

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature
35th Day

Monday, April 11, 1977.

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

RESTRICTIONS ON LICENCE

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of SGIO. I realize that he is a city Member and perhaps he is not aware that the present restrictions that have been placed on our licence prohibit a traditional activity of co-operation in that many farmers get together, one swaths, one combines and one will do the trucking, the new restrictions on our licence prohibits that activity from taking place. Would the Member not agree that the new restrictions are a bit of a deterrent to the traditional practices in farming at harvest time in Saskatchewan?

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office): — Mr. Speaker, I think that question should be directed to the Minister in charge of the Highway Traffic Board.

MR. BAILEY: — A supplementary question. The Minister to whom I addressed the question is in charge of the Licence Bureau now and I would expect that he would have some information. Would the Minister then agree to provide this House with some statement so that we can give some assurance to the people who have traditionally co-operated in that nature that these restrictions may be lifted.

MR. WHELAN: — I'll take it as notice and discuss it with the Minister in charge of the Highway Traffic Board.

SEAT BELT LEGISLATION

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could clear the air a little bit on one subject that is causing some concern and that is, the suggestion by the Government in the Speech from the Throne that you would be introducing legislation providing for compulsory wearing of seat belts in automobiles in Saskatchewan. It is my understanding that there has been some stepping back from this position and it is possible that such legislation will not be introduced in this particular Session of the Legislature. I have had numerous inquiries about it and my understanding was that it was the Government's full intention to bring this legislation forward. I wonder if the Premier could clear the air and tell us what the Government's intentions are?

April 11, 1977.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the Government previously indicated that it would be proceeding with mandatory seat belt legislation at this Session, that was the Government's policy at that time, and is the Government's policy at this time. Any changes in Government policy will be announced in due course.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question. Is the Government considering making changes in its policy at this time in connection with compulsory seat belts?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the Government is always reviewing policy decisions which it has made in the past. It has reached no conclusion to change policies. Any such conclusions will be announced in due course.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question. I wonder if the Premier would not agree with me, is it not somewhat unusual for the Government to change its position after stating its policy in the Speech from the Throne. In this case I believe it was a very definite commitment in the Speech from the Throne that this legislation would be brought forward. Does the Premier not agree that it is somewhat unusual that the Government would possibly be reconsidering that policy at that time?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Not at all, Mr. Speaker. We consistently review policy positions taken in the past. I don't want the Hon. Member to feel that this is in any different category than other announcements made in the Speech from the Throne. The policy stated in the Speech from the Throne remains the policy of the Government and any changes will be announced in due course.

LAMB PROCESSING PLANT

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Last week you indicated that you would be looking into the problems regarding the financial collapse of the Innisfail Lamb Processing Plant. I am just wondering if the Minister has been in contact with the Saskatchewan Sheep and Wool Marketing Commission and whether any arrangements have been made to ensure the balance of the 75 per cent payment to producers in the province for lambs which they have marketed through Innisfail?

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, we have been in conversation with the Alberta Government in this regard and they have advised us that they will be paying the 75 per cent balance which is due as soon as they are able to get their books and their procedures in order. You will understand that they are now transferring from the co-operative over to some new government structure and this will take some time in terms of just ordinary procedure going over how you pay out bills and so on. They have accepted the obligations which they had, the outstanding obligations, and they have assured us that they will be paid.

MR. WIEBE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister give us some indication as to when the producers may

receive their payment and in the event that the payment does take a considerable length of time because of the problems you have outlined, will interest be paid on the outstanding balance of 75 per cent as it does represent a fairly substantial portion of the income that producers would have from the sale of their lambs?

MR. KAEDING: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the decision for that would be in the hands of the Government of Alberta. I think they will decide whether they will pay interest on that or not. I am as concerned as you are about the length of time it has taken to get the payments out but we have asked them to facilitate it and I hope that they will do that as quickly as possible.

MR. WIEBE: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Saskatchewan Sheep and Wool Producers, have you personally or has your department made representation to the Alberta Government in this regard urging quick payment and also suggesting that interest be payable in the event that the time span between now and the final payment is delayed considerably longer than anticipated?

MR. KAEDING: — No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't made that kind of an approach to the department in Alberta, we have simply asked to expedite the procedure.

POSITIONS ADVERTISED — SYLVITE MINE

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Potash. I understand the Government in taking over the Sylvite mine the original target was the 15th and it is now to be the 20th or 22nd of April. The Government will also end certain management positions in the mine and is advertising for positions in the Leader-Post and the Winnipeg paper. With only nine days to go before the takeover there is a distinct possibility there will be no management continuity. What is the Government doing to ensure some of the existing senior management stay on?

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister in charge of Potash Corporation): — Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that all of the existing management have been offered positions with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in the event that we take over the Sylvite mine on the 22nd as the Member suggests. I want to point out what I said was that we hoped that this would be accomplished by April 30th and that is still some time off.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister tell me how many of these present management have accepted positions with the new Potash Corporation?

MR. COWLEY: — No, I could not, it is still somewhat speculative. The final agreements haven't been signed with Sylvite. The management of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is handling it and I have no knowledge of which individuals have said yes or no.

MR. LARTER: — Final supplementary. The Government knows that a failure to give continuity of management after takeover will cause long-term disruption, why did the Government decide to cancel these management positions?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, none of the management or their positions were cancelled or are cancelled. They are all still working for Sylvite. They were all offered positions with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Some may choose not to take those positions. Some of them will be working and have worked for Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting for many years, they perhaps started in nickel, worked in copper, ended up in potash and their chain of succession or whatever it is that they are going through has been with HBMS. They may choose to continue their career with HBMS because that is where they started it, perhaps they didn't plan on staying forever in a potash mine. Others may have other reasons for changing positions at this particular time. The great majority I am convinced will stay with PCS. I don't see any particular problems. Obviously if some people leave they will have to be filled by people from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, from outside or from the Cory mine but we don't foresee any particular problems judging by the number of people that they have talked to, to date. I don't have the information or the particulars of who has indicated they are going to do something else but I am sure that at some future date that can be provided.

SETTLEMENT WITH SGEA

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier regarding the labor negotiations between the Government and the SGEA. It is my understanding that the strike has been averted and that there has been settlement. I wonder if the Government would indicate when they propose to announce the terms of that settlement and if the Premier would indicate in percentage terms the approximate cost to the Treasury of the increase?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I will make some general comments, if there are some supplementaries I will ask one of my colleagues to comment. Firstly, the strike, which so far as I am aware reposed solely in the mind of the Member for Regina Wascana, has indeed been averted, at least to this point. Secondly, there has been, I am advised, an initial agreement between the bargaining teams of each of the respective parties, that is the Government of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association. My information is that the proposed settlement is being referred by the SGEA bargaining team to the membership for ratification. The ratification has not yet been completed and accordingly I cannot announce a settlement. Our arrangement with the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association, or my understanding of it, is that we will not make public the proposed terms of the settlement until they have had an opportunity to communicate the terms to their members and the members have had an opportunity to express a 'yes' or 'no' to the proposed terms.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, it may be that the Premier will have to refer this question, but the Government has indicated an intention to move out of wage and price controls. Will this settlement be subject to the Board in Saskatchewan? Secondly could there be some indication of when the ratification vote is intended to take place? And thirdly, although I might well accept that the Premier isn't in a position to give the specific

terms, could the Minister of Finance indicate the cost, when you include the fringes, what will be the cost in percentage terms and perhaps in dollar terms in approximate figures to the Treasury?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I will ask my colleague the Minister of Finance to respond.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, the first question was whether the settlement be subject to the incomes and prices compensation board. The answer is, yes. In case of the dollar amounts that the Hon. Member is asking, I do not have those figures and if we did provide the figures based on the number of employees that are employed it would then be fairly easy to start calculating what the settlement was. As the Premier has indicated it has been traditional that members of the SGEA have their views known before the final settlement is announced to the public.

MR. MERCHANT: — Supplementary. I wonder lastly then, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister, though he is not prepared to give the dollars, would indicate in percentage terms how much of an increase including the fringes is involved? I wonder, also if the Minister would be prepared to say whether the package is within the guidelines or whether an exception to the guidelines will be required?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, the Member keeps on probing as to what are the percentages. If we gave the percentages the people would know what the settlement is. Mr. Speaker, I think if the Member knows anything about collective bargaining that there are confidences. The agreement has been reached on a tentative basis and I think it is only fair that the negotiators of the SGEA have an opportunity to refer the matter to the membership and the membership have a chance to vote on the settlement.

Insofar as whether it was within the guidelines, I am not sure what the Member means, by what guideline and whose guidelines. In as far as the Government is concerned we do not set guidelines for collective bargaining because we believe in free collective bargaining.

SURGERY INCREASE IN SASKATOON HOSPITALS

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health.

