen by psychiatrists in each of the mental health regions pursuant to Section 18(1) of The Mental Health Act, the cumulative total for the Province, the percentage of such persons seen who were thereafter admitted in each of the mental health regions, and the cumulative total thereof for the Province. (5) The number of people in each mental health region who requested reviews pursuant to Section 24 of The Mental Health Act or the then comparable Section in the 1973-74 fiscal year and the cumulative total for the Province. (6) The number of such reviews pursuant to Section 24 of The Mental Health Act or the then comparable Section which were decided in favor of the patient and resulted in the patient's release from the mental institution shortly thereafter in each mental health region in the 1973-74 fiscal year and the cumulative total for the Province. (7) The number of applications in each mental health region made to the Court of Queen's Bench pursuant to Section 26 of The Mental Health Act or the then comparable Section in the 1973-74 fiscal year, and the cumulative total for the Province. (8) The number of such appeals in each mental health region which were granted pursuant to Section 26 of The Mental Health Act or the then comparable Section in the 1973-74 fiscal year, and the cumulative total for the Province. (9) The number of applications made by people held by reason of their having been found not guilty of some crime by reason of their insanity for release to the review panel for the criminally insane in the 1973-74 fiscal year. (10) The number of patients taken into Saskatchewan institutions for the mentally ill without their permission who had not been found not guilty of some crime by reason of their insanity in the 1973-74 fiscal year. (11) The number of patients receiving ECT treatment (shock treatment) first with their consent and secondly without their consent in the 1973-74 fiscal year.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in relation to the Minister's comments, I accept the Minister's comments at face value. As I had said I had intended only to speak briefly to the matter since I get the opportunity notwithstanding the fact that you adjourned the debate so I address you again, perhaps I will take that opportunity.

As I said, I will be proposing amendments to The Mental Health Act and any information along these lines that is available I would very much appreciate.

I don't believe with all due respect, that the information that I have requested is in the hands of any private psychiatrists. If I may, Mr. Speaker, let me indicate briefly some of the areas that concern me.

For instance, the matter regarding people being held by reason of having been found not guilty of some crime by reason of their insanity. These are people who, and I have long said as a criminal lawyer, that you do a great disservice to your client in having your client found not guilty of murder by reason of his insanity. Because at least if you have him found guilty of murder, he gets out in six or eight or 20 years or whatever. If you have him found not guilty by reason of his insanity, he very likely never gets out.

That is the reason that I ask the questions about reviews of the criminally insane. And that for instance is an area where it is quite simple and easy for the Minister to provide that information.

An area that concerns me, and I stress again that first, I don't believe that there is a particular problem in the Regina Health Region. Part of the reason that I don't think there is a problem in the Regina Health Region because there is a sufficient number at least of both private and public psychiatrists. So that in the larger population areas things work well. I know, however, and I have seen the documentation that establishes that there are abuses being committed under Section 11 and Section 12. I am not saying, Section 11 and Section 12, Mr. Speaker, Section 12 is a section by which a person can be held in a mental institution against his will for 72 hours on the signature of one doctor. If at the end of 72 hours they want to keep the patient in the mental institution, they have to get the signature of a second doctor. Frequently, though the sections clearly state that they have to indicate why they are holding that patient, frequently the material states nothing at all. The nature of the amendments that I am thinking of are to take the matters and have some sort of compulsory review by the courts. That is the reason that I then move to the requests for information, the questions about the review board under Section 24 and second review that is available to a Court of Queen's Bench under Section 26.

Now again that information is completely available to you. You have to know within each region how many reviews were conducted and at what time the reviews were conducted.

That information, Mr. Minister, I suggest shouldn't be difficult to come by. I am afraid that you will find that the review boards are failing in two ways. First, they tend to take as gospel, the opinion of the psychiatrists and so on in their region. That is part of the problem of having review boards in a region instead of having that kind of a review made a part of a review by an independent body or an independent judge, a judge of the District Court or a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench.

The second problem is even a greater problem. A person is committed to an institution not voluntarily, is committed to an institution because he has mental problems. He may, if he likes, apply for a review. But he is unlikely to apply for a review. Indeed he may get comfortable in some ways in that mental institution. He may fall into the trap of not applying for a review. There is no provision for counsel or for legal assistance for him. In the review, again the Court of Queen's Bench is less likely because there is no provision for counsel and there is no automatic review and automatic consideration by the courts.

The nature of the amendments that I am drafting will look at that area and probably be suggesting to the department that some kind of automatic reviews by the courts be possible. I don't think that that would be an onerous problem for the Department or for the institutions and that is part of the reason that I want to know the numbers of people who are held without their will who are not criminally insane.

There is another area where I am sure the numbers are

available and it is important. Mr. Speaker, any wife involved in a marital dispute can go before a magistrate and swear out a complaint and have her husband picked up and taken to a mental institution, taken to a mental institution because she thinks he's crazy. And indeed, I tell you that I get the impression in marriage breakdowns when people's minds are pressed as hard as they can that many of them do appear to be a little crazy at the time. But that's not uncommon for these reviews to be taken. Now again I am not sure that there is that much abuse, I think the magistrates are careful, but I think that our Act should adopt The British Health Act. Our Act was taken almost holus-bolus from the British Act but for some reason under the British legislation only a social worker or a constable of some police force, or some other people in the health units and so on, are able to swear out the complaints before a magistrate, while under our Act anyone is able to swear out the complaints before a magistrate. Now, Mr. Speaker, with all of these things we are not talking about large numbers of people being involved. It is a potential for abuse which affects a very small minority of people, but it does affect people who are mentally ill and it indirectly affects the freedom of all of us, it puts the freedom of all of us in jeopardy. We know and I think the Minister would agree that there are abuses in other jurisdictions, there are abuses in the United States particularly, the power of psychiatrists in mental institutions. And I think that before that kind of thing results here that we should be stiffening, tightening up regulations. I know, indeed, that the Minister is concerned about this matter and I know indeed that studies are being conducted and I have in fact discussed the matter with some of the Minister's officials as well as with various psychiatrists and so on in Regina and elsewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has said that some of the information may be difficult to come by and I accept this. I wonder, in fairness, and indeed I am relatively satisfied that all of the Ministers are fair, I wonder if the Minister might consider and he will have an opportunity to speak on each of these if he likes, I wonder if the Minister might consider informally forwarding to me the information in a piecemeal way if indeed he is saying that it may take a month or two to get all of the information. I think that some of this information is probably readily available. Some of it may well be available within a week or ten days and I hope that the Minister might consider forwarding that to me in a piecemeal manner although at some point you'll have to reply in a formal and proper way in the House. I assume, Sir, that this will be the last time that I will speak, unless something comes up with regard to these matters. I must say I should rather like having an opportunity to speak last. I repeat, I am not pointing any fingers at either the psychiatric services in general or any particular psychiatric health region, but I do think and I expect the Minister shares my concern that there are reasons for legitimate inquiries and potential to tighten the Act and it is for that reason that I have asked for that information.

I now move this Motion for Return No. 53.

Hon. W.A. Robbins (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make only a few brief remarks with respect to this one as well. I would be the first

to admit and I am not very familiar with all the implications and problems related to psychiatry, by any means, that this is a very difficult field. I think even psychiatrists often are not unanimous at all in terms of their methods of treating people, etc. I am not the least bit critical of the Member for wanting to get information with respect to this particular field and we will do our utmost to get all of the information as quickly as we can. I am informed by the officials of the Department that it is a horrendous task to get all of this information and I have only talked briefly to the head of Psychiatric Services and also to the Deputy Minister with respect to it. However, on the basis of an assurance to us that we will do our utmost to get the information, I hope this will satisfy the Member. Therefore, again, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 51

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 51 showing:

- (1) The names of all Government Departments, Branches, Agencies or Boards which supplied mailing lists to any individuals, political parties, partnerships or corporations in the year 1975.
- (2) In cases where the Department, Branch, Agency or Board maintains records of such information, the names of those to whom such mailing lists were supplied.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would ask this question of the Government to supply the Legislature with the names of all Government departments, branches, agencies or boards which supplied mailing lists to any individuals, political parties, partnerships or corporations in the year, 1975. I would be very surprised if I did not get the information from the Government. I am a little surprised it was made into a Return, the question was tabled some days ago. The reasons are obvious, in 1974 the Government of Saskatchewan passed legislation which is designed to protect the privacy of individuals. My argument and the argument of the official Opposition is quite simple that, in effect, the law and the intent of the law of privacy should apply to governments and in particular apply to governments.

The Privacy Act was introduced with great fanfare by the Attorney General at that time and one aspect of privacy is the use of the name, the use of letters, diaries or other personal documents of a person, the use of a name or likeness of a person. Basically supplying information that that person's private information could not be made. People supply information to the Government, either because they are required to or voluntarily. In most cases they supply to governments because they are required to and in the past the Government has supplied information on mailing lists for motor vehicle companies to give them a record of individuals in Saskatchewan. It has been somewhat of a profitable venture on behalf of governments and I am not just referring to the Government opposite but past governments, but I think that the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know if their name is used by the Government or if they are on mailing lists of governments, to what use their names are being put. I think that two years ago I asked this question

with very little modification of the Government opposite and got a reply. The Government was getting anywhere from one or approximately one-quarter of one cent per name. As a result of that question the understanding was given to the Legislature by the Minister that the Government was going to review its policy on the supplying of mailing lists and make sure that the supply was not abused and anybody who wanted to come out and just pay for it wouldn't necessarily get it. There had to be some good and reasonable reason for the supplying of the list of names. As I say, two years ago in this Legislature the information was supplied based on precedent in the undertaking of the Government at that particular time. I am sure that all Members will join with me as I move this Return 51, seconded by the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart) in order to ensure that the privacy of individuals is protected and the privacy laws are applied to governments, boards, agencies and commissions as well as to the average citizen.

Hon. E.L. Cowley (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief here. I think I agree with the Member that there should be no difficulty in providing this information. Just to advise the House, I had a telephone message from one of my officials yesterday who indicated some difficulty on the note that I got. In reading the note I think he must have misread the question, but in any event with due caution I am going to ask it to be adjourned. I don't think there will be any difficulty in passing it later. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 27 — REPEAL OF GIFT TAX ACT, 1972 AND THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT, 1972.

MR. D.G. STEUART (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) moved, seconded by Mr. Cameron (Regina South):

That this Assembly requests the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately introduce legislation to repeal The Gift Tax Act, 1972 and The Succession Duty Act, 1972.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I will move this Resolution. I should like for the benefit of the new Members, just to review some of the history of this particular Act, how we arrived at this position.

For years and years we had a Gift Tax Act and as a companion piece really, we had The Succession Duty Act or Death Duties or Inheritance Tax, or whatever you wanted to call it and as a companion piece of legislation we always had The Gift Tax Act. This was federal legislation, a federal tax but in fact in later years I think 75 per cent of it was returned to the province of origin. In other words the situs of an estate whatever province that was in when that individual died and the tax of his estate or her estate, the results of that tax, the money taken in from that tax was returned, or 75 per cent of it, to the province of origin. The gift tax, of course, as we know it, to avoid or to close an obvious loophole that would allow people as they became

older and decided they wanted to avoid the death duties or the succession duties to hand over their estate to their heirs before they died and as a result would avoid paying this tax. Now I think there may have been at one time a good reason for this tax. The principle behind it being that if you allowed people generation after generation to accumulate wealth and hold onto it, that the wealth tended to end up in a very small number of hands, of very few people. The money had been earned by the efforts usually of many people, and a great deal of the profits that had gone into the establishing of this wealth and the estate had been the results of the labors of a great many people and so it seems reasonable that that money be shared among all Canadians. I think that it was also reasonable that you gave each generation the opportunity to earn their own money, to start fresh.

When we have a fairly straightforward economy and a relatively simple economy, not as complex as it is today, and when the tax structure was not nearly as great as it is today, the tax rates were not nearly as great as they are today, I say I think there was a great deal of merit in this tax. But any need for this tax and any fairness and equity of this tax actually disappeared after the Federal Government introduced, sometime after 1969, the taxation reforms based on the White Paper that was debated from one end of this country to the other for a great many months and resulted in a great change in the whole principle and the bases of taxation in Canada. Things like capital gains were put on, just as one example. A great many people at the bottom end of the income tax rolls were excused from paying taxes and the rates, the actual amounts that people in the higher income tax brackets paid were increased as a result of things like the capital gains tax.

The Federal Government then decided to remove themselves from this field and a great many provinces followed suit, including the Province of Saskatchewan and the Province of Alberta.

After the NDP were re-elected in 1971 they subsequently in 1972 reintroduced The Succession Duty and Gift Tax Act and I think, five other provinces went along with them and as a result for a while the Federal Government, very foolishly in my opinion, did the collecting for them. Now I understand the province does the collecting themselves.

I should like to review some of the things that I said on speaking to the Act bringing back succession duties in 1972 here in the Province of Saskatchewan. I would remind some of the newer Members of the thinking that went on then by the people of this side of the House and I would hope that they would take it into consideration and join with me and with Members of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party in requesting and urging the Government to reconsider this tax and remove it.

I said at that time, in part:

I think we need to take a look at the history of tax reform in Saskatchewan because this is all part of the entire package as far as Saskatchewan people are concerned. We had the White Paper introduced back in October of 1969. We had hearings, committees, representation, provincial conferences and then the House of Commons considered it, debated it in the resulting Bill. The result, a new system of taxation. The result was new rates, the elimination of hundreds of

thousands from our tax rolls. The addition of capital gains tax and the elimination of estate and gift tax as part, and I emphasize as part of the package which was accepted. The result for Saskatchewan, however, which has eliminated 75 per cent of the succession duties is now to add a full and tougher tax which was not part of the tax reform. I feel this is a breach of faith for present and future earners and savers in Saskatchewan who accepted tax reform based upon the elimination of death duties or death taxes only to find out these were not the terms that they thought they were accepting. I think it makes a mockery of tax reform, Mr. Speaker.

The Federal Government has vacated the field that tax reform apparently intended to tax all increases of wealth by the income tax and corporation tax and the new capital gains tax which was levied at a progressively higher rate as a person's income increased. On this philosophy which was considered an unnecessarily heavy burden to tax additionally a person's life savings, every dollar which will have already been taxed sufficiently and in this regard it is in fact double taxation. Three provinces in Canada have and continue to have succession duty taxes, namely British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec. We know that B.C. and Ontario are considering lessening the tax by increasing exempt transfers from husband to wife and by increasing exemptions on total estates. Six provinces, including Saskatchewan, have invaded this field as a result of Mr. Benson's offer to administer the tax collection temporarily and I emphasize temporarily. Already the Government in Nova Scotia has indicated this tax is a temporary revenue. Any withdrawal by one Maritime province could force withdrawal by others and the two socialist governments of Saskatchewan and Manitoba could find themselves alone with the necessity of collecting the tax themselves.

I want to stop there, Mr. Speaker, and point out that this has happened, that the Government of Saskatchewan now has that responsibility themselves.

Most important for Saskatchewan is that our neighboring wheat, cattle and oil producing Province of Alberta is staying out of this taxation. I think this is a very, very serious situation. They are staying out of this taxation. Already they have a great growth and large revenues and offer their people a better standard of living and, in fact, in most areas a gentler climate. Alberta is a 'have' province, but similar in so many respects to Saskatchewan that our people can easily decide to spend their lives working there in order to keep their savings for their families. I'm sure that Alberta officials knowing all this are quietly laughing at Saskatchewan's stupidity and rubbing their hands in glee at the prospects of a shift of productive population to their province.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that this has happened and it is continuing to happen.

Now in all the years that Saskatchewan shared the Federal

Estate Tax I don't think we ever collected much more or even as much as one per cent of our total budget. So while the proposed tax is very heavy for some estates, the total collection has meant little to the province. Now, regardless of any person's view on what should happen to estates, any tax which collects relatively so little I don't think is a worthwhile tax when you consider the results that it might and I think probably will have (in people moving out of Saskatchewan.)

Now why has Saskatchewan collected so little. It has been a Saskatchewan economic fact of life that most people with productive careers who have earned and saved a lot of money have retired and moved to less rigorous climates to enjoy the balance of their lives. We only need to review this winter's climate to know why. They also take their savings with them however acquired such as pension benefits, the result of the sales of their farms or business, sales of their house and all their insurance policies, investment in bonds and shares and all else that they have. As a result when in due course they die all estate tax, succession duties, are collected by other governments and none by Saskatchewan where the money was earned. Unfortunately every person who moves vacates a house, an apartment and a newcomer, if any, occupies what has been vacated. Hence the economic activity of a new house or apartment is created in provinces like British Columbia and Saskatchewan again loses out. Additionally, all sale tax on furniture, the purchase of cars, clothes, other essentials are collected elsewhere. So, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan loses twice. 1. The estate or succession duty tax which we do not collect on the savings earned by former residents. 2. All of the taxes from the economic activity which leaves with the person and is lost to us for as long as they live. It is also an economic fact that the people with the largest businesses are also the people who can most easily move to milder climates. So now to the already rugged climate, if this Government adds a tougher economic climate, surely it guarantees that people whose death it is intended to tax simply will not be here to have their estate taxes. Indeed, if they can move to B.C. where such taxes can be less, or Alberta where there is no such tax, why in fact should they stay? How this can help Saskatchewan which needs population, which needs taxpayers, is beyond me. It is clear, however, that this philosophy and this punitive taxation will help the provinces in Canada which are already better off than we are, based upon the obvious fact that such a tax chases people away. It chases away much needed investment from Saskatchewan and because they will collect a relatively small amount of money, the previous government, which was a Liberal government, abolished, the provincial share of the tax.