Has the Minister taken any steps whatsoever to increase the amount of allocation to the Saskatoon city hospitals and more specifically the Saskatoon City Hospital in terms of allowing them to increase the amount of surgery that may be performed in those hospitals?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, last September we did take steps with regard to all the hospitals in Saskatoon, particularly with

April 11, 1977.

regard to City Hospital and St. Paul's Hospital where day surgeries were set up. It is the intent and the belief of the department and the Government that this will reduce the waiting lists in that particular area. And some additional compensation was provided to those hospitals in relation to beds as a temporary measure because of the tightness of the situation, particularly in Saskatoon.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware that the waiting list at the Saskatoon City Hospital, especially in the field of orthopedics, is extremely long, stretching in some instances six to nine months and in some instances almost a year of waiting period for people to get into the hospital and that that condition continues? The Minister has mentioned some steps that were taken last fall. Have any additional steps been taken since February 22?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, as usual the Member for Nipawin has his facts wrong. There is not a long waiting list at the City Hospital with regard to orthopedic surgery, there is at St. Paul's. The problem is specifically at St. Paul's. A lot of that problem is related to some extent with constraints on orthopedic surgeons' time. It is a fact of life. We have also had discussions with the Board at St. Paul's Hospital and the medical staff with respect to rectifying this problem. But you could double the beds or triple the beds for orthopedic surgery in St. Paul's and you would still have a long waiting list a year and a half from now.

MR. COLLVER: — A further supplementary question. I am sure the Minister of Health would recognize the name Graham McIvor as being a respected medical doctor in Saskatoon. I believe that the Minister will recognize that if this medical doctor has replied to one of his patients as late as February 22, 1977, as follows:

As you know already the pre-booking committee at Saskatoon City Hospital has felt that urgent admission is not required and they feel that you will have to wait on an elective basis.

The bed situation is incredibly bad as far as the waiting list is concerned for orthopedic surgery.

This particular woman has been waiting since November 26, 1976 for needed back surgery, he says:

Even at this time I think it may be a number of months before we get definite confirmation of your admission date to Saskatoon City Hospital.

Would the Minister not agree that that kind of situation is unacceptable that it is continuing and it requires immediate attention by the Department of Health?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that there are certain orthopedic surgeons who have long waiting lists. We admit that. The long waiting lists are really at St. Paul's and not at City Hospital. In fact we have had people seeking orthopedic surgery who have switched doctors and have gone from St. Paul's

to City and got in very quickly. This particular doctor may have a fairly long waiting list. You can't generalize the whole situation simply by picking out one particular doctor.

MILEAGE OF CABLE TV TO BE INSTALLED

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, at the risk of incurring the wrath of all Members I shall direct a question to the Minister in charge of Sask Tel.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh no!

MR. THATCHER: — I would like to ask the Minister, in view of the fact that in all major centres in Saskatchewan we see trucks from all over Canada installing cable television as quickly as possible, concisely and briefly could the Minister . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — . . . tell this Assembly how many miles he has in mind to install in the current fiscal year?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister in charge of Sask Tel): — Your question is with respect to cable, urban cable TV. Mr. Speaker, Sask Tel is continuing an aggressive policy which started in 1968 of laying cable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — With respect to the city of North Battleford — the laying of the buried cable there is almost completed. With respect to Moose Jaw, the tentative timetable for completing the laying of cable is late this fall, certainly by the end of 1977. There are very aggressive construction projects under way in both Saskatoon and Regina. It is not expected that the laying of buried cable will be completed in Regina or Saskatoon in 1977. But it will be completed in early 1978.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. He almost has me beaten down but not quite. Would the Minister indicate to the House how he is financing the cable which is presently being installed, and how that has been financed which has been installed previously?

PENSIONS — GOVERNMENT SUPERANNUATES ASSOCIATION

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. In my letter to yourself dated December 3, 1976, the Saskatchewan Government's Superannuates Association set out its position calling for fairer pensions, particularly the increase in pension for the surviving spouse and they have met with you since. Can you tell this Assembly when the Government will announce its pension increases or pension changes for the Saskatchewan Government Superannuates?

MR. ROBBINS: — The Government's program will be announced in due course.

POSITIONS ADVERTISED — SYLVITE MINE

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of potash. Could the Minister tell me if the position of the senior management of Sylvite Potash has been advertised and in order to get these positions that they have to bid in on these jobs?

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, the officials from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan have been talking with some of the senior management of Sylvite. In the event that an individual indicated he wasn't going to continue in the employment of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, because he intended to stay with HBMS or whatever he intended to do, positions were advertised.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not true that the individual senior management personnel at the Sylvite mine have been informed that all new jobs are changes of positions with PCS and therefore, they will have to apply for those jobs in the normal course of events in competition with other applicants, that all of them have been so informed?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, that is not true, like most of the Member's statements.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH SYLVITE

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister as well, concerning Sylvite, but on another aspect of that particular problem. I've noticed a certain hesitancy on behalf of the Minister in dealing with negotiations. They are going on now and you've been questioned about them before. I'd like to ask the Minister, is there a deadline within the offer that was made by the Government to Sylvite by which time the offer had to be accepted, that the agreement is contingent on it being accepted by a certain date?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm always in some difficulty in responding to the questions from my learned colleagues opposite with respect to offers and agreements because I have a sort of simple understanding of an agreement. You want to buy something, you get an agreement and you make an offer and they agree to it. Then follows the legal part that I have more difficulty comprehending, but I'm sure the Member has a better grip on that than I do.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Agreed.

MR. COWLEY: — I'm sure you do on the legal stuff. I'm not sure I envy you though in that respect.

With respect to this, my understanding is that we have made an offer, it has been accepted in general terms. There are a great many details to be worked out, some of which obviously involve money in their interpretation. So to that extent we

haven't made the final formal offer, because we haven't agreed on the terms of it and they have not signed it, the final formal offer, whatever the appropriate legal description for that is. If the Member wants I'll take notice and get one of the lawyers to write it out for me, but we haven't got to that stage yet, so that we haven't signed the final agreements.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, you really didn't answer the question. I asked if there was any time limit put on these negotiations and I wonder if you would address your mind to that rather than talking about the legal ramifications?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no time limit that I am aware of attached to them. I think, for us to put a time limit on ourselves and say that we are going to have it done by April 30 would obviously hinder us, we have to then wind it up no matter what the other side's position, by that date. I am hopeful that we will have things finalized by April 30th. I still expect that date to be reached or sometime earlier but the deal won't fall through, at least from my perspective, if it isn't done until May 1st.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the arrangements have not been wrapped up within a reasonable length of time, be it April 30 or sometime thereafter, is it the intention of the Government then to invoke its power by issuing a vesting order to take over the Sylvite operation?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question. I would have to wait and see what the circumstances are and then the Government would have to make an appropriate decision. Certainly the Government has no predetermined course of action that it will necessarily follow.

MR. MALONE: — May I ask as a final supplementary then, Mr. Minister, is the agreement which you have referred to, and which I accept you haven't got an in-depth knowledge on, is it firm to the extent that if the details are not worked out between the Government and Sylvite, that you would be in a position to sue Sylvite for specific performance of that agreement and let the court decide on the other details that are causing some concern at this time?

MR. COWLEY: — I would have to take notice on that question.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — I should like to ask the Minister in charge of potash with the takeover of this mine ten or a few more days away, does the Government have a mine manager to take over this mine when it goes into business?

MR. COWLEY: — Yes.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 65 — **An Act respecting Warranties on Consumer Products** be now read a second time.

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill is as you are aware a very lengthy Bill and contains many changes in the existing consumer protection law . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Warranties . . .

MR. MALONE: — That's right, Warranties Bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying this Bill is a very complicated lengthy Bill which we have been examining very carefully in our caucus. There is some consideration still being given to many of the provisions of this Bill, particularly as it affects private sales and there are other aspects of it that we are presently studying. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the matter be adjourned at this time because we have not completed the assessment of this provision. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 39 — **An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation** be now read a second time.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, we will be opposing Bill No. 39, An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation. There is a fundamental distinction between our approach and the NDP approach over resource development in this Act and this Act deals with resource development. Put charitably the NDP believe that mineral resources can best be developed by the public and private sectors working together. Liberals believe that government should confine itself largely to determining under what conditions mineral lands will be explored and developed, and to conducting scientific surveys to provide basic data.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government can establish a royalty and tax regime suitable to encourage exploration of minerals by the private sector and through changing that mineral and tax regime from time to time extract maximum possible returns for the people while at the same time maintaining the highest degree of development possible for the province. Industry has the expertise and capital necessary to search for and develop and market minerals. And we say they, and not the people of this province should take the financial risk. We do not believe that in cyclical world markets the Saskatchewan taxpayer should be the gambler. The Saskatchewan taxpayer now has something in the neighbourhood of \$1,000 per family invested or gambled depending upon the word that you choose to use in the potash

industry. The Saskatchewan taxpayer now has something in the neighbourhood of \$500 per family invested in other forms of resource industries. If the Government really believes they are acting on the wishes of the people of Saskatchewan in gambling money, and the Hon. Member says, agreed. If you really believe that the janitor outside this door wants to gamble \$1,500 in resource development, why didn't you make an effort to encourage him to invest in resource development?

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Riversdale had gone out and said to the janitor outside this door or the man working downtown, "How would you like to invest \$1,500 in the resource industry?", the person would have looked at him as though he were crazy. Indeed, he may be crazy for all I know. But beyond any doubt, Mr. Speaker, people of this province would not voluntarily be investing their money in the resource industries in the way that they are forced to invest by this Government. Mr. Speaker, 99 per cent of the people of this province would have said 'No' they don't have the money to gamble yet this Government forces each family to become a gambler in the risky resources areas.

We say, that every dollar that can be extracted from the industry should be extracted, but that Saskatchewan tax dollars should not be gambled in the process. We say that the public and the private sector cannot work closely together. Mr. Speaker, it's one of the realities of dealing with business, you have to know that big business is reactionary. They're suspicious, they don't like government. They like NDP Governments even less. The reality of the situation, Mr. Speaker, that they are suspicious in any jurisdiction where government forces itself into the areas which have traditionally been considered the preserve of private enterprise. You know, Mr. Speaker, what Government Members might say, "Wouldn't it be nice if government could become involved in the public sector and the private sector could work closely together beside it." It might be nice, Mr. Speaker, and I might well be in a position to say were that the case if they could work closely together that it was better to have some public involvement. The fact is that they cannot work closely together. There's the state of distrust between government and business, and whether or not that distrust is unfair, doesn't matter, the distrust continues. The NDP distrust businessmen, they dislike anyone with a profit motive. The investing public dislikes the NDP, dislikes anyone with a narrow perspective as that held by the Cabinet. That's the reality of this situation and the people of Saskatchewan are now suffering because of that dispute between the two. It doesn't help, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister when he moved this Bill said that it is the belief of the NDP and I quote:

That mineral resources can best be developed by the public and private sectors working closely together.

Who really cares about the mythical situation of what might be? The reality is that the public and private sectors won't work closely together. The reality is that whenever the public sector moves into the private preserve of private enterprise, private enterprise invests elsewhere. And that, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, is the reality of what's happening here.

The Government in 1971, said we're going to get a better deal from the resources. Fair enough, resources were turning

April 11, 1977.

around. Liberals would have gotten a better deal as well, but fair enough. What was not fair were the methods used by the Government. Bill No. 42, Mr. Speaker, was the first initiative into the resource area. It strangled the industry. In the last year that the Liberals were in power 1,251 wells were drilled. In 1975 that had declined under the NDP as a result of Bill No. 42 to 276 wells. In 1976 that had declined to 262 wells. Approximately one-fifth of the development in the best Liberal year and 25 per cent of the development on the average in the seven years that the Liberals were in power.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's one thing to talk about an increased royalty bite but you have as well to talk about the jobs and the lives of the people who have been affected in this province by the destruction of the oil industry. Drilling will be up this year, some initiatives have been taken by the Government and I encourage them in that direction. The NDP indeed with their series of changes have all but repealed Bill No. 42, so the industry in part will start to return to this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I said the first initiative after 1971, was into oil and gas, the second initiative was into the resource area of the potash industry. And in that area, the Government can't even claim through its nationalization to have acquired higher profits to the people of the province. The industry is moving out, the industry is trying to replace Canadian reserves with new mines elsewhere. Pennzoil, for instance, one of the largest developers was reported to the Wall Street Journal, a few weeks ago, to be saying that they feel that they are now in a position that European and other resources will start to replace the Saskatchewan source of supply.

In the third area, hard rock mining, the Liberal program was to encourage hard rock exploration. And that resulted in some fantastic finds. Those finds are now coming on stream. And just as they are coming on stream particularly in the uranium industry, this Government at the eleventh hour foists an inquiry upon an industry that, even without the inquiry, barely prepared to stay because of the size of the royalty rates imposed upon them. There is virtually no staking going on in the North. Basic exploration is at an all time low, Mr. Speaker, in this mining area and that comes closest (in the historical review that Mr. Speaker has been kind enough to accept in relation to this Bill) that comes closest to the Bill itself. In the North, we're completing a cycle that has developed in the late '60s because of the Liberal initiatives to get some development going in the North. Spending is up in hard rock mining but it's really just a playing out of the cycle that began 10 and 15 years ago. At the initiating stage of the cycle there was seen virtually nothing. Private industry because they won't work with the public sector, find it very difficult to imagine further investments in the North, so they're not looking for the resources that they were looking for in the '60s. The Government through vehicles like the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation proudly talks about legislation which compels companies to give up 50 per cent of their equity after the initial exploration expense has been absorbed by the company.

There are all kinds of stories in the industry of government misusing information, information which had come to them in a privileged way through the Department of Mineral Resources. The truth of those stories doesn't matter. It's the same thing

that I said before. It's not that the Minister says, "It would be better if private enterprise and public enterprise could work together." The reality is that they cannot work together. The truth of stories believed in the industry that the Government misuses confidential information doesn't matter. What matters is that the industry believes those stories. Businessmen don't want to deal with any government. An industry that doesn't want to deal with any government finds itself under this Bill dealing with an NDP Government which is more objectionable to them and finds that on a venture when they move into any kind of basic spending they are compelled to offer a 50 per cent share to the Crown. Some of the industry will stay, a large part of the industry will not. And we need all the industry we can get.

Industry, Mr. Speaker, has rightly noted that the Government claims to have all control, and industry rightly notes that contracts that this Government signs seem to be meaningless. And they look at the kinds of deals that have been given to the oil industry and to the potash industry. Hudson Bay Oil and Gas now selling with other companies initiated in 1976 an action that was designed to deal with the Government for breaching their agreement. The agreement in 1951 was to get a 30-year basic tax deal for the potash industry. Any investor in this province looks at that and says, not only did the Government want to get involved with me, not only did they compel me to give up to 50 per cent to them in equity but I can't trust the deals that they write, because I look at what they did to the potash industry and I look at what they did to the oil and gas industry.

The various pieces of potash legislation and The Coal Conservation Act allow the Government to impose controls by regulations passed by the Cabinet and in some instances by the Minister alone, rather than by laws passed by the Legislature. All of that makes the industry know that they are subject to the whim of the Cabinet, and subject to the whim of the Premier. All of that makes the industry know that they are subject to the discretion of Allan Blakeney who has throughout the piece, acted out of pique; it would appear out of bad temper in his dealings with the resources industry. A man who whenever faced with legal proceedings which do nothing more than ask that justice be imposed before the court, always reacts by saying, the industry is going to do what I tell them. The industry isn't going to be able to get the justice that anyone else would expect — the justice of going to a court and having legal interpretations placed on legal agreements that this Government has signed or that previous NDP Governments have signed.

Mr. Speaker, the industry looks on at all of that and knows increasingly they'll be faced with changes made by regulation. They know that control over mineral resources is no longer in the hands of the Legislature but has been turned over by the NDP backbenchers to the Cabinet, to the Premier who, as we have seen repeated in these past few years, acted out of pique in all of these questions.

The Government, now has carte blanche to shut down any mineral producing company by regulation by the minister in charge. When court decisions established principles which indicated to the Government that it could not take the absolute control it was seeking in the various sectors of the resource industry, the potash the oil and gas, Mr. Blakeney amended The

April 11, 1977.

Mineral Resources Act to re-define utilization and conservation in an attempt to circumvent the decisions of the courts. And when faced by questions in the press about the likely loss of the Cigol case, the Premier said, "If we lost that case, we'll nationalize the oil industry." He acted again, Mr. Speaker, out of pique. Again the Minister can read the press reports, he was following on the remarks of the Hon. Attorney General, the Deputy Premier who said we may nationalize the industry and the Premier backed that up. And they didn't say they'd nationalize the oil industry because they thought it was the right thing to do. Or that they would nationalize the oil industry that they thought that would be better in the long term in terms of developing the oil industry or getting more money into this province or more jobs into this province. No, Mr. Speaker, the response was a knee-jerk reaction that no court was going to interpret a legal document for Allan Blakeney. He'd do what he felt was fair, he'd be the arbiter of fairness . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I have no objection to the Member discussing The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation Act, however, I think the Member will agree with me he's straying from the topic and indulging in personal debate, rather than debate to the principle of the Bill before us.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the Bill in question is a part of the piece, a part of the . . . a tax on the resource industry so high that he has been driving resource development out of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister who brought in this Bill, the Minister in charge of Mineral Resources, is a little different from the Premier. You know, I have not seen him acting out of pique — not seen him acting out his private temper tantrums. Unfortunately, the signs have been almost as alarming in a different way. And this Bill that he introduces, Bill No. 39, is an extension of the alarming signs which now come from the Minister of Mineral Resources.

In speaking to the Act, the Minister, Mr. Messer, talked of a need for the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation to be able to expand outside of the province. He indicated they would have a venture going in Alberta, that they had something going now. That they had two ventures going in the Northwest Territories, one in Manitoba, and a good deal of direct exploration in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. Members may recall, Mr. Speaker, the words of the Minister of Mineral Resources, when he was the Minister in charge of Sask Power. Again, he said the same kind of thing in that area, when he was investing Saskatchewan money. I asked, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister on behalf of Sask Power could indicate whether there was investment of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money going on outside of the province. He told us there was investment in the Northwest Territories, investment in British Columbia and in Alberta, through exploration for gas by the Many Islands Company; that we were, in fact, spending more money on gas exploration outside of Saskatchewan than we were within. And he said the same — he moved in the same direction when he discussed Bill No. 39 in moving this Bill.

What does all that mean? It means that jobs are being developed outside of Saskatchewan. It means that Saskatchewan money is being gambled outside of this province. The janitor

outside the door does not want to gamble his \$1,500 in the resource industries but he certainly does not want to gamble that money to create jobs in Alberta and British Columbia and the Northwest Territories. Indeed, I asked the Minister who moved this Bill in regard to Many Islands (the gas vehicle) whether he would be prepared to give a commitment to the House that Saskatchewan Power would not conduct any exploration in the United States. And he would not even give us that commitment.