This present NDP Government, at that time, placed it back on the statute books.

Now that tax has been on for three years, 1972-73-74-75 and if you look at the Estimates they have put an amount in the years before and for this year right now of \$4 million. Four million dollars, they say, the Government opposite says we collect from these two taxes. Well I don't know if they collect \$4 million, I don't believe they do. They say that is the

average. I seriously doubt that that is the average, I seriously doubt if they succeeded that much or have collected that much or they would raise the amount each year. The amount is just an estimate and I realize that no one can tell and foresee how much they will collect in that particular tax, but we know that they are not collecting any more than \$4 million or very little more. This means that with a budget of over \$1 billion we are collecting less than one-quarter of one per cent of our revenue.

I think another new factor has emerged that makes the consideration of this Resolution even more important and that is the change of government in the Province of British Columbia. There is no question that the Province of British Columbia or the new government, will do away with this tax. So now we will have the situation where both the Province of Alberta and the Province of British Columbia don't have this punitive type of tax on the estates of people. With the result they again create the incentive for successful energetic people to move out of Saskatchewan, if they can, and locate their headquarters and themselves in those other two provinces, the incentive now is even greater.

The Government opposite says let's talk about how many people we have lost. Well, we have lost, I think, a great many people. Why wouldn't we lose people, why would people stay here in this climate and in this province, with a government which by its every action is anti-business, whether they are small or large; why would they stay here when on top of all this when upon their death and trying to hand over these assets they have acquired, they will be taxed by the Province of Saskatchewan, when they can avoid that by simply moving to Alberta or to British Columbia?

I think we have to look again at the philosophy of why the Government opposite insists on this tax. It cannot justify this tax by saying that it is a great revenue producer. They never could, but when the budget was \$500 million or \$600 million, if the income from this source of taxation was again three or four million, as it now is, the argument was it's up a little. But today with our budget and the budget we will be looking at next year, probably 1.2 or 1.3 billion dollars, you are down to less than one-quarter of one percent. By no stretch of the imagination can anyone say, with any reasonable fairness or accuracy that they need — the Government of Saskatchewan — needs this source of revenue. So they do it for another reason obviously and the other reason brings out, I think, more clearly that anything else they do, it brings out more clearly as even in Bills 1 and 2 they are moving to seize wealth just as they go to the potash industry. It brings out their philosophy even more clearly than it did in Bill No. 42 where they moved in and seized the oil rights. It brings it out even more clearly than when they brought in the amendments to The Forest Act when they again moved in on business and seized and took over control. Because when they attack these businesses they could lay some claim, but they could lay some claim to the fact that they were attacking large business, multinational corporations which of course upsets them a great deal except when they try to get them back in here, but they could lay some claim to the fact they were attacking big business and business whose headquarters were outside of Saskatchewan and in many cases outside of Canada.

I don't agree with this philosophy. I don't agree with this narrow philosophy that says we keep other people out because they are large and successful or they don't happen to be headquartered

in Saskatchewan, or even necessarily in Canada. If we continue this kind of philosophy we are in for a great deal of difficulty of attracting investment, sound investment, in the years ahead in the Province of Saskatchewan.

But when you talk about succession duties, any pretense of attacking large business, any pretense of attacking business that is headquartered outside of Saskatchewan, of course, is gone, because this tax is aimed at Saskatchewan people and is aimed at small businessmen, farmers, ranchers, Saskatchewan businessmen. No question about that! And how the Government opposite can stand up and say, we must do everything we can to encourage local business, we don't want to continue to see our economy handed over to large multinational corporations or people outside of Saskatchewan over whom we have no control and at the same time, year after year, force Saskatchewan business people to sell out their businesses to these same large multinational corporations or large corporations not based in Saskatchewan, just to raise the money to pay the succession duties or the gift tax. And that is what happens, of course it happens. We have a few people left in the retail business in Saskatchewan who are headquartered in Saskatchewan. We have some large ranchers; we have some large farmers and thank God we have them and the only way they will continue to be large and continue to be able to stay in the marketplace, the only way the people who are in the hotel business in Saskatchewan can compete with the chain multinational large corporations which are building hotels all over this nation, all over the world, if they could stay successful it is because they would be able to hand the assets over from one generation to another.

When you tax them, you don't tax Eaton's; you don't have a succession duty tax on Simpson's; you don't have a succession duty tax on any multinational corporation or any corporation that is not headquartered in Saskatchewan. The only people whom you get at are the people who are here. And anybody who thinks that you are not driving them out of Saskatchewan, you are just living in a dream world so why do you do it? You know that as well as I do. You know what the landlords would do if he could put his headquarters at Edmonton or very soon in Vancouver as against Regina or Saskatoon, or Moose Jaw, but naturally it is the other things all being equal, and I suggest they are not equal — but if all other things were equal he would naturally go and anyone else would, and locate where the tax climate was better; the tax rates were better and where I could hand over my business to my wife or my sons or daughters or whomever I choose to without paying a heavy penalty in the form of estate tax or a gift tax. But other things are not equal, that's the other side of the coin that makes this tax even more reprehensible, more regressive as far as Saskatchewan is concerned. The climate is not equal; they have a better climate in Alberta and they have a much better climate in British Columbia. The economic opportunities to do business in the three western provinces are not equal. There is more money and there are more people and there are better markets in Alberta and in British Columbia.

So we start off with the deck stacked against us in Saskatchewan no matter who is the government. Well then, if we even stack the deck further, or to a greater extent, by placing on the statute books a very unfair and very unnecessary tax like this we are doing ourselves irreparable harm and this is, in fact, what's happening.

Mr. Speaker, the Government knows this as well as I do, and yet the tax stays on. Let's look at the facts. They know they don't take any money in from it. When you balance the cost of collecting the tax, the trouble they have to go to against the net return to them which is under \$4 million, less than one-quarter of one percent of the budget, they know that this is an added disincentive for people of energy and initiative to stay in Saskatchewan. They know it adds to the advantage they have in Alberta and British Columbia for example. Why do they do it? Well, Mr. Speaker, the only reason they do it, if they continue it on again this year when they know British Columbia is going to take it off, the answer has to be their ingrained hatred for financial success. That's why they do it, they can't stand the idea of successful people.

I've got a part of a speech here where one of the Members is talking to this debate and he says the following:

If we fail (this was an NDP Member speaking in favor of reimposition of this tax) to tax great concentrations of wealth we can guarantee that future generations will not exercise an equality of opportunity. To be against succession duties is to be against the equality of opportunity. We ought to say we can't have one without the other. To be against succession duties in my mind is to say that you are against small farmers, to say that you are against small business.

I will just end the quotation there. That was Mr. Cody. Well we know what happened to Mr. Cody in the election after that. He is now working — well I guess he didn't do too bad. First he was defeated but he is doing far better financially than he ever did when he sat on that side of the House, or ever did when he'd sell three insurance policies every year up there wherever he came from.

But I want to point out, that was his philosophy, that's what he believed in. He believed somehow that if they taxed successful people in Saskatchewan, or successful estates that you are helping small farmers and small businessmen. What sheer absolute nonsense! What absolute drivel! What is a small farmer, what is a small businessman? It depends on what you are comparing them to. But it doesn't take a very large farmer or a very large rancher, or a very large businessman today to have his or her estate qualify for estate taxes under The Succession Duty and Gift Tax Act now in force in the Province of Saskatchewan. So, by the very nature of things, especially with inflation, with the value of land, with the value of buildings, with the value of equipment, it makes the statements he made there, it shows them up to be the absolute nonsense they are. So you come back to the only valid reason that this tax is still in force and it is not suggested up to this point that it will be taken off by the Government opposite, and that is revenge. That is what the basic philosophy of the Members opposite is still, and I go back and say it is envy and it's greed. If they can't make it themselves, they will make sure that no one else makes it. They are going to take it away from them, what they don't get when they are alive, they'll get them when they are dead.

Somebody said that you can't take it with out. Well it must have been the original NDPer who said that, the socialist,

you can't take it with you and they even follow them when they are gone. They get it off them after they've gone. But it's so stupid, it's so unnecessary, if there is one tax that is on the books of the Province of Saskatchewan that could be called unnecessary, stupid and hurtful, it's The Estate Tax, the Gift Tax. And I know the speeches will come. I know they will say — "there's the Liberals, friends of the big business, friends of the wealthy". Well, you've got Members over there who when they pass on their estates will be subject to The Estates Tax, and don't tell me that when the time comes those same Members are looking at their sons and daughters, many of whom helped them develop that estate, and they can quietly move their assets over to Alberta or British Columbia, don't kid yourself that they won't do it. Again, it's typical of the socialists. You tax everybody else, but if we can get away with it, get away from it, that's what we will do.

This isn't the case if you are in favor of the removal of this tax or if you are against this tax that you favor big business. It's in fact that shows that you favor small business. We talk about big business, when I do at least, I'm talking about Imperial Oil and I'm talking about Shell Oil, I'm talking about large business — Safeway or Dominion Stores. But this tax doesn't hit them. This tax hits the fellow who has accumulated one or two good-sized filling stations. This tax hits the fellow who has been a successful car dealer. This tax hits the individual who has been a successful hotel operator. This tax hits the individual whose family have been successful farmers, and who has a couple of sections of land, or 400 or 500 head of cattle, or 300 or 400 head of cattle. That's whom it affects. And if the head of the household happens to die, and they hit a tough year and they haven't got liquid assets, you and I know exactly what they have to do, you can go and check the record because it happens all the time, you people want your pound of flesh and you want it in cash. So they are forced to do what has been done over and over again to pay Succession Duties, they have to sell off all or part of the business as a result — who buys it? Who has the ready cash? The ready cash is in the hands of the big people, of big business people. So in fact what you people are doing in your short-sighted greed, you are almost blind with bitter hatred of anybody that's successful, in your determination that you are going to make everything equal, what you are doing is playing into the hands of big business. And I think this is a terrible mistake. I think this is a bad tax and I wish you would seriously consider and take a hard look at taking it off the statute books.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Members opposite and they can get these facts far easier than we can, they can get the facts, they know who pays the succession duties, I don't exactly know. I've got no way of finding out who pays the succession duties. Or if there is, I don't know about it. They can find out and I wish they would honestly do a study of all the people they have collected succession duties off the last four or five years and then do an honest study and see what has happened to the estate, to see what has happened to the business or the farms. If in fact they haven't been forced to sell out, if in fact this has broken up some businesses, some estates, then lay the cards on the table and be honest enough to say 'yes' that tax might have been all right ten or 15 years ago, it might have been all right when it was right across Canada, but now with it off in Alberta and it is going to come off in

British Columbia, it has outlived its usefulness. And if it has done that, take it off. All the money you will lose, net money you will lose, if you take off the cost of collecting this tax from the gross revenue you take in, it won't be drop in the ocean as far as the budget of the Government of Saskatchewan is concerned in the next year and the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members on both sides of the House to take a look at this tax, under today's conditions. Take a look at this tax in consideration of the value, the increased value of assets, of farms and ranchers and local businessmen, take a look at it in view of the fact that we know that British Columbia is going to take it off and now this will set the stage for the other two provinces west of us to be an even more attractive haven for people to locate, people with energy and drive and people with assets to generate business, to generate jobs, to generate tax revenue. Take a look at that and remove it from the books.

So, Mr. Speaker, I so move.

Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the Resolution introduced by the Leader of the Opposition. In doing so I wish to direct attention particularly to some provisions of The Gift Tax Act and as my colleague before me anticipated I too will anticipate some of the response which is likely to come from the other side. I would ask them when they do respond in respect to this, to respond with regard to two matters that I'm going to raise that affect not big business, not wealthy people, but they affect average, small Saskatchewan citizens in a discriminatory and unjust kind of way. Bear in mind the two examples I'm going to give you and the operation of some provisions of The Gift Tax Act. I'm going to suggest to you that these sections that I'm going to refer to are first, discriminatory. They are secondly unjust, and therefore ill-conceived in principle and that they are in addition, in practical terms, working to the detriment of some social objectives of the province.

Let me state my case for those points I have just made, that there are some provisions of this taxing statute which are discriminatory and unjust in principle and which are bad for some desirable social objectives in the province. I am most pleased that the Minister of Finance is here so that I can make this submission to him, because what I want to do is conclude by asking you as a minimum, if you cannot accept the removal in total of these two statutes, which you are not likely to do, unless you have had an unusual change of mind, we would ask you at least as a minimum to begin to look at some of the limits which are now unrealistic. Secondly to begin to remove some of the discriminatory and unjust provisions that I will refer to.

Let me explain first of all the matter of principle that I said I wanted to discuss with respect to some of the provisions. One of the long held historical principles with respect to tax Acts is that a tax law must fall fairly and evenly and even-handedly on all people without discrimination and without preference. All people ought, as a matter of fundamental principle with respect to tax laws to be treated the same, without preference or priority to one group or one individual over another. I think that's long been accepted as one of the

fundamental principles of good taxing statutes.

As members will know who have had some dealings with The Gift Tax Act, the general rule is that one cannot give property to another in Saskatchewan beyond the value of \$2,000 without paying tax in respect of that gift. So the general rule is any gift to an extent greater than \$2,000 attracts a tax. Now if one looks at Section 11 of The Gift Tax Act, one finds an exception to the general rule. One finds a special allowance in respect of some special circumstances and some special people I suggest.

The law permits some classes of persons in Saskatchewan under that Section to make a once-in-a-lifetime gift to the extent of \$20,000. So, therefore, we see the usual rule of \$2,000 being set aside permitting a person to make a once-in-a-lifetime and only once per lifetime, gift up to \$20,000.

Mr. Romanow: — Is this Motion consistent to the new society?

Mr. Cameron: — Indeed it is. It is very consistent with the new society and I'll come to that in a moment and show you how very consistent it is with the new society, because I'm going to talk about some attitudes as well. Some attitudes, I want to tell you that you in part fostered and which are good ones in which you put forward in principle but are not following up in practice. I'll come to that, Mr. Attorney General. In a few minutes with respect to The Gift Tax Act.

Mr. Romanow: — I haven't heard one Saskatchewan Liberal talk about the new society.

Mr. Cameron: — All right, let me tell you something. I'll make my point with you. Let me put to you the provision of The Gift Tax Act with respect to marital property. It wasn't very long ago that you people brought in amendments to The Married Women's Property Act. You fostered in our province the attitude and a good one, that by and large marital property should be in the ownership of husband and wife in equal shares. There was to be partnership economically in a marriage as well as partnership in other respects. A good principle. An attitude which has changed only in the last five years and certainly within the last decade because the old attitude and the old value was quite different. Well now, let me show you how one provision of this Act is acting as a deterrent to bringing that laudable principle into practice.

The Married Women's Property Act speaks of property by and large being owned half and half. Take the case of a farmer, and I had a case of this kind, who in the spirit of that Act and in the new attitude wants to transfer a quarter section or a half section out of his four or five to his wife. The quarter section is worth some \$26,000. The half section would be \$52,000. That man is permitted to transfer only \$5,000 to his wife without paying gift tax. It's true under The Gift Tax Act. Therefore, while we have said to him as legislators in this province, your wife is entitled to half the marital property and that's what you should be doing as a husband, when he finds he goes to transfer it, he can't do it without paying a tax.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — The point of that is that it deters property being transferred from husbands to wives in the marriage. That's one of the things I want you to look at, genuinely and seriously.

Mr. Romanow: — The Law Reform Commission has something coming on this.

Mr. Cameron: — I don't think one has to await, if I may say it, the Report of the Law Reform Commission in this respect. It's a very simple straightforward proposition. It was, when we legislated in respect to The Married Women's Property Act, I think overlooked. This provision by which we are deterring transfers of property from husband to wife in keeping with the marital arrangement that we now want to foster with respect to property is bad. I'm going to ask you to look at that and I'm going to remind you as time goes by, from time to time, when I get the opportunity again about this because it's clearly discriminatory in the first place. Secondly, it is clearly a deterrent to a desirable sociological objective of which I talked about a little earlier. The law operates in this same unsatisfactory way in other circumstances as well. I said there was this basic one-in-a-lifetime gift exemption of \$20,000. Once in a lifetime. That exception, to whom does it apply? It doesn't apply to all the citizens of Saskatchewan. It applies only by and large in two circumstances. One is with respect to a transfer of farm land from father to son or parent to child, once in a lifetime of farm land for farming purposes. I pause and underline my point there.

If a farmer, under this Act, wants to transfer a piece of farm land to his son, he can, once in a lifetime, give a portion of that land to his son to the extent of \$20,000 without paying a tax. The reason for that is obvious because we saw this as a socially desirable objective to have land transfer from one generation to another and not put obstacles in the way of that objective. So we gave to farmers this special right to transfer property up to the extent of \$20,000 without paying a tax, to facilitate transfer of farm land in this way.

Now there is one other circumstance to which that once in a lifetime exemption applies as well, and as Members know it is the transfer of a principal residence from husband to wife, or spouse to spouse. And again, we saw that as a socially desirable objective and we therefore did not put the obstacles of the usual tax, which is a tax of value in excess of \$2,000 on that kind of a transaction in order to encourage and facilitate common fifty-fifty ownership with the principal residence of the marriage.