He talked about this Bill and in doing that, the Minister indicated that the approach that he will take as being the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation, is the same kind of approach that he took when he was in charge of Sask Power, and that is bad news for the Saskatchewan taxpayer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I like the Minister, I think he is a bright and a capable member of government. In some ways he . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — They do not like him in Coronach!

MR. MERCHANT: — Well, I do not know how they feel about him in Coronach, but I will just keep reading this. (Did one of their speech writers slip a page in?) In some ways, Mr. Speaker, his ability to deal with problems, has the respect I believe of all Members of the House. And I am sorry, in some ways, that there are so few of his ilk in the Cabinet.

But in this area, Mr. Speaker, he demonstrates the view of a man almost like a child playing in a monopoly game. He thinks that Saskatchewan tax dollars are just sort of free things — they don't come out of people's pockets, that they can be gambled any place in this continent. He is a man, Mr. Speaker, who takes the money of the janitor outside the door and gambles the money all over the west, and possibly, for all we know in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, resource exploration is a highly specialized area, where markets and connections count. And I say to you that a bunch of NDP tub thumpers cannot move into the resource industry just as though it is a simple prospect and anybody can make a go of it. And that is part of the piece of thinking that is like a monopoly game. That is part of the piece of that Cabinet that they do not seem to realize that the connections are very important. That when dealing with "big business" which is a world-wide business, they may well be out of their league. They do not like businessmen, they distrust businessmen, so as a part of distrusting them, they decide that they are incompetent and stupid to boot. So if they say, Mr. Speaker, that businessmen are the real dummies of this world, and that is the way they characterize them, that anyone with a half a billion dollars to invest, they say can move into the resource industries through the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation, through gas, through potash, and can do very well. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not a monopoly game and the taxpayers' dollars should not be invested in this way.

Section 17 of the Act allowed the province to guarantee loans and bonds for Saskatchewan Potash and allows the lending

April 11, 1977.

of money directly. Again, that will lead to the same kind of situation that we have with potash and that we have with oil. We would not object so much, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister were able to take programs and have them risk the profits that those programs will generate. If, for instance, as an example, the Potash Corporation borrowed the money without pledging the money of this province, we would not object so much. If this legislation did not give to the Government, the power to pledge the people's money of the future, we would not object so much. And that is the only section, Mr. Speaker, that I want to mention. Particularly Section 17.

I said earlier that we will be opposing this legislation. It is curious that the legislation itself, flows from the remarks made by my colleague, the Member for Regina South. The Government had the gall to operate the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation without even having this kind of legislation; had the gall to think that they could gamble the people's money in such a singularly risky way as the resource industries, and not even pass a Bill through the Legislature. And, a year ago, my colleague brought that to the attention of the Government. I suppose then, Mr. Speaker, one could say that this legislation flows from the careful analysis of all legislation that the Government is fortunate enough to receive from Members like the Member for Regina South.

Mr. Speaker, though the Bill may be a product of the good work of one of the Members on this side of the House, it is nothing more than the carrying on of the way that the Government has been operating in hard rock mining. We are genuinely frightened of this kind of legislation, genuinely frightened on behalf of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, genuinely frightened about the future of this province. Mr. Speaker, for all of those reasons, we will not be supporting this Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking against Bill No. 39, I would first like to make a few comments and read a letter that refers to Bill No. 42 and as far as the PC caucus is concerned, we feel it is going to have equally devastating effects on the resource industries of this province.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I would ask the Member, I do not want to presume what the Member is going to say, but what the Members says has to be related to Bill No. 39, and not related to Bill No. 42.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Speaker, it does refer to Bill No. 39 but I would have to take it a little more out of context.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we are again concerned with the appointees under this Act referring to the Mining and Development Act. We are concerned that as in the past, we were wondering if the Corporation has the expertise to attract the people to them who know something about the business instead of entering into similar programs, as they have in the past, without experienced people in the oil industry and in other ventures that the Government goes into. We wonder just how serious these appointments are and what considerations are going to be given to them.

In Section 11(1) we have said it many times, that we disagree with this Provincial Government entering into the development of the resource industries. We feel that these resources can best be developed by private industry, and we still feel that the maximum amount of money to be gained out of these industries is going to be gained by the people of Saskatchewan if these resources are developed by the private sector. We believe that with the right that this Government has to tax up to 100 per cent on the profits, that certainly we can negotiate and give a return to these companies that best know what they are doing in this field.

We, too, are against joint ventures such as this Government proposes, especially when the Government has the right to pull out of the partnership if it feels it is to the detriment of the province. I believe for this reason the private sector will not want to enter into such a partnership as proven in the past where some of them are backing off from these partnerships. We feel with the entering into this as other fields, you are entering a competitive field and it is a completely different ball game. We now have to go out and get our customers. You are competing in a field — it is not like a monopoly where you have that business and we do not feel the Members of the Government or their employees have been in the competitive ball game too long, and we do not feel they are capable of handling it.

By Order in Council, they could put the other partner out of business if they deemed it for the good of the Government. You have the power to acquire and dispose of property and you have too far-reaching powers in this Act by Order in Council, there's no control through legislation on any of these decisions. This means more things by Order in Council, more legislation or more powers to the Cabinet, which we do not agree with. Again, this is a case where the Government is getting involved in the resource industry and when they can get a maximum return for no investment by the taxpayers' money. Once again, I believe this project will have a negative growth effect, as companies do not want to become involved with the Government. This Government with its ideology does not have the know-how or the foresight to develop on its own, which is keeping this a have-not province. We believe that, again, the private sector knows what it is doing, and by negotiating, not by confrontation, that this Government can get a maximum amount of return for the people of this province. We feel that Saskatchewan has the resource base, as has Alberta to become one of the most fantastic provinces in Canada, but because of the management, we are being held back. We will not support the Bill.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might beg indulgence of the Members of the House for a few minutes. I would like to introduce to the Members a very dear friend of many of us, a former Member of the Legislature from the city of Saskatoon, an outstanding Saskatchewan woman whose career in Saskatchewan spans television, public affairs and politics. It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to Members this afternoon, as I say a very good friend of many of us, a former MLA from Saskatoon, Sally Merchant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

April 11, 1977.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — I would like to say one thing. It is interesting that the former MLA has never come back to the House since the day she was defeated, and/or since the day that she did not seek re-election. I know, Mr. Speaker, that there will be large numbers of Members opposite who may find that they are not in this House after the next election, and I hope that they will come back to the House to visit us more often.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. J.R. MESSER (Kelsey-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, may I also recognize the former Member for Saskatoon, Sally Merchant. I am pleased to see her back in this House again visiting. It is unfortunate that she picked a day to see her son so confused about a particular piece of legislation. You know, Mr. Speaker I note that both the Liberals and the Conservatives are back into bed together again. It is such an indecent spectacle!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill No. 39.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, let me just quote some of the remarks that the Member for Regina Wascana said in the debate of this particular Bill. He stressed ‘we Liberals’ and I quote him, “We Liberals are opposed, we Liberals feel that you are gambling that poor janitor’s money that we are extracting from him . . .” They are, incidentally maintenance engineers now, not janitors but it shows just how far back in the stone age he is. I do not know where he got his speech. He admitted towards the end of it as he was shuffling through paper that he got the wrong page in, I would suggest that he picked up the wrong speech totally. The wrong speech totally, Mr. Speaker! He stresses, ‘we Liberals are opposed,’ one would assume when he talks about ‘we Liberals’ he is talking about Liberals in Canada, provincially and federally. I wonder where he stands with such Crown corporations like Petro Canada?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Are they, Mr. Speaker, using Canadian taxpayers’ money exploring for oil and natural gas? He makes no mention of that Crown corporation, but he wants to terrorize people in Saskatchewan by alluding to investments of monies that will never bring any return to Saskatchewan taxpayers. We know that is wrong, Mr. Speaker. He just has to look at the development in northern Saskatchewan now to see that never in the history of this province has there been a higher level of exploration and development — never in the history of this province, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Now the Member again, and I quote, “We Liberals are . . . (I wonder if he opposes Eldorado Nuclear’s operation in Saskatchewan?) . . . opposed to those Crown corporations risking taxpayers’ money.” There’s a company that has been up there for

decades, Mr. Speaker; a Crown corporation of the Federal Government, risking taxpayers' money and ensuring very good returns, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, 'we Liberals' he said, 'are opposed — you are gambling our money.' Does he know that the Canadian Development Corporation, among other investments, has invested in potash in Saskatchewan? It now has one-third ownership of Texas Gulf, which is involved directly in the Allan Potash Mine. Now, I have heard the Member on numerous occasions criticize this Government for involving itself in potash. I wonder if he knows that the Federal Government 'we Liberals' to the Member for Wascana, are risking taxpayers' money and he opposes that. Here they have been investors in potash for some years in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Member for Estevan also to take note when he says 'we Conservatives are also opposed to this,' what do you think is going on in Alberta with Syncrude? What is going on in that province? Is Syncrude a risk or is it not? I suggest that there are millions and millions and hundreds of millions of dollars coming to the Federal Government, coming for the benefit of the Member for Estevan, from the Government of Alberta — that Conservative, Tory Alberta, and also, from the Government of Ontario — Tory Ontario. Governments investing in those risky businesses! While, Mr. Speaker, they may be risky, I would suggest that governments have undertaken in modern times to look at what kind of investment government has to be involved in in order to assure the people that they represent, that they will have adequate sources of energy in this instance, Syncrude; that they will have adequate returns for the development of their natural resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously the Member for Wascana is either mixed up or he is speaking for all the Liberals here in Saskatchewan. The Member for Estevan is speaking for all of the Conservatives here in Saskatchewan — and they say 'we are opposed to this kind of legislation, we are opposed to this kind of investment.' It is only the Liberals and the Conservatives in Saskatchewan who are opposed, because everywhere else in Canada, Liberal Governments, Conservative Governments, invest in the development of our natural resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — I might say one other thing, Mr. Speaker. Liberals are noted for repeating the same old thing over and over and over, and some of those newer Members on the Opposition side of the House, I suggest that they will remain to be old Members in the Opposition side of the House. A former Liberal Member for the constituency of Melfort in 1948 stated that there would not be one oil well drilled in the Province of Saskatchewan, not one oil well, as long as there was a CCF Government in power.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the NDP Government was defeated in 1964, much to the regret of most people in Saskatchewan, it took them seven years but they learned the error of their ways, and re-elected an NDP Government. In 1964 there had been 5,337 wells, not only drilled, but producing in this province. I