Those are the two circumstances in which that special exemption applies.

I said earlier, to whom does it not apply? It does not apply to anyone else. It does not apply to small businessmen in small communities. It doesn't apply to professionals. It doesn't apply to people engaged in other occupations. What I

am going to put to you, is why do we give to farmers a special exemption and a special treatment that we are not prepared to give other people in Saskatchewan who are in exactly the same economic circumstance?

An. Hon. Member: — Like purple gas!

Mr. Cameron: — The Hon. Member is apparently not yet appreciating my point, the former Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins). I said to you earlier one of the basic principles of sound tax law is that it not discriminate. I said in fairness that we have built into this Act a special allowance for farmers to meet a sociological desirable objective. We have therefore singled out the farming community for preferred treatment in respect of this Act. It is equally desirable socially to have small business in small communities transferred from one generation to another. That is an equally sociological desirable objective, if you are sincere in what you say so often about preserving little business in Saskatchewan.

Why, then do we put an obstacle in the way of transferring small business property from father to son. Because what we say in that situation is that we are going to tax anything over \$2,000. We say to a farmer, you can transfer up to the value of \$20,000 and not pay tax. We say to a little businessman who wants to transfer to his son, you pay tax on anything over \$2,000. So there is a genuine and real obstacle which is there. The result of it is that one has to try to find ways and means to get around some of these provisions. Fortunately there are ways one can do it lawfully. But it puts people to a great deal of expense and it takes a very long time. I am sure the Attorney General is aware of the kinds of arrangements to which I refer.

That is why I said to you at the outset that what I am going to put to you is that some sections of this Act are discriminatory, some sections are unjust and they are deterring socially desirable aims in this province. That is why I said to you as a minimum let us at least examine that fairly and take a look at amending some of these sections.

Mr. Koskie: — You are talking about amending, it says repeal here.

Mr. Cameron: — I am trying to put to your Ministers, and you ought to be able to do it more successfully than I because you sit with them, what I think is a very genuine matter here for them to consider. I gather from some of the interested faces, that they seem to have some interest in what I am saying. Perhaps you would do me a favor, Mr. Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) by taking up the same cry and trying to convince them in the corridors and your caucus room of the desirable objective that I am trying to put forward as a minimum with respect to this matter. Because, you, as with me, work with this thing every day among farmers and small businessmen.

I want to refer to an example of an actual case again where this Act is having the effects that I submitted to you. In the little community that I come from of some 200 people . . .

Mr. Malone: — Albert South?

Mr. Cameron: — Not Albert South, in fact, it is a very fine little community, it has produced a number of MLAs and MPs and the like, including one NDP MP, I am sorry to say. A little community of 200 people. I am sure that there are hundreds of examples of this kind around the province. A man in his early 60s who has an SGIO insurance agency and a little dealership, a garage, wants to transfer that business to his son and retire. The son is about 30 years old.

Now, it is to the advantage of that community, and to the advantage of this province for that boy to take that business and continue to operate it in that little town. Because in the end those little towns survive or die in no small part by the number of young people who remain in them. The father wasn't aware that he didn't have the same civil rights as what his farmer customers or farmer friends had. He thought he could transfer his business to his son and not pay tax on the first \$10,000. Remember, the old limit was \$10,000. He saw his farmer friends had that right and he thought he had that right. So he made an arrangement with his son to have his son remain in the town to take on the SGIO insurance agency and the dealership and he transferred it to him, thinking the first \$10,000 was free of tax. Unfortunately that view was confirmed by some professional advice he sought and got. And he made the transfer. Well he found to his sorrow not very long after that he was mistaken. He found that his civil rights were not the same as the civil rights of the farmer. Because he found he had to pay tax to the provincial treasury on everything over the value of \$2,000. And he, in his modest kind of circumstances, paid a rather hefty tax.

He raised it with his Member of the Legislature who was at the time Eugene Flasch. He raised it with the Minister of Finance. He raised it with the Ombudsman. He was told the law is the law. He said, "Well, is it fair that a farmer who is just down the street from me can transfer farm land to his son and have an exemption to the extent of \$20,000 and I can't do the same thing for my boy with respect to my little business? That isn't fair". He was told the law is the law. He asked. "When are you going to amend the law?" Well, we will take a look at it in due course.

What the result of that in the first place is, that you put a stumbling block in the way of that man trying to transfer his little business to his son in that little community, which I said to you earlier, is a socially desirable objective. One that we ought not to be deterring, one we ought to be fostering in every way that we can. Is it little wonder that occasionally we wonder about the sincerity of some Members opposite when they presume to have some concern for the preservation of small business enterprise in this province?

I say to you and ask you to back your professed concern now with some action in respect of some of the provisions of this Act.

In that same little community that I talked about of 200 people, and I am sure as I say, there is example after example of the same thing around the province, there are two other small businesses, one is a bulk fuel dealership, an Imperial

Esso dealership and the other is a GMC dealership. Both these businesses are now run by men who are about to retire and who would like to induce their sons, one of whom is 24 and one of whom is 28, or thereabouts, to remain in the town to take on the bulk dealership and to take on the GMC dealership. They are trained to do it.

Why should we put before those two men, who now want to retire and keep those young boys in that little community, an obstacle by saying to them, if you make the transfer you are going to have to pay a tax on everything that exceeds \$2,000 in value? Why do we do that particularly in respect of those small businessmen and not do it in respect of farmers? There is that discrimination that I talk about in connection with these sections.

I can't think of anything more sensible or commonsense or logical than that. As I say, I draw it to your attention and I am sure that each one of you has similar experiences in the communities from which you come. We ought to be doing something about it, we ought to be changing the law in that respect.

I want to give one other example to show to you that it doesn't only apply in respect of rural people but it applies in a discriminatory way to urban people as well. If one takes an example of a young couple who are getting married and want to buy a home, again a socially desirable objective, Members opposite would agree I am sure, homes are very expensive, prohibitive almost, for young people, and suppose the parents were prepared to help the children buy a home; or suppose the parents were prepared to put up \$10,000 to \$15,000 by way of assistance to his daughter or his son to buy a home. Well they couldn't do that without paying tax to the Provincial Government on the value of the gift to the extent that it exceeds \$2,000. Again, this is a deterrent to mothers and fathers helping their children to purchase homes when they are so very expensive these days. One can't argue with that. Those are very clearly the conclusions that have to be drawn from these sections of this particular Act. Again, I say it is a socially desirable objective which we all talk about. We all talk ad nauseam almost about it. We ought to be doing something about it in a real way by, as I say, a minimum at least of amending if not throwing this Act out. The practical consequences which I talked about a little earlier in addition to the principle.

An. Hon. Member: — Don't overdo it!

Mr. Cameron: — My friend says don't overdo it. At least I am pleased I brought him some distance along the way. I don't want to lose him, so I won't overdo it I assure you.

I talked about the matter of principle in itself, in terms of pure principle; I talked about the matter in terms of its practical application and how I think it is unsatisfactory for those reasons. That has been of course with respect to the once in a lifetime gift provisions under this Act. The other one I referred to a little earlier in response to the Attorney General was the provisions of this Act that apply as between transfers of property between husband and wife. This Gift Tax Act and this general tax regime was of course put in place long before we amended The Married Women's Property Act to provide for the basic principle of ownership of marital property fifty,

fifty. We did not in the process, as I was indicating earlier to the Attorney General, I think reflect on the effect of this statute upon the amendment we were making to The Married Women's Property Act and the general attitude which we were trying to foster in getting husbands and wives to own marital property jointly and in equal shares.

I gave him a very real example. It is one that exists some 80 or 90 miles east of Regina where a husband of very modest circumstances would like to transfer a quarter or a half section to his wife. He finds problems in doing it because this Act stands in his way. His attitude is, why should I be deterred from doing something which the law says I really ought to be doing. He too, in his sort of commonsense way is mystified as to why we continue some of these taxing provisions.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by asking the Minister of Finance and the Attorney General and those other Members of Cabinet who have concerns in financial areas to very genuinely go back and have a look at the sections in the terms in which I have put them to you as being discriminatory and unjust and effecting in their practical result, socially undesirable consequences. I ask you as a minimum on the assumption that you are not prepared to repeal the statutes, as a minimum to look at repealing these sections and giving the small people of Saskatchewan some far better break than they are currently getting. I will support the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. Robbins (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be relatively brief with respect to this particular motion. I listened with interest to the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron). I think he presents some reasonably valid arguments in relation to the problem that arise in relation to The Gift Tax and The Succession Duties Act. When I made a remark with respect to purple gas, I was simply attempting to point out that in any tax there is often a measure of discrimination. I think you could argue purple gas tax free for farmers and not available to the fellow who runs a small paint shop, or a plumbing establishment, etc., shows a measure of discrimination.

I suppose there is a philosophical difference with respect to this tax between the philosophy of the Liberal Party and I presume also the Conservative Party. I think I am not being immodest when I say that perhaps I will have as large an estate as anybody in this Legislative Assembly with the possible exception of the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) and perhaps the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) who have silver spoons rattling around in their mouths. Sometimes I think it rattles their brains. Nevertheless, I want to make it very clear that I agree with the Hon. Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart) when he says that The Gift Tax of course is simply a means of reducing succession duties and as the Member for Regina South, I think properly pointed out there are anomalies anomalies in that particular Act.

However, I think it irrational to change an Act without looking at all the implications because often when you change an Act and remove one anomaly your create other anomalies. It

does take a little bit of time and study in relation to actual effects that may result from it.

I notice also that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) argued that pretty soon British Columbia would be removing the tax, I knew the Liberals and Conservatives had a pretty close relationship with Social Creditors in British Columbia in the recent election, but I wasn't aware of the fact that they had a pipeline to the Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan as well. He may be right, they may remove the tax, but it is pretty presumptuous to work on that basis while the tax actually exists. Succession duties do exist in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Quebec and Ontario on about 19 million out of 22 million people in Canada.

I think it is fair to say that it should be reviewed and is being reviewed periodically. It was reviewed by this Government after it was instituted in relation to the inflationary trends in society and the fact that some difficulties were arising in relation to the exemptions applied under the Act.

However, I categorically deny that I as an individual, and I think this is true of Members on this side of the House, feel that the Succession Duties should be applied simply because we want to apply it out of revenge or envy or hatred of people who are successful. I want to make it crystal clear that I have no anti-business feelings myself and I am sure this is generally true in relation to the Members on this side of the House as well. I may have some further remarks to make with respect to this particular motion at a later date and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 30 — SHORTAGE OF HOUSING AND RENTAL ACCOMMODATION IN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle) moved, seconded by Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its failure to take any provincial government action to alleviate the crisis of shortage of housing and rental accommodation in the Province of Saskatchewan.

He said: I am glad you reminded me to stand up, Mr. Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, I will at the end of my remarks today, move this Resolution. It is interesting to note I think if I can put down at the outset what the basic problem is facing, not only Saskatchewan citizens but citizens all across this great country, the basic outline of the problem when it comes to the housing and rental accommodation shortage.

First, I think it is an obvious statement we are not building fast enough or enough moderately priced houses.

Second, I think that people basically can't afford the cost of the housing that now exists in the Province of Saskatchewan. I did some research and the average cost in 1974 in Saskatchewan of a three-bedroom house in Regina is \$24,500.

In Saskatoon it is \$21,769. Obviously figures like these and the inflationary costs have brought those figures up at least another ten per cent so that we are looking at roughly \$27,000 in Regina and \$24,000 in the city of Saskatoon for a three bedroom bungalow with a minimum of amenities.

We also have a problem that no government has grasped or has done anything about and that is the fact that many people already housed and people with adequate existing shelter that they own or are in the process of buying and in which they are living are making severe demands upon the housing market by wishing to upgrade themselves. I don't know, I have been unable to find other than a statement of the obvious problem, I have been unable to find any government that has done research into the very question of what effect on the cost of housing existing homeowners are making, as they try to upgrade themselves.

In 1974 in the city of Regina only ten per cent of the houses, new houses were purchased by first time homeowners. In other words, 90 per cent of the new houses purchased in 1974 in the city of Regina were purchased by people who already owned or were living in their own homes. Now what effect has that particular segment of the buying market had on the high cost of housing?

I would hope that in debate on this particular motion that the Minister responsible for Municipal Affairs and the Housing Corporation would table for the benefit of the Opposition any studies that the Government may have on this particular aspect of the problem.

The other major problem on the overall question of housing is the fact that without a doubt the housing sector of our national and provincial economy has contributed to inflation.

Dealing with the problems that I have set out, of course, is a complicated and complex matter. My basic premise, this morning, Mr. Speaker, is basically this. That although housing starts in Saskatchewan are at the highest level they have ever been in, that the problem in Saskatchewan is that the Government opposite has had nothing to do with that. I will document in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I think, evidence that shows that the Government opposite, although it has tried to take the political benefit of the record of housing starts in Saskatchewan, has not contributed anything, I submit, to the creation of the number of housing starts. I will admit and make it quite clear to the Minister responsible for the Housing Corporation that more moneys were spent by this Government than by any previous government, including the Liberal government. I will admit because without a doubt he will say it, that more money has been spent for unconditional grants to cities, that if they wanted to use them they could go into land assembly projects, that he has spent more money, his Government, than any other. I will grant, because he will repeat it, housing starts, there are more housing starts in the Province of Saskatchewan in the last three years than in any other three years I believe, in the Province of Saskatchewan.

So I will grant, will state that those statements are I think valid, that the Minister will repeat them. When he does repeat them I think, Mr. Speaker, that all Members of this House will take it as read, because surely the Members opposite

when they are concerned about being repetitious wouldn't want to repeat what I have just set out before the Members of this Legislature.

The problem also has another interesting aspect. That is the fact that under the constitution of the Dominion of Canada, housing, shelter and real property are solely within the jurisdiction of the provinces. I think it would be unfair for the Minister in reply, if I may anticipate him to say, that the housing problem is all federal, it's all up to them to solve the problem, because constitutionally he would be wrong to say that, because without a doubt and I don't think it's a matter of debate, real property and the matter of housing is purely within the jurisdiction of the Province of Saskatchewan.

So, to sum up my basic premise, the problems are four-fold. That we are not producing enough moderately priced housing, secondly, that people can't afford the housing, that there is a problem with people already in adequate housing insisting and desiring to upgrade and finally the housing and construction industry has created, or added to inflationary pressures. I submit that by constitutional law the governments that should be solving the problem and showing the initiative are the provincial jurisdictions.

But provincial governments have either been incapable or have refused really to solve the problem. As a consequence the Government of Canada has been forced, I think, to intervene and intervene in a pretty dramatic manner. The federal programs, I think have not been successful in supplying an adequate degree of shelter for Canadian citizens. But I think that the real problem and the real failure to supply adequate shelter and adequate housing to the people of this country is the failure of the provincial governments, including the Government opposite who have failed to show imagination, who have failed to put the necessary priority on the supply of proper shelter and proper rental accommodation.

The Federal Government has been forced, because of the failure of provincial governments, to take an aggressive and an active, although granted, insufficient role. The Government of Canada has been forced to establish a secretary of urban affairs, not a full department, because it is not within Federal Government's jurisdiction. However, the only government as far as Saskatchewan citizens are concerned that has shown any initiative in the question of new housing starts is the Government of Canada.

I'm going to read into the record some of the recently announced federal programs, all of which have been implemented, every one has been implemented because provincial governments, including this one, have failed to take any adequate action. There is no reason with any of these programs that it couldn't have been done by any provincial government and in particular, this one.

The first step on the federal direction to cool excessive demand for increasing expensive housing and to channel moneys into more moderate housing:

Lenders will be required to restrict the high ratio loans (that is loans with low down payments) to two homes that fall within the NHA limits that are set in each province.

The Federal Government has established a mortgage review committee to establish targets for the various individual lenders and to monitor their activities.

The Government, to make residential mortgages more liquid and more attractive as an investment, will establish and activate the federal mortgage exchange corporation and that becomes effective tentatively, I understand, by April 1, 1976.

There is no reason, I submit, Mr. Speaker, while the Government opposite, when it has already stated in this Assembly that the major residential lender or one of the major residential lenders are the credit unions of Saskatchewan, that a system could not be utilized and developed in the Province of Saskatchewan to make residential mortgages more attractive as an investment and there is no reason why the Provincial Government could not have taken action in this area.

The Federal Government has established new land incentives. They make a federal grant of \$1,000 per unit available to municipalities which approve moderately priced, medium density housing.

I think without a doubt that this is a direct encroachment on the jurisdiction of the Province of Saskatchewan. I think without a doubt that the Province of Saskatchewan could have had a similar program and a program as expansionist as the Government of Canada was forced to implement by reason of the failure of the provincial governments.

The Federal Government has a rental assistance program. Again, there is no reason other than an establishment of priorities why the Government of Saskatchewan couldn't have a rental assistance program to encourage the development of rental accommodation in the Province of Saskatchewan. No reason whatsoever.

The capital cost tax allowances have been extended through until 1977.

We had suggested publicly prior to the Session that one of the best things the Province of Saskatchewan could do to alleviate any housing shortage crisis in Saskatchewan was to give tax incentives to the private developers to encourage them, to construct rental accommodation. What we have in Saskatchewan of course, is rental control legislation which will not, will not assist in the development of new rental accommodations. And in fact, the threats made by the Government opposite to go into its own construction business and its own apartment business is more of a deterrent than an incentive and I don't think any Member of the Government opposite would object to that criticism.

Mr. MacMurchy: — I'm going to.

Mr. Lane: — You're going to. The assisted Home Ownership Program has been extended again. A federal program into new housing. Again, I think frankly that it's fairly close to being a dereliction of duty that the Federal Government should even be involved in the housing field. I think in the matter of financing that certainly it has a strong role to play, but the program development for new housing, for rental accommodation, should

come from the provincial governments in all parts of Canada.

What do we have in the Province of Saskatchewan? Again, I've made it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Government opposite has spent more money, the housing starts are greater, but a problem still exists.

The Housing Corporation was established with great fanfare and had a new Minister appointed, responsible for it. The new Minister has his picture on several different pages of the annual report of 1974. I don't know whether it hurt him or helped him and my advice may be to the new Minister, that he may want to cut back on the ego tripping a little because we all know what happened to the last Minister.

The Government has a municipal program, a department was established, research and information department and I've already alluded to that aspect. I would hope that if the Minister's department has or if the corporation has studied the matter of pressures on the high cost of housing by people with existing accommodation, I would hope that he would table that, at least for my information.

The House Building Assistance Act is a program of the Provincial Government. It is restricted and I say unfortunately basically to people with a family income level of \$10,000, which is totally inadequate when I refer to the figures of the average cost of a three bedroom home in 1974, probably 1975 of about \$27,000 in Regina. I don't think and I urge the Minister to revert back to the previous Liberal program when that was not restricted to family income level. I think it's an unnecessary restriction with the high cost of housing, the inflated cost of housing.

We have a Neighborhood Improvement Program which is basically to try and improve older areas of communities. It's interesting that that program is a federal program, not a provincial program, a program in which the Provincial Government now participates to a much lower level than does the Federal Government. The initiative and the development of that program was purely federal, had nothing to do with the Provincial Government and I would hope the Minister would not take credit for that particular program.

1974 (here are the program results and I am quoting from the annual report of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation) 1,935 house building assistance grants were issued during the year.

That's to a \$1,000. If we take the average cost of \$24,000 or \$25,000 for a house, one twenty-fifth of the total cost of the housing, not counting mortgage costs, is all that the Government opposite contributed. I fail to see as a matter of priorities in the province how the Government opposite could choose to put nationalization of the potash industry ahead of solving this matter, the housing crisis and the lack of rental accommodation in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I have two figures for some particular reason. According to the Annual Report of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, Saskatchewan had 7,684 starts in 1974, that is about 1,000 more than Statistics Canada has allotted to the Department, referring to their record, single detached housing was 6,390.

There is a discrepancy there. I am prepared, notwithstanding the lack of credibility of the Government opposite when it comes into this field, I am prepared to ride with the figures of 7,684 starts in 1974. Approximately 8,000, approximately 2,000 house building assistance grants were given. All that the Government opposite can take out of that particular program is that it was involved in a fifth or one-quarter of the housing starts in the Province of Saskatchewan, that's all! With the fanfare and the publicity that you have gone into and how you are always patting yourselves on the back with all the great housing starts, by your own reports, you were involved in only 20 per cent of the new housing starts and I think in light of the problem that that is a sorry record indeed. The official Opposition again urges the Government opposite to take off the income requirement of The House Building Assistance Act and restore it as an open program as it existed prior to your becoming the Government to expand the size of that grant to make it a meaningful grant. There is no reason why the Government of Saskatchewan should be involved indirectly with grants, 50 per cent of the housing starts in the Province of Saskatchewan. To date, 20 per cent is your record.

I can go through the subsidy and self-help programs referred to on page 8 of the Annual Report, it makes mortgage subsidies available to low and moderate income families. I should like to know the duplication between that program and the house building assistance program. I think that the 20 per cent figure of direct Provincial Government involvement would stay static and that is the maximum number of new houses that the Government can take any credit for and the credit being one twenty-fifth of the actual cost. I think that is not much credit to really go around to tell the people about. This program has to operate in conjunction with the federal program.

Here's another example of the initiative coming from the Federal Government and not the Provincial Government. Residential rehabilitation program, same thing again. I think the residential rehabilitation program is something that the idea and concept came from the Government of Canada and not from the Provincial Government.

The one program that I am prepared to give full credit to the Government opposite, I think the Minister will agree, is that the grant is to be improved, and that is the senior citizens' home repair program.

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . Federal initiative!

Mr. Lane: — The Premier obviously is not listening. I think it is unfortunate because I just prefaced my comments that I am prepared to give the Government opposite full credit for the senior citizens' home repair program.

I don't know if I am going to have to keep repeating for the Premier, but in that particular case I don't mind giving him credit, because I know the Minister will refer to it later.

The interesting thing about that program is that it doesn't deal with new houses, it deals with existing structures, granted that is all that particular program is designed to do. I am quite prepared to get off that particular program if the Minister doesn't want to refer to it. The Minister doesn't want

to refer to that program as one of his great programs in helping the housing crisis in the Province of Saskatchewan because I don't think he can take credit for solving the housing crisis with the senior citizens' home repair program. It doesn't deal with new housing, it doesn't deal with the shortage of new housing in the Province of Saskatchewan.

We go into the matter of public housing. Low rental public housing is provided by the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation in conjunction with municipal government and with most of the money coming from the Federal Government. The very suspect co-operative housing program is a provincial program. I say suspect, because when the matter was debated in the Legislature it was quite clear that the successful co-operative housing program deal with those areas where there were the construction skills within the members and that co-op housing has been a failure when people without the technical skills became a dominant part of the housing co-operative.

Program after program, housing for people of Indian ancestry, rural housing assistance, neighborhood improvement are all Federal programs that the Provincial Government pays its 25 per cent basically to get 75 per cent federal money.

We look at the land assembly. I think that the Minister opposite will remember statements made by the former housing Minister about how he was always crying to Ottawa because they needed more money and there were not adequate grants for land assembly. Most of the land assembly around the city of Regina was done by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The land was subsequently bought by the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation after last summer. As a bit of an aside, it is very interesting to note that prior to the cancellation of the Westridge sub-division by the Government opposite, it had purchased most of the land assembly from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the city of Regina has no alternative now but to grow in the direction where the land is owned by the Government of Saskatchewan. I think there was a slight conflict of interest in the cancellation of the Westridge sub-division. I am sure the Minister will have some comments denying that particular allegation, either a conflict of interest or a very strange coincidence, one of the two.

We go into the matter of rental accommodation. The lack of rental accommodation is so severe in the Province of Saskatchewan that for all practical purposes there is no rental accommodation available to the people. What has the Government opposite done about it? Obviously nothing. There was an opportunity in the rental control legislation to come out with a positive indication from the Minister in charge of that particular Bill of what the Government is going to do to encourage rental accommodation. Nothing was said, new rental accommodation was exempt from rent controls, but the lack of rental accommodation existed before the imposition of the rental control legislation so I don't think that is going to be effective. I think the Members opposite will agree that the exemption will not be effective in creating new rental accommodation. I think in reality there is nothing.

We have urged the Government of Saskatchewan to give tax credits to private developers as the Federal Government has done to encourage the construction of apartment buildings and rental

accommodations. We think that that would be a positive approach by the Government, there is no reason why the Government opposite cannot come out with an apartment assistance program like the Federal Government. There is no reason why the Government opposite cannot give mortgage subsidies to private developers to encourage them to go into rental accommodation, no reason whatsoever other than the misplaced priorities of the Government opposite.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that tragedy exists in the province of Saskatchewan, because by constitutional law this is within the jurisdiction of the Province of Saskatchewan and yet the initiative for new housing in this province has come from the Federal Government because the Government opposite has failed to show any imagination, any initiative and any concrete suggestions to solve the rental accommodation crisis and has failed to take any action to expand the number of new housing starts in the province. As I said, you can take credit as you are wont to do of the record number of housing starts. You can slice that matter any way you want, the true facts are that only 20 per cent of those new housing starts had any participation by the Government opposite, by the record set out in the Annual Report of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation.

We heard an awful lot of talk prior to the last election about the Saskatchewan option, the only option in housing in Saskatchewan is whether the Government opposite decides to enter into a program because the Federal Government pays 75 per cent or the option not to participate in the program. There is no option of the Government opposite to as I say show some initiative to develop its own program to encourage new housing starts. I think that the Government opposite is to be soundly condemned for its failure to take any action whatsoever to solve the rental accommodation crisis in the Province of Saskatchewan.

In fact, the Government has deterred new rental accommodation by its threat to go into government constructed apartment buildings, to set up its own construction company. The failure to add to a rent control program incentives and tax credits to private developers was a threat to them and failed to give the necessary encouragement to the private sector to build rental accommodations. I think it is time that the Government opposite quit riding on the coattails of the Federal Government when it comes to housing and rental accommodation. I think it is about time that the Government opposite showed some leadership and initiative to solve the rental and housing crisis in the Province of Saskatchewan, a crisis which is solely within the jurisdiction of the Province of Saskatchewan by constitution.

I think that many of the backbenchers will join with me when I say that I think the Government opposite is showing some pretty warped priorities when it's prepared to sink \$1 billion into the potash industry without one new job to take over, out of a fit of pique and refused to give one red cent to solving the rental accommodation crisis in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) this Resolution.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, quite obviously I would be more lengthy than the 30 seconds allotted to me. It takes that long for me to gargle my throat in the morning. I wonder if I might call it 12:30.

The Assembly recessed until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 36 — TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO BUY WESTERN CANADIAN BEEF

Mr. E. Anderson (Shaunavon) moved, seconded by Mr. McMillan (Kindersley):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to encourage wholesale and retail meat outlets in Saskatchewan and meat consumers in Saskatchewan to buy western Canadian beef in preference to lower quality Australian and New Zealand beef.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this Resolution encouraging the Saskatchewan Government to put on an advertising program to encourage the consumers of this province, both the people who consume meat out of the meat markets and the wholesale retail chains to use Saskatchewan beef rather than the Australian and New Zealand beef. The merit would be that a lot of the consumers of this province do not realize the high proportion of offshore beef coming from Australia and New Zealand that is being used in the hamburger trade and in the various steak house chains. A larger portion of the steaks used in the steak house chains and a large proportion of the hamburger used in hamburger chains, and in the general retail meat trade, is made up of offshore beef.

This beef is of a lower grade standard than the beef that comes off our markets because our grain fed beef usually grades out at a higher actual quality coarseness and fat cover. I think it is not realized how heavy the pressure on the prices of our domestic producers is by the large amount of imported offshore beef. Right now there is quite a trade going into the United States of cull cows. There is quite a trade coming on the market of cull cows, as herds are culled and even reduced in view of the lower prices. This is the market that the Australian beef competes with. This competition therefore has a doubly bad effect on our producers at this time, because if this price on the cull cows were a bit higher we'd have more of the producers right now culling the herds which is a very necessary thing in this time of increased production in common herds. By holding back for heifer calves which would then come on into production, two to three years from now when we would need the increased beef. So I do believe that if we could put on an advertising program to get our consumers to realize this, to keep our cow kill a little higher right now and still hold back in our calf crop to make up the cycle when we need it.

The Australian imports came at a very bad time for oil companies raised their prices of oil and thus they forced countries which were very large importers of beef, especially from Australia and New Zealand to cut their imports from these

countries.

For instance, Japan, a large user of Australian beef virtually closed their borders for a 12-month period to imports of beef to save their foreign exchange to buy needed energy reserves. Italy, which was a large importer of both beef and petroleum products, closed her borders, or virtually took her buyers off the markets for beef and this surplus beef had to go somewhere. Where did it go? It started to pour into our North American market and help to further depress our prices at that time. They still have a depressing effect although the imports are down over this period of the last few months.

To illustrate the impact upon our beef prices that Australian beef imports do have, or did have, I should like to go back and trace the history or the off-loading, of Australia to Canada of beef and veal in metric tons for 1973, 1974 and 1975.

In January of 1973 you must realize that these loadings come in six weeks shipping time for them to get here, was 1,069 metric tons of beef and veal, loaded from Australia and New Zealand. That off-loading has jumped in the following of January to 1,407 metric tons and in 1975 to 1,878 metric tons. When we go back to February, 1973, we find that there was virtually no off-loading of Australian beef destined for Canada, but when you go to 1974 you find that in the year from 1973 to 1974 from a nil tonnage you come to 1,523 metric tons. Surely, you will agree with me that this must have quite an effect on our market, especially on the market where we are trying to sell culled cows, when in a two-year period from February, 1973 to February, 1975 you go from nil or no off-loadings to over 2,600 metric tons of Australian beef imported.

You go to March, 1973, you will find that there was no beef imported from Australia; in 1974 this came up to 656 metric tons and in March of last year it came up at 3,593 metric tons, which again is a substantial increase in imports in a two-year period for a market or a country of our size to absorb, from nil off-loadings to over 3,500 metric tons. The same is true for April 1973, no beef was imported and in 1974 this had jumped to 942 metric tons; in 1975 to 2,290 metric tons. In March, 1973, nil off-loading; in 1974 - 1,459 metric tons to 1,825 metric tons today.

This decline of beef prices began in 1973 with monthly increases of imported beef from Australia and New Zealand. Nil before July; July - 2,111 metric tons; August - 3,105; September - 2,814; October - 3,722; November - 4,498 and December, 1973 - 3,740 metric tons. This rise came at a time when our calf run and yearling run is on the market and when our cull cows are coming on the market and it proved at that time to be disastrous.

I think we could have probably survived a small import of that type of beef if it had been slackening off, but it didn't. It is still holding up and I think that we would be foolish to believe that it is going to slacken off in the next year. The European Common Market, Australia and New Zealand are in a surplus condition of beef production right now and there is no indication that this continual rise in beef production can even be reversed in 1976 or 1977.

It is interesting to note that the Australian marketing board has been making every effort to cut their production, cut back on production, and yet with the calf crop coming this year in Australia there is going to be a one million calf surplus over last year. So their buildup is increasing and our buildup hasn't started to decline, but they are increasing at a much faster rate, although it looks as though Japan has started to ease their import restrictions on beef and that will take some pressure off. Italy yet is still in a foreign exchange position problem so that, even if she wanted to import beef, she just hasn't got the spare foreign exchange to do it. The European market is flooded with beef. There is no place to put it there. England is a member of the Common Market now and it is very difficult to push the beef into there, so it is going to have to come onto our North American market.

One of our problems too is that we are running into the end of our global quota system terminated as of December 31st and that quota system that we had against imports was 125 million metric tons, or 85,000 live cattle per year, which we allocated to beef producing countries on a past performance quota. Now this has expired and a new one will have to be negotiated this year and there is going to be a lot of pressure from the Australia-New Zealand countries to ask for a higher export of beef.

We have another problem, that it is not possible to say that we will put an import restriction on the Australian beef because Americans have left on their legislation, their old traditional legislation, that allows them to put an import quota against us. They have removed the quota, but they have not removed the legislation. If we put a quota against Australian beef that surplus that is in transit will turn to the United States. The United States then can impose a quota that is still on the books that, by presidential proclamation has been, you might say, put in abeyance, but it is still there.

The sad part is that our quota of beef exports to the United States, our traditional one, ran out on November, 1975 and the quota ran from August, 1975 to August, 1976. We now have it filled. If we put a restriction against Australian beef, we automatically leave the United States to impose that restriction, which would virtually close their borders. Bang, you can't do anything about it. So rather than ask for something which is impossible to achieve, a quota system or something against Australian beef, I think the best we can hope to do is to make the consumer aware that when she goes to the market or to a chain store, ask the people that you are dealing with, are you serving me off-shore Australian beef, is that what you are serving me, or are you serving Saskatchewan beef? Because not only is the quality better, I think that if the program were put out to the consumer, if they would concentrate on Saskatchewan beef now we would probably avert a shortage that will show up in a couple of years and make beef much higher at that time. By that time if the economies of Japan and Italy improve and Australia goes back to its traditional markets we will be in short supply of beef if we cut back our herds too much. And in keeping the prices for the cattle up, matured cows, we can take the calves off the market that would come on the market next fall and yet in doing this I am quite sure that most of the producers who sell cows will be keeping heifer calves which will then come on stream

Therefore, I would hope that we could receive support for the Resolution, asking Saskatchewan people if they could

institute an advertising plan, state this position to the consumers in the province. I would hope that it would do some good to alleviate the problem for the producers in the province and in the future prevent an undue shortage and a very high price.

I should like to move this Motion, seconded by the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. N. Shillington (Minister of Co-operation): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this. I think it is regrettable that the Conservative caucus did not go forward with the Resolution No. 32, because I think the two are intertwined to some extent.

It is interesting that the beef producers are all in favor of a free market when it comes to marketing boards but not in favor of a free market when it comes to things like import quotas, encouraging the use of Saskatchewan beef. It just goes to prove to me that nobody really believes in free enterprise or free markets as such. What they believe in is the freedom to seek the best advantage for themselves. As I said, I don't think the two can be discussed separately. I am sure that the Hon. Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) would have, and has given us a speech on the necessity of leaving the beef producers free of any sort of a marketing board. I am equally sure that the Member for Thunder Creek, on this Resolution, will, in due course, tell us the necessity of government action to save beef producers.