April 11, 1977.

suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that only a Liberal could be wrong 5,337 times on one given subject. Only a Liberal, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he talks about statistics — the Member for Wascana. He refers to statistics about wells that were drilled and shows that there was some higher activity in the Province of Saskatchewan under the former Thatcher Government than there has been in some periods of time under the present New Democratic Party Government. That may be the case. But what really counts, and what he will not relate to, Mr. Speaker, is the revenue that is generated because of the activity in this province. Oil revenues as I have said in this House before, \$37 million in the former Thatcher years, compare that to a lesser time under the present New Democratic Government, almost \$350 million, or ten times as much, Mr. Speaker.

Then he talks about jobs. Mr. Speaker, let me remind him, perhaps there was some decline in real jobs in the oil industry in Saskatchewan, but never had there been in recent history, more jobs created totally in the Province of Saskatchewan since 1971, under this NDP Government. Never before have there been more jobs created. The lowest unemployment of any province in Canada, until recently where it now ranks second lowest.

He made some mention, Mr. Speaker, about risking this poor janitor's money — I feel sorry for him, he's packed his lunch and left. Always grabbing this \$1,500 from this janitor, and he knows full well that we are not taking money directly from taxpayers in Saskatchewan. It is not taxing revenue that is being involved in these investment operations. He also criticizes us because we will not give him a guarantee that we will keep all of that activity or all of that expenditure totally within the provincial boundaries of Saskatchewan. And certainly, we will not give him that kind of guarantee. His own example, referring to the exploration and development of natural gas, Mr. Speaker, we certainly are exploring and developing natural gas in Alberta. We are exploring there because the dollar spent has a much better chance of finding natural gas where there is higher volume of gas in the Province of Alberta than we have in the Province of Saskatchewan, and in so doing, we have increased the reserves of natural gas to the Province of Saskatchewan several times over. And that is certainly a large contrast from the former Thatcher Government when they were selling natural gas from the Saskatchewan gas field.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and again the Member for Estevan showed his ignorance and he displayed it several weeks ago, when he undertook to try to convince, I don't know who it was, but he was trying to convince, perhaps students who happened to be in the gallery at that time — that because we were not exploring or developing our natural gas, it was going to evaporate, it was going to disappear. We are finding natural gas in Alberta at less cost than it would cost us if we were developing in Saskatchewan, and when the time comes we will find gas in Saskatchewan and the price will be higher than it was yesterday, higher than it is today. We have given assurance to people in Saskatchewan that we will have a reserve of energy for them; something that the Conservatives and the Liberals would not, have not and do not display that they would do if they ever have the good fortune of being the Government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I simply want to say that he, the Member for Wascana in particular, the Liberal Party, a spokesman for the Liberal Party, seeing that he is generally here speaking as if he is leader of that party (I sometimes wonder who really is) that he is assuming that we are compelled to invest in every activity that takes place in the Province of Saskatchewan and that all those activities are going to be losers that is totally false. He knows full well, Mr. Speaker, that we invest in only the activities we choose to invest in.

MR. MERCHANT: — That is why the industry is so happy!

MR. MESSER: — Oh, and he says the industry is not happy. I wonder if he can explain why, and I do not think he can deny it — the level of activity in northern Saskatchewan has never been so high. I wonder how you can have that kind of contradiction. In one breath he says industry is all leaving the Province of Saskatchewan, yet the facts of the matter indicate that there has never been a higher level of activity in northern Saskatchewan. They are not leaving, they know the policy of this Government they know that we may choose to undertake to involve ourselves up to a maximum of 50 per cent in such ventures in northern Saskatchewan. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that they would much rather have it that way, than wondering what the next move of any political party or any government whatever its stripe might be, as to legislation or regulations in regard to its operation. They know that once we involve ourselves as a partner, that we suffer some of the consequences of that operation. And, I think that we have a much better understanding, a much better assurance and a much better rapport that we each understand each group's or each party's problems. I suggest to you that through this kind of legislation, through this kind of co-operation, through this kind of development, we will even reach greater roles of development in this province as far as non-renewable resources are concerned. Time will tell, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Regina Wascana will eat his words when he says, 'we Liberals oppose this kind of gambling and this kind of risk-taking.'

Mr. Speaker, having said those few brief words, I again move second reading of Bill No. 39.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Robbins that Bill No. 63 — **An Act to amend The Marriage Act** be now read a second time.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks with respect to this particular Bill. Particularly because of some remarks made by the Hon. Member for Regina South in the debate in this House on March 23, 1977.

At that time, the Member for Regina South requested that we consider a House amendment to Section 31 of The Marriage Act and that particular section, Mr. Speaker, deals with the matter of child marriages. Section 31 of The Marriage Act states that, in essence, no licence shall be issued to a person under 15 years of age, and no marriage of such person shall be solemnized

April 11, 1977.

unless there is furnished a certificate of a duly-qualified medical practitioner stating that immediate marriage is necessary in order to avoid illegitimacy of offspring. The Act further states that a child marriage cannot take place unless the consent of both parents is received. If this parental consent cannot be obtained, the individual may apply to a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench or to a District Court Judge for such consent. This child marriage provision was not, Mr. Speaker, originally in The Marriage Act, and I have been attempting to unearth the social and other reasons which caused this law to be enacted by a provincial Liberal Government in the year 1936.

I would like to give the House some recent information about the number of child marriages so that this question can be seen in reasonable perspective. In 1970 there were three child marriages in Saskatchewan. In 1971 there were two. In 1972 there were five. In 1973 there were five; and in 1974 there was one child marriage. In 1975 there was one child marriage. The data for 1976 has not yet been fully processed, and I am not able to confirm with complete certainty the number of child marriages for 1976, but it would appear that there were three in the year 1976. In the last few years there have been approximately 8,000 marriages per year in Saskatchewan. Even though one child marriage may well be one too many, the House should know that there is no alarming change in the pattern of child marriages. We believe the reason this topic has been drawn to public attention is because of an article which was written in the Saskatchewan Anglican, and reprinted in the Leader-Post under date of February 19 this year.

This Leader-Post article drew attention to the child marriage issue and presented one side of the case, and one side only. Subsequently, other media channels have picked up this story, and unfortunately we believe the public has not yet seen or heard a balanced assessment of the difficulties in dealing with the entire issue of child marriages.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that I personally do not support child marriages, and I would like to see this provision in The Marriage Act changed, however, I do not want to make this change in a hasty manner, because there are very wide implications related to it. It is obvious that if we amend The Marriage Act to prevent marriages from taking place below a minimum specified age, choose any age you want, 15 or 16, the Government would be enforcing illegitimacy upon the offspring of these child unions. While I recognize that today's moral codes may not attach the same stigma to illegitimate children as has been attached in the past, there remain in Saskatchewan, many people who are concerned about illegitimacy on social and religious grounds.

Moreover, under existing legislation, legitimate children have certain legal and property rights which illegitimate children do not have. These legal and property rights of children born to child parents, have to be considered and have to be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, of even greater concern, is the question of the custody and the responsibility for the babies of these child unions. If we are to amend Section 31 of The Marriage Act in the manner proposed by the Opposition Member, we are stating quite explicitly that children below a certain age are too young, too immature, and too irresponsible to enter into a marriage. But under other existing provincial legislation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Might I ask the Minister if he is, in fact, discussing Bill No. 63, which is under his name, or Bill No. 82 which is under the name of the Member for Wascana, because I gather he is talking about the aspects of Bill No. 82?

MR. ROBBINS: — No, Mr. Speaker, I am not. I am discussing the question raised with respect to Bill No. 63 by the Member for Regina South, Mr. Cameron, in his portion of the debate. I am not referring to Bill No. 82, the one introduced by the Member for Regina Wascana.

MR. SPEAKER: — I accept the Member's word that he is in part doing that. Now, there was some confusion on my part, and I did not warn the House that the Member was closing debate. However, I heard no Points of Order raised with regard to the matter, and I assume that we will continue, since no Points of Order were raised on that particular point.

MR. ROBBINS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Of even greater concern is the question of the custody and responsibility of the babies of these child unions. If we are to amend Section 31 of The Marriage Act in the manner proposed by the Opposition Member, (I am referring to the Member for Regina South) we are stating quite explicitly that children below a certain age are too young, too immature, and too irresponsible to enter a marriage.