I guess what they are doing is talking about socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. As I say, the two are really intertwined and I should like to deal with Resolution No. 32 just very briefly and I'll make the connection within the two, although I think it is obvious to most Members of the House.

The Prime Minister in his Christmas address, or somewhere close to Christmas, spoke of what I think is a new economic order and I think that the old order is dead and is dying and I believe what the Prime Minister is saying, that the increase in oil prices, inflation, shortages of natural resources, unemployment, the problems which beef producers face, are not the signs of a world gone mad, they are part of a developing pattern. I believe what he was saying was that we live in a time of fundamental economic change. And if anyone in this decade really believes . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think the tradition in this House for the past two months has been one of speaking clearly and concisely to the Motion which is at hand and I fail to see the relevancy to Australia and New Zealand beef and the Prime Minister's speech and I would ask you to call the Minister to order.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that all Members are aware of that and I am sure that all Members will aid me by practising that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — What the Prime Minister was saying, of course, was that there is going to be an increasing involvement of the Government in the business community and in marketing. That is not only true for wage earners who are going to find their right of free collective bargaining restricted, it is also true of businessmen who are going to find their right to do as they please in the business community restricted.

It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Members opposite were as silent as the very hills when the anti-inflation program was brought in and the wage earners pointed out that their freedom was being restricted to bargain collectively. Now that the Chambers of Commerce have wakened up and found out that the anti-inflation program affects them as well . . .

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — On a Point of Order please. Would he please stay to the Motion that is on the floor.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I didn't get the Point of Order.

Mr. Katzman: — He is not speaking to the Motion.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, if the Member for Regina Centre is speaking to Resolution No. 36 . . .

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, asking the Member to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I knew it, but I wanted the Member for Regina Centre to assure the House that he was speaking on that and intended to relate his remarks to the Resolution.

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I understand and you will correct me if I am wrong, that once a Motion has been placed on the Order Paper and the Motion has been stood, I understand that if there is any further discussion on that particular Motion it then must wait, of course, until the next Private Members' day. What the Member is now doing, of course, is speaking on Motion No. 3 (Resolution No. 32), the Motion under discussion is Mr. Anderson's Motion No. 4 (Resolution No. 36).

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. What I am doing is developing the background for Resolution No. 36 and as I pointed out earlier it is not unrelated to Resolution No. 32. It is just coincidence the two happen to come together. But what I am doing is to develop a background for Resolution No. 36. I think that the Prime Minister comments . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I assume that the Member is in fact dealing with Resolution No. 36 and he says that he is. I can only at this time take his word that he is developing background for his remarks.

Mr. Shillington: — This is my first Session in the House and I assume by what has gone on, Mr. Speaker, in this House, that Members are allowed quite a lot of liberty in developing background.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, something like 40 days and 40 nights. It is interesting that the Members opposite are as silent as can be when working people complain that their freedom is restricted. When the Chambers of Commerce wake up and find out that their freedoms are restricted then all of a sudden the Conservative caucus comes to life. I, frankly, was not convinced that there was a lot of life in the Conservative caucus but I guess when the interests of the Chambers of Commerce and the businessmen are concerned we find a little life breathed into the Conservative caucus. The general place of the Government in the world of the farming business, I think, is going to increase as time goes on. I think that we do not disagree with the goals which the Hon. Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Anderson) seeks to attain. We certainly don't have any quarrel with the involvement of the Government in the beef industry to attempt to encourage more consumption of Saskatchewan beef.

An. Hon. Member: — The Liberals . . .

Mr. Shillington: — That's right. The Hon. Members opposite clearly seem to believe in that sort of an approach. I want to go on to point out to the Hon. Member for Shaunavon that there may be some problems with encouraging Saskatchewan consumers to consume Saskatchewan beef. He talked about quotas and he talked about public statements and it wasn't entirely clear to me exactly what he expected the Government to do to encourage consumption of Saskatchewan beef.

Let me make a few comments. The free market economy which I assume the Members opposite are concerned about in light of Mr. Trudeau's statement is operating in the beef trade in Saskatchewan and it doesn't provide a mechanism for identifying western beef. The present market system doesn't identify the beef by its point of origin and it would be difficult in the current structure . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — The Hon. Members opposite are very interested in what I am saying and that certainly pleases me. I know that they will all be in the debate later on and all contributing to the understanding of this problem. Due to the lack of compulsory labelling of all meats as to the source of origin of the Canadian orders for beef, the Government can only encourage the buying of western beef by public statements to consumers.

If the Members opposite are suggesting that we do something more than simply make public statements, (I assume they want something more than that), then I suggest that there must be some change in the manner in which beef is labelled when it comes into the province.

Tariff and trade restrictions have significant implications

for trade and for the beef industry. Border restrictions may not always be in the best interest of the beef producers, complete isolation from world markets may encourage inefficiencies in our beef production. Governments must recognize and I think this House must recognize that short of complete isolation from the beef market the consumers and the wholesales and the grain traders will respond to the price changes faster. I should point out to all Members and I am sure the Hon. Member for Shaunavon is aware of this, consumers have a very direct interest in how we encourage the consumption of western beef. If indeed the beef that comes from the southern hemisphere is cheaper, the consumers of Saskatchewan obviously have an interest in precisely what form the encouragement takes. If it takes an appeal to your sense of nationalism and "buy Saskatchewan", I guess that's one thing, but if the encouragement takes any other form then it might mean the consumers' interests are adequately protected.

Mr. Speaker, I have further comments I should like to make in a further debate and I should like to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 37 — RECENT PURCHASE OF CONSUMERS OIL LIMITED, CALGARY

Mr. A.N. McMillan (Kindersley) moved, seconded by Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to instruct the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to provide full particulars with respect to its recent purchase of Consumers Oil Limited, Calgary.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution has been placed on the Order Paper for obvious reasons. I think all Members of the House are aware that I asked a question during Question Period the other day requesting information from the Government that I felt was of an urgent nature and that was information that would lead me to have a little more understanding of the events surrounding the purchase of Consumers Oil. That information was denied me. The Minister involved, I believe, suggested or intoned that it wouldn't be in the public interest to receive it. As the Opposition is in this position as well with the potash debate, we don't have enough information to make a decision on behalf of the majority of this province as to whether or not this Government is acting in their best interests. We have been asking for information for 30 some days in the Legislature regarding the potash question and this Government refuses to give us any. We have now taken another major step in the petroleum field in the purchase of Consumers Oil Limited of Calgary, and again we asked for information that might shed a little light on the events surrounding this purchase. The Government has again denied us this information.

Now, I should like to discuss the purchase of Consumers Oil for a few minutes and try and outline here the position that the people of Saskatchewan are in as far as this purchase goes. And I want you to sit there and compare this when I speak because I think you will find that it is a particularly uncomfortable

position at best for the people to be in. They have to look on this purchase and the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Power Corporation has stated that it is a necessary purchase, well, they have to ask themselves that question. No government is going to be right all the time and on every major question of policy there are people in this province that question that Government's ability to make proper decisions and so it is the case in the purchase of Consumers Oil.

Now people ask themselves two questions regarding the purchase of Consumers Oil. The first one is, is that purchase necessary?

Mr. Romanow: — . . . long time ago for a song.

Mr. McMillan: — It must have been a long time ago, Mr. Attorney General, and I look forward to you entering this debate on your feet rather than on your butt. Now the people ask themselves is it necessary and it may in fact be necessary. It is indeed an honorable approach to take to assure people in Saskatchewan that they have a long-term supply of natural gas. No one in this province would argue that point with you.

Mr. Romanow: — Why did you sell the Hatton Mine Field then?

Mr. McMillan: — If you would quit interrupting me, Mr. Attorney General . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McMillan: — The people are asking the question, was this purchase necessary? And under some circumstances it may have been necessary. It may have been necessary if all methods for extracting natural gas out of Saskatchewan soil had been exhausted. Apparently the Minister in charge of SPC and the Government opposite believe that's true. What they are admitting, if they say that there is no more natural gas that can be developed in Saskatchewan for people of this province at a reasonable price, what they are suggesting is that all potential gas in this province has been discovered and proven. I don't think that is the case. I know the people in the petroleum industry don't think that is the case and they are the experts.

However, let's operate on the assumption that that was the case. This Government has gone and moved into reserves of natural gas and petroleum outside the province and as I say, if in fact all petroleum reserves in Saskatchewan had been proven and we were well aware of the situation we were in, then that move may have been understandable. We are aware that they will be creating jobs in exploration outside Saskatchewan, spending I suspect millions of dollars outside the province.

An. Hon. Member: — . . . couldn't be better spent!

Mr. McMillan: — I hope you are right, that that money couldn't be better spent in this province, because if you are not right you have made a serious mistake. You haven't to this date given us the information to make that decision and that was some of the

information we asked for. Give us the information that told you that it was necessary to move outside of our borders to search for natural gas and to buy reserves. That is the first question people ask and they don't have that information.

The second question they ask, I think, is just as natural and that is, is it a good deal or not and that question is being asked more and more often in these last four years and particularly since the purchase of Intercontinental Packers. The people of this province are of the consensus that you made a bad business deal there, maybe your intentions were good, I don't question that. Maybe in fact, as the Minister suggested earlier today, that Intercon would have fled the province had it not been for the Government's intervention. I doubt that, no one ever proved that to us. They are suspect about the kind of deals that this Government gets in because you have a poor track record. You are naturally suspect about this deal with Consumers Oil and I think legitimately so, so the second question they ask themselves and they want to ask this Government is, is this a good business deal. And I'll tell you something, on the information that you have provided the official Opposition with, those of us who represent 60 per cent of the population of this province, the Liberal and Tory Opposition, on the basis of the information that you have provided us, this is a bad deal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McMillan: — Now I have talked to people in the petroleum industry, I have talked to people in Sask Power and they assure me that it is indeed a good deal and I don't have enough information to disagree with them on that and I hope that if I did have the information that I wouldn't have to disagree with them. But the people of this province can't make that decision. They don't know if it is a good deal or a bad deal. All they can see is what is on the surface. They see that this Government has purchased 56 billion cubic feet of proven gas, a six month's supply for the Province of Saskatchewan, for \$10 million. That is proven recoverable gas. In order to recover that gas for the use of the people of this province a good deal more money is going to have to be spent. So in fact, to buy 56 billion feet of recoverable gas we may in the long run spend many tens of millions of dollars. And in that light alone this is a bad business deal. You have to set up compressing stations and draw that gas out of that gas field. If you intend to run it into the Trans-Canada Pipeline you have to build compressing stations to take it up to 900 pounds in order to put it in the Trans-Canada Pipeline. I can only assume because that is a tremendous cost that you are going to develop your own pipeline, and we have heard that intimated. Laying a pipeline and compressor stations along that field is a tremendous cost. And if we are spending this kind of money only to recover 56 billion cubic feet of gas, a six-month's supply in this province, it's a bad deal. Now I suggest that the people I talked to in Sask Power and the petroleum industry say, well, we hear it's a good deal. But I want to know why. Give us that information. If there is more gas in that field and I suspect there had better be, tell us how much more gas.

The Minister intones that there may be a thirty year supply of gas there. I want to know on what you based your decision. We have that right as the Opposition. This is no different, this entire situation, than the people of Saskatchewan saying to the

Government or one individual saying to another, I need transportation, I haven't got the time or you are the expert in this field, why don't you go out and buy me a car and they give him a blank cheque. You go out and you go to somebody and I have suspicions that this somebody was an excellent salesman, but you went out and you bought a car and you brought it back and these people went out to look at this great car that you spent \$10 million for and it looked like a wreck. Shabby. And that's the kind of information I get about the kind of wellhead equipment and the surface assets you bought from Consumers Oil. That the equipment is shabby. The cementers that have worked on those wellheads in the Loverna and North Hoosier areas tell me the assets are shabby. It is no different than this person going out and looking at that car that you bought on their behalf for a sizeable sum and they see a piece of rusted out junk. Now they say to you, what have you done to us? This looks like a piece of junk, it looks like a bad deal and what does the Government say, no, no, no, trust us, we are never wrong. This is a good deal. And the public says, well tell us why it's a good deal. Let us in on it. Maybe it's got a nice engine in it. But the Government says, oh no, I'm sorry, we don't want to lift the hood, it's not in the public interest. Maybe its only got first gear in a great big standard transmission and they say let's see, let's have a look at the car. And the Government says, no, no, I'm sorry, it's not in the public interest. We are going to have to wait how many years in this province to find out if this is a good deal or a bad deal?

That kind of information I suggest to you, if you were dealing with your neighbor on that basis in buying a car, you would not accept that and there is no reason why the people of Saskatchewan have to accept your posture on this question. You've refused to provide us with the information. Now, I don't know if you are going to have a change of heart in the near future or not. We have a gas field here that to the best of my knowledge, part of it, the average producing well is 180,000 cubic feet a day. That's poor, that's shabby, that's rust, a piece of junk, and I understand that the wellhead equipment that is used to pump that is shabby. That's not a good deal right there. I suspect, and I am told by Sask Power and other people that it is a good deal, so there must be more than that. There has to be more than the equipment you have bought. There has to be more than that 56 billion cubic feet of potential recoverable gas. We want to know that. I asked you if you would tell me who did the independent surveys, that told you that this was a good business deal, that there was potential there. We asked for the last financial statement of the company to show that this company at least in its own right operated at a reasonable level. You refused that information for us. No different than if you refused to lift the hood on the car that you bought for somebody. What have you got to hide? Maybe there is no engine under that hood at all. The people of Saskatchewan don't know that. Maybe we have only purchased 56 billion cubic feet of gas and shabby assets for \$10 million. We have the right as representatives of the people in this province to get that information. I tried on their behalf in Question Period to get that information and you refused it to us. I am trying here again by standing on my feet and urging you to supply us with that information and I hope that you don't refuse us the next time. If you don't have anything to hide lay that information before us.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members of this House will

consider the right to this information as a right of the people of this province. I suspect the vast majority of Members in this House would prefer to operate with a clear conscience. I would urge them and I would expect them to support the Motion. I therefore, move this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in seconding the Resolution and I advise the Minister now that I don't intend to adjourn the debate and certainly I expect we will hear from the Minister and indeed I have some specific inquiries to the Minister.

What the Government suggests to us from time to time both in the potash debate and when they deal particularly with Sask Power transactions is that so much is not within the public interest for the Opposition or the public to know. I wonder indeed when we review the Consumer Gas purchase if the three standout occasions, the three important ingredients that the Minister didn't communicate to the House, aren't of interest both to this House and his reason for not communicating them.

First, when I asked why the Consumers Oil deal had gone through in mid-December, asked why that wasn't announced, his reaction and perhaps quite logically so, was that the deal was that it would be announced in early January. I might well be able to accept that. Except that when the Minister did announce the deal in early January, how did he announce it? Did he announce it in this House, knowing that it was a large deal, an interprovincial deal, a deal involving three provinces, something about which this side of the House might well have had some thoughts? No, he announced it instead through a Press release. He announced it in such a way and at such a time that there was no opportunity for the Opposition to question him about it and no opportunity for the people of the province to be given an opportunity to judge the value of the deal or not.

When he did announce the deal, he held back the BC portion of the acquisition. Held back that there is a three per cent gross override in the Grizzly Field. A portion of the purchase which I'm advised is worth something in the neighborhood of \$3 million. On this side of the House we were convinced until that came to light that it was a terrible deal. Now, we suspect it may not be a good deal, but at that time we thought it was awful. We then discovered that there were British Columbia holdings of which we had no knowledge. Not a very candid open way to present matters either to the Press or to this House.

Then, lastly, the Minister wasn't here yesterday. Yesterday, I asked about a pipeline that has to be constructed. We don't yet know the length of the pipeline, where it is going. We know that there is an application to service central Saskatchewan, we don't know the cost and we don't really know what the Government has in mind.

I leave it, Mr. Speaker, to you and to others to judge the candor of the Minister in presenting this transaction to the House in the way that he has. I think you have to look back to my submission, and I have a comment to make about it, to what I suggest is not a very candid approach of the Minister when I

was questioning him about some problems in the East Cantuar field, close to Swift Current. The same kind of process, it is like pulling teeth out of a squirming pig. Mr. Speaker, why is the Government, through Saskoil and through Sask Power putting such an emphasis on exploration outside of this province?

I have, for instance, the figures on oil and gas exploration in Saskatchewan for the last six or seven years, and every year it has gone down. I have the same figures for Alberta during the same tax years of the Federal Government and every year it has gone up. Indeed the Grizzly field which is 17,000 - 18,000 feet wasn't profitable until the price was changed, paid by an NDP Government in British Columbia, at 65 cents for a thousand cubic feet. Paid by that Government in its marketing agency. And I have said before to this House, there is an example of us not buying a product but in fact losing any right to control the produce that we produce.