Under existing provincial legislation, however, a child mother has complete legal custody over her baby regardless of her age. Here we have the dilemma that on one hand we are preventing child marriages from taking place, and on the other hand we are imposing the responsibility on these children to rear and provide for their babies, regardless of their age.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the broad implications which revolve around the child marriage issue. I believe that we can reach a sensible solution to this problem, but it will take some time, and a great deal of consultation to find the best answer. I want, Mr. Speaker, to inform the House that officials of the Department of Health and of the Department of Social Services are reviewing all of the legislation relevant to this issue. In addition, the Department of Health will shortly be contacting all marriage commissioners and ecumenical leaders in Saskatchewan to question their opinions, their comments, and their suggestions concerning child marriages and solutions to the problem.

The Department of Health has already been in touch with most of the provinces in Canada to examine the provisions that other jurisdictions have made to restrict or permit child marriages, and to examine the solutions which other provinces have adopted or may adopt, with respect to babies of these unions.

We cannot receive this additional information quickly, and it will take some time before the decisions can be arrived at. Mr. Speaker, while I concur to some degree with the comments of the Member for Regina South, I am not prepared to adopt his suggestion that we accept a House amendment to The Marriage Act to prevent child marriages.

April 11, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I will therefore, prepare a suitable amendment to The Marriage Act, dealing with child marriages, for introduction into the Legislative Assembly in the fall of 1977. At that time, my colleague, the Minister of Social Services, will have had an opportunity to reconcile any proposed changes to The Marriage Act with other social legislation which will also be affected. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 63, An Act to amend The Marriage Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that Bill No. 76 — **An Act to amend The Department of Finance Act** be now read a second time.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill that is before us, I believe does need some clarification, which I am sure we will receive in the Committee of the Whole.

Today, I would like to confine my comments to the role of the Provincial Auditor as is mentioned in this particular Bill. Mr. Speaker, I believe this to be another procedure that governments, not only in this province, but perhaps in other provinces and even in Ottawa, do where the independency and the powers of the Provincial Auditor are being usurped. The Provincial Auditor is an office and a title, that I suppose, he's the Court of last resort is the final check on government spending.

There are times when the auditor, whether it be the Auditor General in Ottawa or the Provincial Auditor in Regina or Edmonton or Winnipeg, or wherever it may be, there are times when this office can be very embarrassing to the Government, and yet I really do not see why it should be. Because, if I were a Minister of the Crown, and that auditor found that some portion of my department was not functioning properly, as a Minister of the Crown, I would find it my duty to act on the information, and I would encourage the auditor to keep people in my department sharp.

I really do not know why governments do fear the auditor because he can be that last check point that is available to see if your department is running smoothly. Granted he is not the be-all or the end-all, but he is the mechanism.

This Bill will allow Crown corporations to use someone other than the Provincial Auditor to audit their books. I do not know exactly what the intention of the Minister is, in proposing this change. I am aware that the Provincial Auditor is vastly understaffed. He is having problems in recruiting people and I really do not intend to go into that because I am told that this is being looked after in another portion of government.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very dangerous thing when the public auditor does not personally, or his officials do not personally, view the financial statements of a government department or a Crown corporation. I will grant you that this Bill still does give the auditor power to examine the financial statement of a Crown corporation, but I believe that it should go further than that. I believe that the Provincial Auditor and his staff should be doing the accounting.

First of all, it has got to be cheaper. If the Provincial Auditor's staff is going to be expanded, and hopefully through another vehicle or another medium it will be, then the Provincial Auditor must look at the entire, overall picture. I have every confidence that the Government is going to expand the office of the Provincial Auditor; make the necessary changes that he has requested; give him the staff to properly and completely do his job.

Mr. Speaker, I have many additional comments which I would like to make to Section 16(a). I would prefer to deal with them at more length on another day, therefore, I would bet leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that Bill No. 79 — **An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act** be now read a second time.

MR. THATCHER: — Again, Mr. Speaker, we see an example of tax increases in regard to the tobacco tax, and this is probably an area where governments all over seize upon to impose increases because they think that they are not going to be criticized.

I suppose tobacco and alcohol are considered fair game. Frankly. I think people who choose to smoke, or choose to consume alcohol, have some rights too. Because one does choose to consume alcohol, it does not make him an alcoholic, and because one may choose to have the odd cigar, occasionally, it does not necessarily mean that he is going to die of lung cancer. And, if he so is going to, I believe that is his choice.

I do not believe that these taxes are imposed in order to eliminate consumption, because certainly your statistics show very conclusively that they do not. I believe that the time has come to have a little mercy on our tobacco smokers, and for that matter on those who may purchase alcohol, because they are not all necessarily bad — contrary to what some people across the way may tell you. Not everybody is an alcoholic and not everybody is a chain smoker.

And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the Bill.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, there is not very much to rebut. The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley said that they would oppose the Bill, or that he would oppose the Bill. I am not sure whether he was speaking for the total Liberal caucus. I am not sure whether the Member who just took his seat has indicated the position of the Liberal Party or whether he is just speaking for himself.

Mr. Speaker, I think the question of consumption and price, whether it be in tobacco or cigarettes or any other consumer item, has a relationship. The higher the price, the less the people will use the commodity or purchase the particular item. I am certainly hopeful that by increasing the price that we can reduce consumption. There are some indications in other countries in the case of alcohol in particular, that by

April 11, 1977.

increasing the price, of what is a so-called social pricing policy, has had a dramatic effect on reducing consumption of alcohol.

MR. MALONE: — Name one!

MR. SMISHEK: — I'll name one. I can name you Sweden, I can name you Norway; the Scandinavian countries! By sharply increasing prices there has been a dramatic reduction in the consumption of alcohol. They have proven it conclusively.

Mr. Speaker, in considering the whole area of tax increases, I think it is fair to say that people object less to increases in such things as tobacco and liquor, than they do in other commodities. We found it necessary to raise additional revenue because of government expenditures going up. We looked at all taxes and felt that this is one area where we could increase the tax without too much resistance from the consuming public. We believe that this is one tax that will not be resisted too much by the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words, I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

SECOND READINGS

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 74 — **An Act to Regulate the Practice of Denturists in Saskatchewan.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the main principles incorporated in this proposed Act, called The Denturists Act, This legislation will legalize and confer self-regulation status upon denturists in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, other than the Maritimes, Saskatchewan is the only province which does not have legislation legalizing denturists and regulating their practices.

Denturists have been present and practising in our province for a number of years, but have until now lacked any reasoned legal basis for their practice and have technically been illegal as a health discipline. This legislation has been requested by the Denturist Society of Saskatchewan in order to establish a legal basis for the practice of denturists and to put in place a regulatory mechanism under which basic training, competence and practice standards for denturists may be defined.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health has worked very closely with the denturists and the dentists in the province to develop provisions for this Bill which can be accepted by the major interest groups.

Under controls and safeguards established by this Bill, denturists will be enabled to fit and supply complete dentures, directly to patients. Provision is also made for denturists who meet special requirements to fit and supply partial dentures in collaboration with dentists.

Mr. Speaker, for the public this Bill will ensure that all denturists in Saskatchewan have met basic licensing requirements through examination and have demonstrated satisfactory levels of training, skill and performance. Furthermore the public in Saskatchewan at the present time do not have any protection against the malpractice of denturists.

When this Bill is enacted, Mr. Speaker, the criteria for malpractice will be established and the public will have a legal basis and an organization to which it can direct its complaints and its concerns.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice in this Bill that we have separated the function of dispensing complete dentures from the function of supplying partial dentures. We realize that supplying partial dentures is subject to much more risk for the patient than supplying full or complete dentures. Before a patient should receive a partial denture, very careful diagnostic work should be undertaken by a dentist to ensure that a patient's dental health is such that a partial denture can be placed in the mouth of that patient and that the partial denture will not adversely affect the health of the other existing live teeth in the mouth of that individual.

The matter of allowing denturists under very strict conditions to supply partial dentures was a subject of extensive discussions with the dentists, the denturists and the Department of Health. Agreement has been reached that supplying partial dentures should not be established as part of the basic scope of the practice of denturists. Special criteria and limitation will be established in regulations, governing the dispensing of partial dentures. Fully licensed denturists may write a special examination to qualify them to supply partial dentures and if this examination is passed, the denturists will be known as a partial denture technician. These partial denture technicians will then be enabled to fit, manufacture and dispense partial dentures, only in collaboration with dentists as spelled out in this Bill, with details found in regulations pursuant to the Act.

Organizationally, Mr. Speaker, there will need to be a transition period during which the new organization for denturists is established and during which examinations will be held and any necessary educational upgrading provided for practising denturists in the province. During this transitional period, denturists will be regulated by a Transitional Governing Council, to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The Transitional Governing Council will be responsible for establishing licensing requirements for denturists, for defining standards of competence and practice and for otherwise regulating and governing the practice of denturists.

During the interim period, all denturists will be examined by an independent board of examiners, to be appointed by the Transitional Governing Council. Those denturists who immediately satisfy licensing requirements will receive full licences. Those denturists who are found to require further training, will be awarded provisional licences, which will be valid for no more than 12 months. These provisional licences will enable denturists to practise under controls, while they become fully qualified. However, provisional licences will not be established as a permanent feature of the Act.

April 11, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the House, the provisional licensing feature a little more fully. Formal training courses for denturists have been established in other jurisdictions, only relatively recently. For this reason, denturists currently practising in our province have become skilled in their craft in a number of ways but chiefly through apprenticeship and other types of on the job training. Because of the considerable variations and backgrounds of Saskatchewan denturists we have decided that there will be no grandfather licensing and that all denturists will be required to prove their qualifications before they are licensed. We have provided under provisional licensing a reasonable time period of 12 months during which denturists are to be allowed to practise under conditions established by the Transitional Governing Council. During that period they are expected to upgrade their education.

I should mention, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Continuing Education will make available to denturists the necessary educational upgrading that will allow them to become fully licensed. If denturists require educational upgrading before they are entitled to receive full licences and if they are unwilling to take this upgrading after 12 months they will not be able to practise in this province at all.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill requires the Transitional Governing Council to turn its responsibilities over to the board of directors of the Denturist Society of Saskatchewan at the direction of the Lieutenant-Governor when sufficient numbers of denturists have become qualified and have received full licences. Only holders of full licences will be eligible for membership in their society. On the date that the board of directors of the Denturist Society of Saskatchewan assumes the responsibilities of the Transitional Governing Council denturists will have reached full self-regulatory status. Even when the society becomes fully self-regulatory the Bill empowers the Lieutenant-Governor at his discretion and if he considers it to be advisable to appoint one or two persons to be full members of the Society's Board of Directors, in other words there can be public representation on the board of the Denturists Society.

I would like to summarize and emphasize the important safeguards for both denturists and the public which have been incorporated in this Bill: (1) The status of denturists will be recognized by law for the first time in the Province of Saskatchewan. (2) Licensing will be by examination only. (3) Examinations will be conducted fairly and impartially by an independent examining board. (4) A Transitional Governing Council will be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor to administer and implement the Act during an interim period before the board of directors of the Denturist Society of Saskatchewan assumes its full regulatory responsibilities. (5) Regulations enacted by the Transitional Governing Council or later by the board of directors of the Denturist Society of Saskatchewan must be approved by the Government before they become law. The Act further provides that the Minister may request that a regulation be amended, enacted or repealed and if a satisfactory agreement has not been reached within 60 days the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is to be empowered to impose such changes as are considered necessary. (6) Denturists who require upgrading training will be provided such training on a fair and impartial basis. (7) Denturists who are initially unable to fully meet licensing requirements will not immediately be denied the right to practise and will be allowed a fair and reasonable

period of time in which to obtain full qualification. (8) Appeal procedures from the decisions of the Transitional Governing Council and later the board of directors of the Denturist Society of Saskatchewan have been provided in this Bill. (9) Denturists will be entitled to appeal disciplinary decisions to a special three member tribunal headed by a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench.

Mr. Speaker, we are confident the Denturist Bill contains necessary safeguards that will protect public interest and the legitimate interests of denturists and dentists. Mr. Speaker, I therefore move that this Bill be given second reading and be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill I understand is to recognize the Denturists Society by law in Saskatchewan and I presume this is the wish of the majority of denturists in Saskatchewan. I understand Saskatchewan is one of the last provinces in Canada to recognize the denturists as a professional society. I have some concern about Sections 3 and 4 where it says the directors and officers holding office at the time of coming into force of this section shall continue in office until the successors are elected or appointed in accordance with this Act. Section 5 says, that there shall hereby be established a Transitional Governing Council which shall consist of not more than seven members. Section 5(2) says, "The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall appoint the member . . ." On the one hand the Bill recognizes the ability of the current officers to conduct the business of the society but on the other hand it says that's fine, but we'll do it for you.

Another area of concern. Section 10(2) reads:

Every person who makes an application for registration as a denturist who is of good character and has fulfilled the qualifications required by the Governing Council may register as a denturist.

The permissive 'may' is what concerns me. It seems that a person who makes the application is of good character and who has fulfilled all the qualifications required by the Governing Council should be registered as a denturist, I just don't understand the permissive 'may'. I notice this same clause, by way of amendment, is going into The Medical Professions Act, and I just don't quite understand why it is there.

Section 22 says in part:

When the Minister is of the opinion that a sufficient number of denturists have become registered and licensed under this Act . . .

the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may transfer the powers to a board.

Section 20 says:

The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may, on and after the day fixed by him pursuant to subsection (1) of Section 22,

April 11, 1977.

appoint one or more persons as members of the board . . .

This I think is a mixed blessing. I recognize that perhaps members outside the professional society should be represented on the board but I don't see appointments by the Minister through the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as being the proper way to get these lay members on the board. It is an awful lot like the ophthalmic Bill going through at the moment. It would appear that we have another instance of the Government saying, yes, we think we should recognize your association but we think that we, the big brothers, should determine how it shall be set up, organized and constituted and that we may amend the legislation next session. It is just taking, in my opinion, all too much power unto the Cabinet.

This is typical legislation of this socialist philosophy that we are going to run your business until such time as in our opinion you are capable of running your own and when we do turn it over to you we reserve the right to appoint one or two of our friends to your council to keep us well informed as to the opinions, philosophies and the thinking of your membership. This type of legislation is now becoming the accepted practice of this Government. 'We will let you know where you are, what you are, who you are, why you are, when we think you are ready to know, when we think you are capable of running your own business. After all, we in the Government and in the Cabinet in particular are denturist specialists and we know what is best for denturists in Saskatchewan.'

I favor the principle of the Bill, recognizing denturists in Saskatchewan, however, I have trouble accepting the powers that the Government retains unto itself in this Bill.

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, our health critic is away this afternoon unavoidably. I am sure he will have even more penetrating remarks to make than the Member for Cannington and accordingly I beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

MR. ROBBINS (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 75 — **An Act to amend The Public Health Act.**

He said: This Bill to amend The Public Health Act deals with three different and particular issues. The Act now provides for the appointment of a board of governors to operate a hospital owned by the province. The two boards appointed under this authority in the past have been the board for the Souris Valley Extended Care Hospital at Weyburn and the board of the Regina General Hospital in Regina. The Act presently authorized these boards to operate, control and manage hospitals assigned to them.

The first amendment to The Public Health Act will confer on these hospitals' boards the same powers that are now possessed by the University Hospital Board in Saskatoon and the Board of Governors of the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre which deals with three hospitals in Regina. These additional powers will authorize these boards to construct, renovate and remodel hospitals. These additional powers are intended to give more flexibility to the manner in which the Regina hospitals'

regeneration plan will be carried out. Members will recall that the Government has embarked on a program in relationship to hospital regeneration in Regina at a cost of some \$66 million over the next ten years.

This amendment will permit the Board of Governors of the Regina General Hospital to become contractually involved in various aspects of the regeneration plan.

The second amendment is related to the fiscal year of these boards. In accordance with other Bills which have been passed by this House in this Session, the fiscal year for hospitals owned by the Government will be changed from the calendar year to the annual period fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. This again relates to the fiscal period of government, April 1 to March 31, and has been standardized across the country. In effect this amendment will change the fiscal year for the Regina General Hospital and the Souris Valley Extended Care Hospital from the calendar year to the period from April 1 in one year to March 31 in the next. This amendment will bring the fiscal year of hospitals in line with the fiscal year of the Provincial Government and should facilitate budgeting and accounting to the Legislative Assembly.

The third amendment pertains to the consent required for medical or dental services where the patient by reason of physical or mental disability is not capable of making such a decision for herself or himself. In the past the legal validity of consent given by relatives in these cases was not entirely clear but was accepted in practice. However, when no known relative existed the law did not authorize any other person to give consent. The only exception was that where emergency services were required no consent was required.

In putting forth this amendment, Mr. Speaker, the Government wishes to clarify the various legal responsibilities in such cases and to remove some of the apprehension felt by those involved. The proposed changes can probably best be explained by example. Let us say that an individual is referred to an extended care hospital for possible admission. Let us say further that the condition which prompted the referral has resulted in some mental incapacity such as the individual does not have the capacity to either give or withhold consent for medical treatment. The amendment before the Assembly would permit legal authority for the admission. If a relative was known to exist it would be that person's responsibility to give or withhold consent. If no relatives existed or if none could be located admission would be allowed on the advice of the attending physician and written concurrence of another physician. In the case of dental services, the same example would apply except that a dentist may authorize the provision of dental services with the written concurrence of another dentist.

There is one further aspect of this question to be noted. It is possible that in some instances the nearest relative to the incompetent individual may not wish to accept responsibility for authorizing medical or dental service to the individual. In these circumstances the nearest relative may disclaim any responsibility for the patient if he so chooses. In these instances the medical or dental consent could be obtained by the two physicians or the two dentists mentioned earlier in these remarks.

April 11, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will provide the flexibility that is necessary if medical and dental services are to be provided in such circumstances without undue apprehension for nearest relatives, physicians or dentists. These improvements will be welcomed by the relatives of those concerned and by those charged with the responsibility of services in question.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with all the main points of the Bill and I would therefore move second reading of this Bill.

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview).