I asked the Minister today, would we be going into the Territories and into the Dakotas? He indicated they might to into the Territories. I asked him again, does the Minister — I remind the Minister you haven't dealt with the question of the Dakotas. You haven't told us whether this Government will invest Saskatchewan Government money in the United States exploring. He didn't answer again. Then I asked another supplementary and again he didn't answer. Not, I suggest, a particularly candid approach and a particularly candid way of dealing with the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are three specific questions that I will be putting to the Minister when I conclude. Before I do that I wonder if the Minister might in his remarks tell us the direction that he expects for investment in this province with the great activity if you like of Sask Power in doing its own exploration. We already know that new gas in Alberta pays about 60 cents, that's net after royalties. We know that in British Columbia it is 65 cents, paid by an NDP Government there, when it set the price, and that is net again without royalties. While in Saskatchewan the price is about 22 cents and after royalties it is 10 cents or 11 cents, making it impossible financially for any exploration to go on in this province.

If the Government proposes to continue in the way that it has with Consumers Gas and Many Islands, and that is what we are asking for is figures, asking to know the direction in which the Government is going, then I ask the Minister how you expect any private enterprise in gas and oil to continue in competition?

The last time that this kind of a situation arose, was about 1958 or 1957. It had to do with a utilities tax on shareholders, a tax on earnings of utilities companies in the Province of Alberta. What the Federal Government did on that occasion, was, they said, we will not tax the utilities' shareholders we will allow their development, their investment to go tax free. If that doesn't happen, if the Federal Government didn't back off in dealing with all oil and gas and I suggest that there is no possibility that they will, then only two options are available. Either the oil and gas industry will be completely destroyed and the figures show that it is certainly on its last legs in this province, or secondly, the provincial government will have to accept and start to pay federal tax. It is part of the reason indeed that I was asking questions

today from the minister about Many Islands in a tax way.

I said I had three specific questions. First, I understand that your conversations with Don Getty, the Alberta Minister that took place three months ago. You told us that you believe you have the assurances of the Alberta Government that it will be possible to get the product out of Alberta. You have told us that you never even discussed it with the British Columbia Government. I can imagine the hue and cry of Members opposite if a Government from outside of Saskatchewan were investing money here without ever discussing it with you. But I am told that your discussions with Don Getty, the Minister in charge were three months ago. I wonder if the Minister would tell the House whether those discussions have been updated or whether the concerns that I have and the concerns expressed by Mr. Larter of the Conservative Party are legitimate concerns, concerns that the Opposition might well be placing before you.

Secondly, let me say and I suspect to an extent I am saying it almost to the Attorney General, whenever these kinds of questions are asked they hurl it back in our face, to ask them in Crown corporations. As the Attorney General well knows, but some of the Press may not know, to put this into Crown corporations would mean that it would not be open to discussion until April or May of 1977. If I am to get the kind of information that I suggest the people of the province are entitled to know about the East Cantuar field, that won't come up until April or May, 1977 in Crown corporations. As the House well knows Crown corporations only deal with the year under review. There is one exception, and that exception is that if a question is placed on the Order Paper and the Government then indicates that matter will go to Crown corporations, it may then be questioned in Crown corporations in that year. It would be possible if the Government allows it to happen. But I could, in Crown corporations debate, receive the information about the East Cantuar field and Members on this side could obtain the information that I suggest we are entitled to have about the Many Islands purchase and the pipeline and the whole Consumers Oil proposition.

I ask the Minister specifically about Don Getty. I secondly ask the Minister specifically, I will be placing questions on the Order Paper, asking for information about both of these matters, would the Minister now indicate to the House that you will, to facilitate those matters going into Crown corporations, direct that the answers go to Crown corporations? I can't put the matter before Crown corporations, only the Government can do so in this year. And I suggest that that would be the appropriate and fair thing to do for the open government that we hear so much about.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I had assumed up to the time that the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) moved the Resolution that all of the used car dealers were in British Columbia, but I found during his remarks in regard to the purchase of the Consumers Oil Limited, that he knows much more about automobiles than he does about gas and the exploration and development of gas fields. Had he taken the time, Mr. Speaker, to acquaint himself somewhat better in regard to gas, gas exploration and development, reserves and consumption in the prairies he wouldn't have shown his ignorance as he did in his brief remarks

in introducing his Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is strange that the only people we have heard comment about the Consumers Oil deal being a bad deal are the Members who sit to your left.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The general public, Mr. Speaker, and they may be excused because they may not be all that knowledgeable of what the transaction really means to Saskatchewan, but there is no opposition there. We go to the public sector that has some knowledge about gas and oil or to the media, take for example the Star-Phoenix, an article that the Attorney General just passed to me, indicating that the purchase has to be a very good one. Independent comments from the industry, not only in Saskatchewan but in Alberta, have given credit to Saskatchewan Power for having foresight in buying the reserves that Consumers Oil had. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Kindersley should also acquaint himself with the kind of deals that the Liberal Party and the former Liberal government of Saskatchewan made before he undertakes to criticize the deals that this Government is in the process of making before they have ever had an opportunity to prove themselves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I would suggest to the Member that he acquaint himself with the sale of the Snakehole Sodium Sulphate resource by the former Liberal Government. Surely the Member for Qu'Appelle can inform him of some of the background in regard to the sale of that resource for I believe the figure was 1 cent per ton, is that correct? One cent per ton, 200,000 tons of sodium sulphate that is now valued today, at, using the Attorney General's figures, \$17 per ton. If people want to know about bad deals in Saskatchewan, they only need to look at the deals that the Liberal Party made between 1964 to 1971. I would suggest that the Member for Kindersley, along with the other greenhorn Members that sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, look at . . . well the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) may have some better information in regard to the bad deals over some of the others, I am sure he is not going to bring them to the attention of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — But I suggest the new Members look into the performance of the Liberal government in its sale of Saskair. I suggest they become more acquainted with the deal that the Liberal government made or had going with Athabasca Pulp. I would most importantly, Mr. Speaker, suggest that before they start to talk about whether or not the purchase of Consumers Oil Limited was a bad deal for Saskatchewan or not, I would suggest that they acquaint themselves with the Hatton Gas Field sale.

The Member for Kindersley asked the question Mr. Speaker, do we not have sufficient gas in Saskatchewan? Well, if we are talking about a supply of gas for 25 to 30 years, I don't want to stop at this point in time to remind the Member

that I said that we were trying to obtain a 30 year supply, but I did not want that to be interpreted to mean that the Consumers' purchase would provide us with that supply. Certainly, it will not. It is only one step in obtaining an additional reserve of gas in order to obtain that 30 year supply.

He asked, do we have a sufficient supply in Saskatchewan? The answer to that is, No. And I think any informed person or persons in regard to gas knows that we don't have that kind of gas potential in Saskatchewan. We might have had that kind of gas, or at least we would have been closer to it, had not his former colleagues sold that Hatton Gas Field for a song some years ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — He talks about 55 billion cubic feet of gas, that was a pittance in comparison to the amount of gas that was sold in that sale, for no good reason whatsoever. That action of the former government, Mr. Speaker, has forced this Government to explore and develop outside of the Province of Saskatchewan in a more concentrated way, to try to recover some of those needless and senseless losses of the former Liberal government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to convey to the Members opposite that I have some extended remarks to make on this debate and I am therefore going to adjourn the debate so that I can answer with some precision some of the questions that not only the member for Kindersley advocates, but also the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant). But I want to say at this point in time that the Member for Wascana criticizes the Government for saying some of these concerns that he registers, or has registered, can be discussed better under Crown corporations. I say that in some instances, if it is of an immediate concern, he is probably right. Some of the answers and some of the debates should take place in the House. But as far as his track record is concerned in regard to some of the questions and some of the innuendoes that he has made in this House before the Orders of the Day, it would simply be ridiculous to try and answer them in this form. He mentions, for one, Mr. Speaker, the release of gas in the East Cantaur field. I don't think that any Member in the history of this House has undertaken to misinform the Members and the general public in regard to the seriousness of that outbreak of that natural gas.

And there was absolutely no immediate concern or emergent concern to debate that issue in the House, but the Member got up before the Orders of the Day, playing to the Press, trying to say that we were losing millions, perhaps billions of dollars in natural gas because of a release which has proven to be very minor when it was reviewed.

Now I am saying to that Member that if he wants to have some co-operation from Government Members then he should undertake to be sincere in the kinds of questions that he asks, because it will not take long for the general public to realize that it is simply nonsense that the Members opposite are referring to, when they try to illegitimately expose certain issues that are not in fact issues of concern within the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) and the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) have asked a number of questions and I assure them that I want to answer some of those questions, including the information that I believe, especially the Member for Kindersley needs, in regard to the Hatton Gas Fields sale and I think this is a most appropriate Resolution to do it under.

I also want to assure the Member for Regina Wascana that I shall answer his questions in regard to Mr. Getty and the Crown corporations and its intent to explore and develop outside of the Province of Saskatchewan. And I am going to adjourn debate so that I will have the opportunity to do that in a fuller way than I would by answering at this point in time.

But I do, briefly, want to respond in regard to the Member for Regina Wascana's reference to the meetings and discussions or correspondence that I had with Mr. Getty, Minister of Energy in the Province of Alberta. Yes, the last meeting that I had with him was some three months ago, but it was not to discuss specifically the purchase or the removal of gas from the Consumers Oil holdings. Certainly we were negotiating with Consumers Oil at that time. We were also discussing with Soquip and with Algas our partners in the Joint Ventures Limited program. We were also looking at exploration development in other areas, at other levels of activity in the Province of Alberta, so that the discussion was more general in regard to the receptiveness of the Alberta Government to the Province of Saskatchewan and its Crown corporation developing and exploring for gas and/or oil in the Province of Alberta.

I indicated to this House several days ago, before the Orders of the Day, that Mr. Getty on behalf of the Alberta Government, assured me that the province and its Crown corporations was most welcome to participate in the development of Alberta's resources.

I also inquired as to whether or not there would be any problems as to the exportation or the removal of gas, if and when it was found and proven in the Province of Alberta. And the Minister, again, assured me that if those Crown corporations that had activities that the province was responsible for and abided by the regulations of the province, there should be no problems in obtaining an export permit.

I don't want the Members opposite to assume that we have a guarantee, a carte blanche guarantee that we will be able to remove all gas that is developed in Alberta, because they have some guidelines, legitimate guidelines, legitimate criteria that all removers of gas and oil have to respect when they make application for those removal permits. And we respect those guidelines and those criteria and we believe that we will be able to live within them and make realistic applications which will allow the removal of gas from Alberta to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I said that I wanted to comment in some further detail in regard to this Resolution, so at this point in time I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, will the

Minister permit a question? The Minister, when we first talked about East Cantaur indicated that he wasn't sure that it was a Sask Power breakout at all. I wonder if the Minister would indicate how much money it cost Sask Power to pay for Gustafson Drilling to drill a relief well and how much it cost for Bata Petroleum to drill a relief well, and I understand two wells were drilled and I wonder if the Minister knows approximately how much they cost Sask Power?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I know approximately, but from past experience with the Member for Wascana, I think that I should give him the precise figure and I will do that at a later date, rather than give him an approximation.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 39 — ESTABLISH A STUDY WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES.

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana) moved, seconded by Miss Clifford (Wilkie):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to establish within the Department of Social Services a study to consider the policies and operation of those policies regarding; (a) adoption of children; (b) placement and removal of foster children; (c) aid and assistance to handicapped and retarded children either staying with their parents or not, and adults; and report the recommendations of that study to Members of this Assembly within nine months of the passage of this Resolution.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to this Resolution which concerns itself with some of the procedures of the Department of Social Services surrounding the adoption of children, the treatment of foster children and the approach of the Department to handicapped and retarded children. Part (c) of the Resolution asks the Department to look into the policies and operations of those policies regarding aid and assistance to handicapped children and in some ways that doesn't quite fit with parts (a) and (b), which concern themselves with the procedures surrounding the adoption of children and the placement and removal of foster children. But because the nature of the Resolution is to ask the Government to review its policies I hope the House might include two related areas of subject matter (a) and (b) with (c), although the matters, as I have said, aren't precisely on all fours with one another.

I, Mr. Speaker, will principally be raising areas of concern. Members, I suggest, must be made aware of the problems surrounding the Department's policy in these three areas.

The Resolution asks the Government to look in upon itself, to do an in-House study. I suggest there are none so blind as those who refuse to see and, frankly, within the Department of Social Services I get the impression that they justify the way they operate simply because that is the way it has been operating for many decades. The very inertia of departmental policies have tended to blind people within the Department who should know they are off the track. I suggest they should redefine their

goals and should be looking in these specific areas.

The area of concern about the way the Department handles the placement and removal of foster children is really a concern because there is an absence of, what I would call, fair and even justice. No rule of law exists within the Department. A different problem from the handicapped children problem, but with adopted children and with foster children my concern is that injustice is sometimes done and when it is done there is really no right of review.

The Doucette case surprised the whole province and I don't think that the message that we should have acquired from that case should be lost. No one realized, for instance, that there were no appeal procedures set up by the Department of Social Services, and there still aren't. If someone obtains a judgment against you for \$25 there is an appeal. If you get a driver's license assessment, an additional assessment on your driver's license, an appeal lies; if you are refused unemployment insurance, a couple of appeals lie. Even within the Department of Social Services itself if you are refused benefits, or you think the benefits are too low, two appeals lie. What I am saying is that within our system we have always believed that it is possible for a review board or a committee dealing with something to get off the track and make a wrong decision and that is the reason we have always relied on appeals. We have always said, not just in the courts but in most of our deals and in most of our government departments, that an appeal should lie in some way.

We believe within our administrative tribunals and certainly the Department of Social Services operates in that way sometime, that it is possible that errors can be committed by people making decisions and it may be that prejudice may lie. Then, lo and behold, along came the case of the Doucettes. It got a lot of publicity. Three foster children were living in Prince Albert. They had been with that family for a long, long time. They were taken from the family. The fact that they ended up in an American home and that the Americans then turned the children back, I don't think really matters. That would be going sort of to the specifics of the case and I don't think the specifics of the case are so vitally important.

The acting Minister at that time, I believe the Minister of Labour as I recall, the acting Minister at the time, chose not to meddle and he may have been wrong, but what we should do is remember that the Doucette case goes beyond the personal injustice that may or may not have been made out and it goes beyond because it demonstrates an injustice within the system, an injustice within the Department.

The committee studying the Doucette case, studying what to do with those children had spent eight months reviewing where they would send the three children, deciding what to do with the children without ever even talking to the Doucettes. They didn't ever even tell the Doucettes that they were considering taking the foster children from the home. So what will now be a shock to the province, it now comes to light that there is no provision in law and no provision in the policies of the Department to compel the committee in such a situation to talk with the people who are involved, in that case the Doucette family. The family wasn't consulted and there is no onus on the Department and no onus in law to force them to consult.

The Saskatoon region which decided the Doucette case, and I gather they said this when dealing with the Judge Hughes report. Judge Hughes report incidentally was then kept from this House. As far as I know no disclosure was ever given. It was buried, if you like. First the Government said of the Doucette case, if I wander a little from my notes, what they said was, don't worry about it as justice will be done. They will give it to a very well known and qualified judge. He is! And we will put some good people with him, and they were. And the report goes into the Department, and that was the end of it.

Mr. Snyder: — . . . a copy of which was sent to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Merchant: — I wasn't aware of that and I am pleased to be corrected.

The Saskatoon region, which decided the Doucette case, said that the Department occasionally invites the foster parents whose children are being discussed to meet with the Department; to meet with the committee, but that is the exception to the rule. And that is what the committee itself said. To the shock of the province over the Doucette case, it became apparent that there is no provision under The Family Services Act for an impartial hearing before a board or committee which would permit foster parents to present their case before foster children are removed from their home. There is no provision in the Act; no provision in law for them to answer allegations that may be made against them, and indeed they may not even know that allegations are being made against them.

The examples that I have gone into which allow an impartial review in every other area of government are almost endless, yet with the lives of children and the lives of the families who are so completely involved with those children, there is no review.

I know of a particular instance where the Department, after some years, this instance happened in the Lakeview constituency, came in and took a foster child, who had grown to three and a half years. No offer for adoption. Indeed, they refused the couple the option of adopting. It was a Regina case. The couple applied to adopt and they were refused. They had older children, the Department, perhaps for whatever reason, said that there are good families with younger children or no children at all and the Department refused to allow that adoption. No one ever knew — and that couple when I talked to them continued to be under the impression that some allegations may have been made about them. No one ever knew if things had been said about them. That is not information to which a couple is entitled. The woman in that case was so tormented by the problem that her mental health was damaged and she was receiving treatment because the doctors thought she might have a mental breakdown.

I know of another case in the Lakeview constituency, where the Department simply rolled in one day and took out three children without any notice. One child was 13 and had been in that home for over two years. They didn't have any other adopting family, they were just taking the children. They placed them in another home and I expect, and indeed I hope, that I will remember for the rest of my life, sitting in their home talking to the couple and being told of how the boy, who had

come out of his shell was going to school, the boy was taken from the home and put into another home and that shortly thereafter — they kept in touch with him and the boy would come over and visit them — that the boy shortly thereafter stopped going to school and started working in a service station. It probably ended any chance of following the usual course of action that leads to success and that is higher education or at least finishing his high school.

I don't know why those decisions are made. I don't know what was behind those decisions, but neither did the foster parents. They were not given an opportunity to defend their reputation before a committee; they were not allowed to meet the allegations which may have been made about them or even to make representations before the committee, which made such crucial decisions about their lives and the lives of the young people in their homes.

If the Department thinks that these people are fit to have the foster children in their home in the first place, at the very least the Department should believe that they are fit to make representation to the Department when any changes are going to be made with those children.

Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about foster parents. Unfortunately the same procedure applies to children in the homes of couples who propose to adopt and the problems in both areas are the same.

I assume, frankly, that the Department ordinarily acts properly. I assume that for adopted children and I assume that for foster children. I am sure that that is the case in the greatest majority of cases. I, indeed, doubt there is ever any intention to do wrong deliberately by the Department, but I suggest that inadvertently the Department may well be doing wrong and not hearing the foster parents or the adopting parents is a mistake. Again, as an example of the way the Department may act, I want to tell you a story of a particular couple who live in Gladmer Park in the constituency which I represent.

They had a girl by the name of Christine. The mother is 43, he is 40, neither of them drink nor smoke. As far as I can tell they are a good average family. They know that they can't have any children, they know that they are older than the age when one may ordinarily adopt, so they adopted a Métis child. It is harder I gather to find homes that will adopt Métis children. They were delighted to have the child. For whatever reason the Department came in and took the child away after some months. I forget how long it was, frankly. But it sticks in my mind that it was about 8 months.

Allegations had been made that they categorically denied. But the Department didn't discuss the allegations with them. They came in, they made a decision and they took the child. They, to this day, don't know specifically what those allegations were. The situation in that case was and indeed I believe continues to be most improper.

Again, as with the Doucette case, though the decision of the Department may have been wrong, the importance I suggest to this House was not that decision. The importance to this House was the direction in which the Department moves and the way in which the Department operates. What is important to this House

is that the Department acts without any controls either established by legislation or established within the Department as far as I am able to tell. They came in, they took the child, this couple had no right of review, didn't even have any right to be heard by the Department before the Department made its decision. Didn't have any right to present their case and have departmental officials hearing their matter to know what their side of the matter might be.

I stress the word right, because the Department, under a great deal of pressure after the fact purported to review the matter.

Now what did the Department do? First, and it is a legal phrase that perhaps the Attorney General will understand, but we had in that review called 'nemo judex' I believe, the same people reviewing after they had made the decision. A legal principle that says and it has existed two thousand years, that the same people can't review themselves, because even if they try they come in with a prejudice and a pre-determination. And that is what happened in that particular case.

Mr. Speaker, the Department, in dealing with that matter, ran what I choose to call and perhaps somewhat unfairly, a sort of kangaroo court of appeal. Kangaroo court, not because it was intended to run that way, I suggest, but here were the people who had already made the decision.

The second thing they did, I forget the Latin phrase for this principle, but they didn't allow them to be heard in advance but even on their re-hearing, they didn't allow them to have any advice of counsel, nor did they allow them on their re-hearing to have the accusations presented to them. What the re-hearing did was it heard the allegations that were to be raised against this particular couple, heard them in the absence of the couple, hearsay evidence at best, I suggest from a neighbor or whatever. They really didn't know what allegations they had to meet. Then they were brought into the room before the group that were to deal with the matter with sort of the flavor of the Spanish Inquisition, and then the Department questioned them about these allegations, and then the Department made a decision again. Of course, what was that decision? It was the same decision again. That particular couple went to the Ombudsman, but the Ombudsman had to tell them it was quite right. I have told them, the legal aid authorities have told them, that there is nothing in law that requires the Department, I don't overplay this, to deal justly with adopting parents. I don't say that they don't ordinarily deal justly with adopting parents, but using that phrase, in a legal sense. They don't have any duty either in law or by the procedures established by this House to grant any appeal and to go through any review.

I have a letter for instance dated July 18, from Mr. Charabin, the acting Deputy Minister of Social Services at that time regarding the particular matter. He said we will hold an appeal sometime. They pointed out that there was no appeal procedure. They don't know when there will be an appeal procedure. But as soon as they have an appeal procedure then the appeal will follow.

Of course, there is no appeal procedure to date. And that has been going on for 10 months. I don't believe that without some spurring from this House or from the Minister, that there

ever will be an appeal procedure within that Department unless some kind of pressures are created.

Mr. Charabin told me in that letter that they had decided that the couple wasn't suitable to adopt a child and they won't allow them to apply for another until they win the appeal. Then in the very same two paragraphs, the letter sort of reminiscent of the book, *Catch 22*, he told me that there was no appeal procedure.

I have been trying to do something to help that couple. I stress that the importance is not this specific case or any of the half dozen specific cases that I have presented, but the procedure of the Department. A procedure that I am sure grew up at a time when they said we have to deal in camera and we have to deal as quietly as we can.

I don't think that the Department will stop running this sort of star chamber hearings about foster children and adopted children, situations like the Gladmer Park example, and the Doucette case and the examples from Lakeview. I don't think they will stop unless there is some impetus from this House. These things come to the attention of Ministers, and come to the attention of Members and I dare say that all of you at one time or another in your travels have run into claims of injustice along these lines. But we tend to think that they are exceptions. What would be so heinous and so horrible for the Department to have some form of appropriate appeal to allow a fresh hearing or a re-hearing of these situations?

Mr. Speaker, I said that a secondary resolution would address itself to handicapped and retarded children. I say again that the areas are very different.

For handicapped and retarded children in general there is very little departmental aid. Very little, no in specific terms, but very, very little in relation to what is done in other jurisdictions. The Department interestingly enough can't take a handicapped or retarded child out of a home and put that child in an institution at \$400 or \$500 a month. The Department can't, under the way our system works, give \$100 a month to a family keeping the handicapped or retarded child in their home even where need lies. Here we have situations where families find that they cannot meet the added expense of a handicapped or retarded child. I am not saying there should be an allowance for handicapped or retarded children. But it is ridiculous that the Government is able to pay to break up a family but can't subsidize to keep a family together though they know that these children cause added expenses and they do require extra care and extra assistance. Particularly with retarded children as they grow older, they sometimes need more help and sometimes it can be relatively expensive.

This Resolution again asks the Government to look in upon itself in this area. In doing that I suggest that amongst other things the Government should be looking at Ontario which subsidizes the delivery of services to handicapped and retarded children in their homes and keeps them with their families in the community. The Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services provides a number of family support services for the mentally retarded and handicapped children and the parents of those children.

Four years ago that government decided that the development of community services would be less expensive and more appropriate than the institutional system. But we haven't made that jump. They have a number of programs. They have a day nursery program for children between the ages of two and five. There are 79 programs licensed under The Day Nurseries Act for retarded children in Ontario. Under that Act, from two to five, the Department pays 87 per cent of the fees or more if there is need, a minimum of 87 per cent of the cost. Once a child reaches five, and goes into the standard school system, the nursery system, then the child if there is need gets 100 per cent subsidy from the provincial government.

They have a system of developing centres with day attendants that they are working on. Children of school age up to the age of 18 who haven't been accepted in the school system and are not trainable, or children between the age of two or five who are profoundly retarded attend those centres. They can still stay in their homes while attending those centres, while those same types of children tend to become institutionalized under our system.

The fees under this system are subsidized by the government again 100 per cent. There are 14 such centres in the province at the present time. Up until four years ago, as now exists in Saskatchewan, those children almost always found themselves going into institutions. They have nine half day programs available for physically handicapped children. They provide homemaking and babysitting within limits to assist families who might otherwise become forced (and I think that is really what does happen), forced to allow their children to go into institutions because they find that they cannot meet the added financial responsibility of holding the child in their own home.

Ontario has some pilot projects and they include early infant stimulation. A program which tries to go in at a very young age before the child is two, almost from birth. Teach the family how to deal with a child from birth to age two. The objective is to reach the children at a young age to provide parents with information regarding simulation and training so that the children will grow up to be less seriously handicapped than they might otherwise have become. The province is working towards the integration of mentally retarded and handicapped children with normal children. Trying to develop regular programs with a component for retarded children. Their new buildings, 15 of their latest buildings in the last few years in Ontario have all been done close to or as a part of existing school buildings, or municipal nurseries so that the new buildings always go up in the same school yards, trying to bring those children within the system of all of the other children in the system.

Mr. Speaker, what can we learn from Ontario's leadership? I know full well that Ontario over the years has had money to spend that simply hasn't been available I suppose to the Province of Saskatchewan. But we have been shirking badly in this area. If Ontario is presenting a Cadillac program, we can do a lot better than we are doing now.

The program in Ontario, if you view it in its intent, seems to be more prescriptive than our system. It seems to be a system that tries to deal with the problems as individual

problems. I am afraid that our pattern and perhaps it was that way under the Liberals as well, but our pattern certainly now under this Government is to deal with them almost as numbers, and not to deal with them in the individual prescriptive way Ontario does. I think Ontario's lead is the lead we should be following.

But in Saskatchewan even such basic assistance as the assistance given to the Saskatchewan Council for Crippled Children and Adults to help with transportation in Regina seems to have been given by the Government almost grudgingly. The subsidy for instance was cut off for some period of time in 1975. A subsidy that I would have thought was almost automatically given. It was then renewed with pressure from a number of quarters, including pressure, I might mention from His Worship Mayor Baker. The province provides limited spending for special transportation of the handicapped in this province. It is better than nothing, but certainly not as good as it could be. I suggest that that cut-off in 1975 was indicative of the attitude of the Government.

Now what does the NDP say about the problem? And what does the NDP as a party say about what I am now saying to this House? That is the NDP party as opposed to the NDP Government. It always seems to me, and I review your policies fairly regularly, good ideas there from time to time, unlike the kind of rule that exists in the Liberal party when the Liberals in convention pass a position or a resolution, you will find that becomes a part of our policy and you will find that we have made good on our policies when we have had the opportunity to do so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Merchant: — That's not the way the NDP has operated. Here's a resolution, it wasn't the policy of the entire NDP party, which came out under the signature of the Hon. Ned Shillington in May, 1974:

Whereas adequate support of programs for parents who are caring for a handicapped child are not yet available under the Saskatchewan Act Respecting Family Services.

Whereas the program should meet such special needs as: (a) adequate income for all handicapped children and adults; (b) subsidized housekeeping services; (c) subsidized suitable transportation services for handicapped people of all ages; (d) effective rehabilitative and education programs for the seriously handicapped; (e) the availability of orthopedic shoes, prescriptions, vitamins and nutritional guidance, etc., at minimal costs; and whereas the lack of family support encourages parental rejection of handicapped children, be it resolved that the Government of Saskatchewan be respectfully urged to establish new and realistic support of programs which will encourage parents to maintain mentally and physically handicapped children in their own homes.

That is an NDP resolution. May, 1974, in the city of Regina. In the city of Regina. I said in my comments that it is not the policy of the entire NDP party. But I suggest to you that that is an example of saying to your people we are moving in that

direction. That is a good direction to move and it is a good thing to say to your people. But now I should like to see you moving a little further and taking the steps that you should be taking.

Now I have spoken in the House from time to time about the way the NDP seems to say one thing at one time and do another at another and this seems to me to be a classic example of inaction. This Resolution quite simply put and I don't oversell it and I don't want to press you into feeling as if you are in a corner, says look in at yourself. It says to the Department, look in, re-examine the direction in which it's going. It asks the Department to examine its priorities in these very narrow areas.

Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in moving, seconded by the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) this Resolution. I thank Members for their consideration and I hope that the Minister may consider these matters and that we may well hear from the Government in due course.

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) seems to have the unhappy faculty of taking a reasonable motion and presenting it in an abrasive and obnoxious fashion so that he virtually destroys what should be support for that particular motion.

I was rather surprised that at this point in time he chose to re-introduce in the public view the Doucette case which I think was a highly emotionally charged case which was I think a very sensitive one, one that embroiled people such as the Leader of the Opposition who, not being in possession of the facts, was prepared to take a public stance, only to find himself painted into a corner pretty badly after Judge Hughes' report was delivered up and which virtually vindicated the position of the Department.

I have a good deal of sympathy for some of the suggestions that are entertained in the Resolution which we are discussing. I think perhaps the Doucette case itself tended to bring to the fore some of the deficiencies in the adoption program. This was not only recognized by myself for that short period of time when I was Minister of Social Services following June 11th, it was acknowledged by the former Minister, Alex Taylor, who had put some wheels in motion for a review. He had given consideration at the same time to an appeal mechanism to overcome some of the complaints that have been expressed by the Member for Regina Wascana.

For him to suggest however, that somehow or another the Hughes report was delivered up and then hidden in some kind of an obscure corner is surely stretching a long bow, Mr. Speaker. If the Liberal party opposite should decide to caucus at some point in time they might discover that a copy of the Hughes report was delivered up, not only to the Leader of the Opposition, it was also delivered up to John G. Diefenbaker who also had injected himself into the matter.

The report itself was the basis for a news release that was presented, received I think a degree of prominence, both

in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix and the Leader-Post, if my memory serves me correctly.

As I said before it's a delicate, it's an emotional and a sensitive area and I think the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) will appreciate the fact that the Department of Social Services is always at a disadvantage in terms of attempting to protect themselves when unpopular measures such as the removal of foster children from foster parents is concerned. He will know, as do other Members I'm sure, that files, departmental files are confidential in nature. Accordingly to air these in public would be, I think, a feature that would be most unpalatable to most Members of this House.

I think it should be remembered and acknowledged that the Department of Social Services has over the last number of months been reviewing its policies and practices concerning the adoption of children and the placement and the removal of foster children. Because of the significant reduction in infants which are available for adoption a phenomenon has been noted, not only in Saskatchewan, but across the country. We have initiated a provincial waiting list system for applicant couples in order to ensure that applications are processed in orderly fashion and the waiting period is still about 30 months. I'm not sure whether that's a reasonable period of time but that's the current situation.

I think it should be acknowledged also that the Reach Program which was developed by the Department of Social Services, an outgrowth of the former program, the Adopt Indian Métis Program, was initiated a little over a year ago and I think it has to be said that that's proven to be relatively successful. Through this program we have seen a large number of hard to place children placed for adoption and these are youngsters who might otherwise have been without permanent placement.

I understand the Department is currently involved with other provinces in the establishment of what is referred to as a "national adoption desk" in order to arrange for correlating all of the information and disseminating information and co-ordinating adoption procedures as between different provincial jurisdictions. I think this will provide a greater scope for adoption and placement of children within our own country.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, while I was still the Minister of Social Services, a temporary moratorium was placed on the adoption of children outside of the country by what was referred to as the Arena Program. To give credit where it's due, this was a program, the Adoption Resource Exchange of North America was developed when the Minister of Social Services, Mr. MacDonald was still the Minister. A number of children were placed outside of the country during his term of office and the program was accelerated during later years, particularly in situations where family groups were difficult to place for adoption.

In regard to the removal and placement of foster children the Department established permanent planning committees in each region in September, 1975. The committees you may know are comprised of departmental personnel as well as representatives from the Foster Parents Association which has placed an invaluable part in this program.

Before a child is moved, the case is now reviewed by the committee so that the best plan possible will be realized for that child. The department's first consideration has to be for the welfare of the children who are placed for adoption. Included in this process has been the separation of permanent and temporary wards so that appropriate planning can be done in each particular case.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Department of Social Services a preliminary study has been done by Doctor Norman of the University of Saskatchewan which took place some time ago, concerning a special appeal mechanism. A committee has been structured to bring the report into implementation and this procedure will ensure that the rights of clients are thoroughly protected in their dealings with the department.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, before I beg leave to adjourn the debate, it should be noted that of the many children who are in care, a large number of them are of native ancestry and the Department of Social Services is working on a proposal to be negotiated with the Métis Society of Saskatchewan which would enable native people to begin to find their own resources and to be involved in direct services in planning for the placement of native children. There are some additional remarks that should be added in light of the remarks of the Member for Regina Wascana. I know that the Minister of Social Services has some comments that he wishes to add at a later date and accordingly I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RETURN NO. 21

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 21 showing:

- (1) The number of principals appointed to the Community Colleges that were previously (a) former NDP MLAs or MPs; (b) defeated NDP candidates, federal or provincial; (c) candidates who contested a nomination for the NDP provincially or federally; (d) known campaign workers for the NDP, provincially or federally, or both. (2) The annual salary for each.

Mr. J.L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, in picking up the debate on this particular Order for Return it is somewhat discouraging to look opposite and see any Member in any party who would introduce this type of an Order for Return. If we look at the actual Order and we realize the type of inference that's contained in that particular Order, I think that any Member with any honorable instinct whatsoever would think it's repugnant and disgraceful for this House.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if in fact this Order were completed and if it were ever possible to start a witch hunt which is contained in this Order, then you would see the individual people in this province driven underground, the ordinary civil servant who likes to participate in a parliamentary process

would be driven underground and these people then would not be able to assist in the democratic process in Saskatchewan.

Not too many years ago we had a party that used to go around this province and liked to find out if individuals had membership in a particular party and if those members did have that type of membership they could expect to be treated very shabbily and in fact many, many of them lost their jobs in that particular era of our history.

I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that not only by driving the people underground and probably putting them in a position of embarrassment, it would also create a system of fear in this province that has never been seen before. I'm also suggesting that that type of fear is not what we need in the democratic society and this type of Resolution and this type of Order is one of course, that is completely unnecessary and is one that is a disgrace and one that should never have been placed in this written form.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that this is a clear example of people who aren't prepared to treat the ordinary citizen of this province fairly. I am suggesting that we have no need for this type of an example in this province and I'm suggesting that we look at the ordinary Bill of Rights, both the Canadian Bill of Rights and also the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights and we shall realize that there is protection for people in this province; realize that people are entitled to protection for whatever belief they want and in reading the Bill of Rights, the Canadian Bill of Rights, and the Hon. Member for Rosetown-Elrose should be well familiar with the Bill of Rights that was drafted, it says in this Bill of Rights:

It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed, and shall continue to exist, without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, color, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely . . .

I won't bother the Legislative Assembly to read all of these, but the ones that are pertinent to this particular Resolution:

Freedom of assembly and association.

And freedom of the Press of course follows that one.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it clearly spells out that:

The Parliament of Canada affirming that the Canadian nation is founded upon principles (and by the looks of this Resolution there is very, very little principle involved there by the one who introduced it), upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions.

I hate to think, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member who introduced this Resolution had anything sinister or any motives behind that Resolution other than perhaps trying to bring some information out, but if I could find out what information would do any benefit to that Hon. Member and to his constituency then I might be able to accept what I see in front of me.

There is no question in my mind that this is a strict fascist type of a Resolution that will be well explained in the constituency that the Hon. Member comes from.

I'd also like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when we look at this Resolution and we see what it's asking for, the number of principals appointed to the Community Colleges who were previously former NDP MLAs or MPs, etc., etc., maybe we should go back not too long ago in fact, to May 8, 1975. On the stationery of the Eston-Elrose School Unit No. 33, Roy H. Bailey, Superintendent, the office number, the residence number, then beside it C.N. McClelland and the Secretary-Treasurer, the office number, the residence number. It's got the picture of the administrative building and it's dated. It's addressed as an open letter to the Saskatchewan Association of Human Rights. It's addressed to the Executive Secretary of that Association. I won't belabor the Legislative Assembly today to read all that letter, because really it's just about as red neck a letter as I have ever seen in all the time I've been around.

Mr. Larter: — On a Point of Order. There's a fire over on the other side of the House.

Mr. Skoberg: — In this letter addressed to the Saskatchewan Association of Human Rights it spells out — and I must first say that all candidates in the last election received a questionnaire on the Saskatchewan Association of Human Rights. It was up to the individual candidate to answer that if he so desired and this is the answer, of course, that we have before us, the Hon. Member who introduced this Resolution. After reading this letter, reading the Resolution, then I can understand why it was introduced. He says, "Dear Sir." I won't go into the preamble there is quite a bit here:

First and foremost you have owed the candidates an explanation as to the purpose of the organization and the source of funds on which it operates. Your questions are ambiguous and ridiculous and I have every reason to believe that your association deals under such a humanistic need, they have the right to conduct the survey, interpret the answers and issue Press statements which could be used as political blackmail.

Now even in this paragraph it indicates that the Hon. Member who is in the House now and the one who has signed himself as the district superintendent of education, wasn't even aware of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Association. Next paragraph:

I want to assure you that the people of my constituency . . .

Now he is a spokesman for his constituency and he hasn't been elected yet.

. . . are intelligent people . . .

And I agree with him because I know many people in that constituency.

. . . and are not in need of outside organizations infiltrating through the media, exercising political biases

January 9, 1976

and prejudice.

Another paragraph:

I happen to be a candidate who is pro-police. I firmly believe that you should be concerned with police rights.

I didn't know that they weren't concerned with police rights.

Who are you to suggest that your association should interfere with a judiciary and with a normal operation of our already over criticized police forces?

Another paragraph:

You asked several questions about tenant's rights and I find no questions dealing with the rights to own property and the right of an individual to protect his property and a right to take a small return on his work and his investment.

Another paragraph:

Your questionnaire made me sick. The intent and analogies which you can draw from this questionnaire prolongs that feeling.

Another one:

I am sick of commentators and . . . canonizing anarchists, revolutionaries and criminal rapists, while condemning law enforcement. I am sick of educational idealists who would like to turn our schools into ugly nightmares. I am sick of potsmoking entertainers deluging me with condemnation of society's moral standards. I am sick of cynical attitudes toward patriotism. I am sick of politicians with no backbone.

And brother, I can tell you if this Resolution goes, that individual Member has no backbone, Mr. Speaker, or I certainly don't understand what backbone is all about. And he continues:

I am sick of the dirty, the foul-mouthed, the unwashed . . .

And I would like to suggest that if we really use, and I mentioned this yesterday, one of the reports from the Hon. Member to his constituency, it is quite apparent that he isn't all that truthful in what he reports to his constituency. He continues:

I am sick of the decline of personal honesty and personal integrity.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, he signs this as "Roy H. Bailey, District Superintendent of Education:, and even see his secretary, it has E.M. behind it, the initials are E.M. He even had the secretary, the taxpayers who had paid for that secretary, even type out the letter for him to send back to the Saskatchewan Association of Human Rights. Mr. Speaker, when I look at this letter and I look at the letterhead and I look at this Resolution we have before us, I think there can be only one position that we could possibly take at this particular time.

Mr. Wiebe:— On a Point of Order, I am

just wondering if the Member for Moose Jaw North would permit a question at this time? Will you permit a question at the conclusion of your remarks?

Mr. Skoberg: — No, not after I adjourn. We believe that every Member in this House, in looking upon this Resolution, realizes in the type of a letter that has been written back to the Saskatchewan Association of Human Rights, realizes in all probability, I don't know how many questionnaires were sent out by this Association of Human Rights, realizing that they do try to do a job, they do try to protect people in this province from this type of a situation we have before us. We consider, Mr. Speaker, that we probably should, or I would like to see, at least, time given to this Resolution so that we can possibly send this type of a Resolution to the Saskatchewan Association of Human Rights in order to get their decision as to whether or not the individual human rights of these people here whom he is referring to would be protected at least, in some sense. It appears that in this Legislature we notice that the Liberal Party also stood up en masse the other day wanting to have an answer to this question so they are tainted just as badly as the Conservatives are tainted insofar as this Resolution is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I am going to work on a resolution, I now move to adjourn debate.

Motion to adjourn debate agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 30

Blakeney	Faris	Rolfes
Pepper	Robbins	Cowley
Thibault	MacMurchy	Tchorzewski
Bowerman	Mostoway	Matsalla
Smishek	Larson	Skoberg
Romanow	Whelan	Vickar
Messer	Kaeding	Koskie
Snyder	McNeill	Johnson
Byers	Feschuk	Thompson
Baker	Shillington	Banda

NAYS — 13

Lane	Clifford	Larter
Wiebe	Anderson	Bailey
Malone	Merchant	Ham
MacDonald	McMillan	Katzman
Cameron		

RETURN NO. 22

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Larter that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 22 showing:

The number of NDP candidates from June 11, 1975 Saskatchewan Provincial Election that now work for the Saskatchewan Government or a Saskatchewan Crown

Corporation: (a) their names and positions held; (b) the positions advertised; (c) the salary that accompanies each position.

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, before I get into speaking on this proposed motion by my colleague for Estevan (Mr. Larter), I should like to ask the House at this particular time to accept my apology for an earlier question which I directed to the Attorney General during the public Bills which were before the House. I did not intend to have the House become embroiled in a controversy again, I was simply seeking out a clarification and I apologize for the House getting into that particular situation.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I don't wish to impede any apologies that are felt should be given but I was not in the Chair when that happened and I would suggest that this is not the proper place to offer an apology if one is required. I just mention that in passing.

Mr. Bailey: — I am glad that the Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski) is asking the former Minister because in dealing with the question that has raised such a furor on that side of the House, and I would like to inform the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg), Mr. Speaker, that the innuendoes that he made in his presentation this afternoon . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Member for Moose Jaw North has not spoken on this Return which is before us. The Attorney General is the only person who has spoken.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Speaker, the relationship between the Return of my colleague for Estevan (Mr. Larter) as already pointed out by the Opposition are exactly the same thing, they have told me it is the same thing and this is why I was dealing with it in the same way. However, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out in putting this question on the Order Paper that I have no regrets whatsoever for my reputation of working in this province in education. I can assure the Members opposite and I am not breaking my elbow to pat my own back, but in 27 years in education in this province, and if any Hon. Member opposite wants to take any area whatsoever in which I have served and go to the people and ask them about my reputation, I should be very pleased to have it brought before this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the former Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) and I have worked under many Ministers of Education. I have a lot of confidence and I trust the Minister of Education a great deal. I know that the new Minister of Education who happens to be sitting right behind him has got some pretty big boots to fill, because the Hon. Member for Last Mountain-Touchwood did in fact do a fine job in his office. He made a few mistakes and that's true and

I have no doubt the new Minister will make a few mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, for the most of my life I was raised in the old Weyburn constituency. This was the former CCF Premier's constituency and I had a great deal of respect for the then CCF Party. I had a great deal of respect for the honesty and integrity of that party. And when I placed this question on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, and when my colleague placed a question on the Order Paper, we did it for one thing and one thing only. It was not to embarrass any Minister, it was not necessarily to embarrass the Government. These are the questions which are being asked out in the communities and we placed the question there, my friend for Estevan placed this question there, and we think that the people of Saskatchewan deserve an answer to these questions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to have taught when the larger school units or administrations were just coming in and nobody in this House, including my colleagues on this side or that side have perhaps the number of years to their credit in education. Mr. Speaker, I was appointed as Superintendent of Schools, there was no politics involved. Nobody in this province doubted that I was a strong Tory. I happened to get a position in what happened to be a really strong government constituency. It never entered into my employment. But, Mr. Speaker, what I am concerned about and I should like the new Minister of Education to listen very carefully to this. I am a strong supporter of local control in education. You can ask the former Minister of Education, he can probably tell his colleagues that the area that I served probably has the most input as my friend, Mr. Larter, in his question, the most input in local autonomy. Now when we ask these questions, Mr. Speaker, we are wondering why, why at this particular time that these appointments are made and in many cases appointments are made both in Mr. Larter's motion that is before us and yet, Mr. Speaker, we can't get any answer to the question. We got a lecture from the Attorney General and I am not saying that these questions are right, maybe we were wrong in doing so. But, Mr. Speaker, we are finding out information daily about the MLAs opposite who were defeated, they won. They won!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bailey: — And some of the MLAs who were elected, according to this article in the Leader-Post, they lost. They lost! Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps because we are new in the House and I make no apology for that, I have no particular axe to grind with any Member opposite. None whatsoever. None. Nobody can accuse me and nobody can accuse any person in the Conservative caucus that we are here to get somebody, that we are here to grind somebody up. We have not done it in the House up to this point and I can assure the Members opposite that we will not be doing it in the future. But in return for that, Mr. Speaker, I expect a little return in the way of a little bit of support and little bit of recognition because we, in this government over here, and what I heard this afternoon in return for my colleague's question, and my question and no doubt in return to his question, if any Member on that side of the House wants to play rough, I want to tell you right now that I am the boy that can play rough with you. And I want you to understand that. I have no intentions of doing so but just let another repetition of what happened this afternoon and you will have a rough Member of the

Opposition on your hands.

Mr. Speaker, we placed these questions on the Order Paper, we know what has been happening, we see these appointments being made, people out in the boondocks are asking questions. What happened to this person and, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of this province have a right to know this. They have a right to know in the case of my colleague's question on the Return No. 22. The number of candidates in the June, 1975 election who now work in the Saskatchewan Government. The Government need not be ashamed of that. This question, this type of question has been going on for years. They need not be ashamed of that, why not make it available to the public of Saskatchewan. It should be public information.

Why should this information be denied to the public? Well, there may be good reasons, Mr. Speaker, in the heated potash debate that has been going on for days. There may be good reason and I suspect maybe there is, if the Government Members want to withhold information from the Opposition. There was a question this afternoon in the House to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Messer) to give reasons for the information not being brought to the House. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why the Government that's followed after the pattern of the old CCF with their honesty and integrity, there is no reason for them not making this information available. It has nothing to do with a witch-hunt. We are not talking about hundreds of people, Mr. Speaker. Take a look at the Return of my Hon. Friend here for Estevan, it says, the number of NDP candidates. Surely, surely, Mr. Speaker, that with 38 people elected there would be no problem in making available to the people in this province the number of candidates who were favored with a position. I'm not even saying it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying it's wrong if they do it in British Columbia.

But what have they got to hide, Mr. Speaker. If I recall, Mr. Speaker, correctly and I have watched politics in this province for a long time, when the late Ross Thatcher's government I remember a very similar type of question, mind you it may not have been worded that way, but I remember a very similar question being asked by the then Opposition and the information, if I remember correctly, was given. So why all of a sudden now you want to label my friend for Estevan (Mr. Larter) or myself, for seeking to get information out to the people of Saskatchewan that they deserve, as if we were some kind of freaks or something?

Mr. Speaker, we have problems. Here is another quote from the Regina Leader-Post, I believe it is today where it says: "Keeping Job Necessary, MLAs Say". I can appreciate their position, Mr. Speaker. And it goes on in length to tell why these Members aren't in the House and as individuals I can feel for them. Nobody in the Conservative caucus started jabbing the Government because they weren't there. I am in exactly the same position, probably the worst position of any Member opposite, but I am here and I am here every day that I can possibly be here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this, we believe that the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know what happens in this province after an election. We are not talking about anything, as Mr. Larter has mentioned in his question, does not mention anything but the number of NDP candidates from June 11,

1975 provincial election that now work for the Saskatchewan Government or a Saskatchewan Crown corporation, the names and positions held; positions advertised; the salary that accompanies each position.

Surely the people of the province have a right to know that. I can't see any organization in this province, I can't see any reason whatsoever, be it the Liberals sitting on that side of the House; be it Conservatives sitting on that side of the House, that this information is, in fact, not given out.

Mr. Speaker, we, as you know, constitute or make up approximately in representation in this House of seven Members, about 30 per cent of the population of Saskatchewan. I want to say that we are not deserving, as we have mentioned earlier, and the innuendoes that have been passed from that side of the House in particular to myself and my colleague for Estevan. This was something that is only done by some low-down snake, something like this wouldn't ever be performed in the House; questions like this are strictly taboo.

Mr. Speaker, after watching the performance of this House since the short time that I have been here, I want to say this. If these two questions and particularly the question by my colleague for Estevan make a heck of a lot more sense being brought before this House than a good number of the questions and nobody over there ever criticized these other questions. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we were at a bit of a disadvantage in coming to the House; we came as seven new Members to this Legislature. Not one of us had ever sat in the House before and although there are a lot of new Members, in my friends to the right, at least they had some . . . politicians to show them the way. The new Members over there, some of them I hardly see; some of whom I have never heard; obviously they have a wealth, a wealth of seniority in that House to give them guidance. And maybe, Mr. Speaker, in response to these two questions being on and particularly to the Attorney General, maybe it is true that we should not have put these questions before the House. Maybe that is quite right, but I don't think for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that at this particular time that the Government of Saskatchewan, or the Government opposite should at this time, after numerous times, ask to stand these two particular items on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. In the Province of Saskatchewan, and I was born here; I was raised here; I have spent all but one year of my educational career here and I have never seen in the time that I have been here, and I followed politics since I was in my teens, I have never seen so much in the way of hiding and covering and job-seeking that I have in the last two elections. I never have.

Maybe it is right to do so, I don't know. All I am saying is that the people of Saskatchewan are thoroughly fed up with this continual patronage which is going on. It is costing them money; it is costing them thousands and thousands of dollars. We have put this question on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, to try to get some answers out to the people of Saskatchewan. I don't think the Government has anything to hide, not at all, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, as it was in the case with the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg), both questions are related. I am not ashamed of my record in this House, small and limited that it is. I am not ashamed of my record in

Saskatchewan. Despite what the Hon. Member wants to say.

We think that these answers should go out to the people of Saskatchewan and if they want us to amend one part of these two, this one in particular, we will amend them. We will amend them from this side, we don't need your tampering over there. We will amend them. Just put the plain facts out to the people of Saskatchewan and let them know what is going on. Let them know what is going on in the back rooms of Regina. Let them see the number of people whom they are bringing in, bringing in, bringing in. There may be nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, it is the taxpayers' money. The democratic process says that they, in fact, have a right to know and I think, in fact, they should know.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to go back just for one moment to this proposed motion from my colleague for Estevan. I want to tell you that during the election my opposition, that is a Government Member opposite, one of the finest men that I ever met, beyond a doubt. He was a personal friend of mine and I couldn't conceive, and I have known many of you people over there for some time, including the Hon. Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). I can't conceive, Mr. Speaker, meeting the former Member for Elrose or walking up to the Member for Weyburn, or any Member in the House whom I have talked to and I ask them for pertinent information as I have done in the few weeks that I have been here, and we sit at the back of that room and I have asked these questions, concerning Government policy; getting some information and I must say that I have been treated with the utmost respect and I got that information and you have been very, very good and I appreciate it. But, Mr. Speaker, I did not appreciate, and I will not appreciate any more lunatic tantrums like we heard this afternoon and in the past.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, in closing, I don't think for one moment that my colleague for Estevan or myself were deserving recipients of the comments of this afternoon. I think despite the fact that certain things have been taken out of context I am going to ask the Members opposite, before I close off my speech this afternoon, to reconsider the comments made this afternoon — they can come to me in private if they wish. All I am asking the Government Member is to reconsider the statement which he made. This is not a bribe and it is not a threat, but reconsideration of the statement which was made, all I am going to say that some day, and it won't be too far, it will be in the near future, the statement that he has cast this afternoon will be regretted, not for this year but, indeed, for the next four years.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.