HON. D.L. FARIS (Minister of Continuing Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 77 — **An Act to amend The Student Assistance and Student Aid Fund Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to this Bill are fairly routine and my remarks will be brief. These reflect an updating in the Act brought about by the establishment of the Department of Continuing Education, a separation of a single university into two distinct university institutions. Section 2 of the Bill corrects the designation of committee members on the Scholarship, Bursary and Loan Committee resulting from the creation of the two universities and of the organization of the Department of Continuing Education. The two universities are now represented as also is the director of student services in place of the director of administrative services and the assistant to the Minister.

Section 3 of the Bill corrects the wording by replacing education by continuing education. Section 4 of the Bill provides for investments of a broader nature than are currently permitted as governed by The Department of Finance Act. Certain investments have been made which the Provincial Auditor considers are not covered by the present Act but which conform to the Department of Finance Act which covers most other government investment.

Section 5 of the Bill arises from discrepancies between the fiscal years of government and universities. Because of difficulties in defining fiscal years it is proposed to delete this and cause the legislation to conform to current usage.

Section 6 of the Bill provides legislative authority for regulations to be made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council which cover the qualification of students to whom awards may be made.

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 77 be now read a second time.

MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might make a few remarks. I agree with the Minister, at least from my reading, this is basically a housekeeping kind of Bill.

The section which the Minister just mentioned, Section 6, with regard to qualifications required by students to whom awards may be made is an intent of the Bill that I would have hoped might have been clarified a little differently in line

with the debate a week or so ago in Estimates, about qualifications of students in Saskatchewan who are applying for loans as distinct from students who are applying for loans with money, that is basically federal money and is handled by the province.

Aside from that particular point, however, the change in the people who are on the selection committee and the change to bring the fiscal year into line, would appear to be appropriate and I have no other comments to make.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, our education critic is unavoidably absent this afternoon. I know that he did have some comment to make on this Bill and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. ROBBINS (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 80 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act deals with two particular issues.

My remarks in regard to it will be quite brief. The first relates to the type of services which qualify as benefits under the provisions of the Act. Under those provisions, as it now reads, only hospital related services qualify as benefits for which payments can be made. The Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan is organized to make grants to institutions only on that basis.

The amendment that is being presented will broaden the range of services which can be funded by the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, beyond those provided solely in or by a hospital.

Further the amendment provides for payments to be made to individuals for services which they provide pursuant to an agreement with the Department of Health.

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that in addition to paying for hospital based services, we will have the administrative machinery in place to allow us to pay for services that may be provided outside of the hospital environment. This amendment will provide the Department of Health with more administrative flexibility to cope with an ever increasing need for community type programs.

Mr. Speaker, the second amendment relates to the financial reporting period for Saskatchewan hospitals and has been referred to in other bills before the House this Session. At the present time the financial year for all hospitals is based on the calendar year January 1 to December 31.

This amendment proposes the period be changed to begin on April 1 of one year and to end on March 31 of the following year. It also proposes that the reporting period for the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan be changed to a similar status. Obviously considerable administrative difficulty and expense will be eliminated by having the reporting period for hospitals and the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan consistent

April 11, 1977.

with the fiscal cycle upon which the Government of Saskatchewan operates. This change will require transitional periods from January 1 of one year until March 31 of the next. I would suggest to this House that such a change can be easily made by Order in Council.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the amendments to this Bill can only improve the outstanding record of this Government in the health care field.

I, therefore, move second reading of this Bill.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, just a couple of brief comments. The amendment relates to other services and I have no quarrel with that. The amendment as it relates to fiscal year — fiscal year means a period fixed from time to time by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and I do quarrel with that. I think that if the calendar year isn't convenient as it relates to coinciding with the government year and if April 1 to March 31 is more convenient that that could be legislated and be more acceptable to my thinking, at least. The way that it is left here a government of some questionable repute could possibly do a little juggling every year by changing the fiscal year back and forth. I am not suggesting that any government would do that, but the power exists under this amendment and I have a problem living with that as it is laid out. I don't think there is any problem in bringing forth legislation stipulating what the fiscal year should be.

I will have a little more to say on this later so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Telecommunications) moved second reading of Bill No. 85 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 85 was prompted by the decision to build a new head office building for Sask Tel as part of the larger complex in downtown Regina which involves both Sask Tel and SGIO and also providing space and facilities for a number of additional enterprises all of which will hopefully help to rejuvenate the downtown area of Regina. It was recognized that some organization had to spearhead the overall planning of this project. Sask Tel has the largest needs and, therefore, is the logical choice to assume this responsibility.

This kind of participation in urban development projects is not uncommon for telephone companies and other enterprises across Canada. The Regina downtown project is large enough that it may not be incidental to Sask Tel's powers to construct and operate a telecommunications system. Consequently the purpose of this amendment is to provide assurance to Sask Tel that it has the necessary legislative sanction to proceed to construct, manage, lease and dispose of as it appears necessary a large complex to accommodate other enterprises as well as the normal operations of Sask Tel.

In a nutshell, then, this legislation will enable Sask Tel to incorporate its own needs into a larger plant, which is designed to serve both the interests of the people of Regina and the people of this province.

While the need for retroactivity may be questionable, Sask Tel has been involved in planning the project since last September and I believe that the retroactive provision is necessary to assure Sask Tel and others involved in this project that there is no question about the authority of the Crown Corporation Sask Tel since that date.

Mr. Speaker, the other amendment increases from \$10,000 to \$100,000 the value of land sales or purchases that do not require approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 85.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments in regard to this Bill. I imagine that we are going to be supporting this particular piece of legislation. The only things that I question is that I understand that the particular Bill will provide the authority that Sask Tel needs to construct a new head office.

The question I ask is: why is it absolutely necessary that that head office, once again, be located in the city of Regina? It seems as if Mayor Henry Baker again is getting all the benefits of the balance of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan in terms of locating head offices such as Sask Power, Sask Tel, SGIO, etc. We have talked about a government that is trying to diversify its operations and become more available to the people of Saskatchewan and yet every major Crown corporation, which is located in the Province of Saskatchewan, does have its head office right here in the city of Regina.

I could see nothing wrong with Sask Tel locating its head office, for example, in the city of Swift Current allowing people in the southwest part of the province to be able to say, we have a head office located in our particular section as well.

One of the Members at the back says that he may lose 1,000 constituents, possibly the Member for Morse may then gain 500 and the Member for Swift Current gain 500 in the city of Swift Current and the constituency of Morse.

I think it is something that we should certainly be looking very closely at. Instead of locating these head offices in the city of Regina, take a closer look at locating them in some of our smaller centres. I should like to rule out the city of Saskatoon, as well, Saskatoon and Regina are two of our major cities in the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe that more attention should be placed in areas such as Swift Current, Estevan, North Battleford and so on. I understand that the possibility of changing Sask Tel's head office is too far down the road, as commitments have been made, as the Minister has said, the Bill is retroactive to last year.

Again, let me just reiterate my claim stating that I would hope that in the future that new head office buildings for Crown corporations be located in centres other than in the city of Regina and that the city of Swift Current and the southwest part of the province be looked upon with a little more favor.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg leave to adjourn debate because I should like to consider the statement made by the Minister.

Debate adjourned.

April 11, 1977.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — Bill No. 66 — An Act respecting Auctioneers

Section 1, 2, 3 agreed.

Section 4 as amended agreed.

Sections 5, 6, 7 agreed.

SECTION 8

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to this Bill as stated previously. I have checked with the Saskatchewan Auctioneers' Association and they have agreed that the licensing as well as the regulations are in agreement with them and we will be supporting the Bill.

Section 8 and 9 agreed.

SECTION 10

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Chairman, I have a brief question about Section 10 and that is simply, if the Minister has any intention of making files available to those individuals for whom a file may be kept. We ran into the problem in Crown Corporations the other day where SGIO does some investigative work of individuals whom they might be going to insure and will refuse them and will refuse to give them reasons why they have been refused. They also refused to allow them to peruse the files that SGIO may hold on them, so that if for some reason an individual is refused insurance for reasons that the investigators may have picked up he is given no chance to clear himself if that information should be incorrect. I just noticed that there is a potential in this Bill to have the same situation exist in Saskatchewan, and that is, that a person may apply to be an auctioneer and for whatever reason be refused. I would like to know if the Minister has any intention of making those files available to the individual on whom they are kept for their perusal? As most of you know, in The Credit Act it is compulsory that a bank, for example, or chartered financial institution make available to those individuals a copy of their file so that if there is any erroneous information contained in it that they may be given a chance to clear themselves. I wonder if that is going to be the situation here?

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — I think, Mr. Chairman, they are two entirely different sets of circumstances and if the Hon. Member will look at 14 carefully and 15, it sets out the procedure for a hearing and if the person who has been suspended or refused a licence, is not satisfied with the hearing he can appeal to a Court of Queen's Bench.

Section 10 agreed.

Sections 11 to 20 agreed.

SECTION 21

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Chairman, I should like the Minister to make some clarification with regard to this section. I would like to know if the auctioneer would be, in fact, held liable for

goods that he had auctioned if there was a lien against them or anything of this nature.

MR. WHELAN: — The auctioneer would not be liable unless he was fully aware of what he was doing and that there was such a lien in existence.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Would he be held liable and not the person who submitted the goods for auction, or would it be shared or which?

MR. WHELAN: — If he knew, he would be liable but if he didn't he would not. The person who gave him the goods to sell would be wholly liable, if the auctioneer was unaware of the lien.

MR. BIRKBECK: — In other words if the individual were to have some merchandise and have a lien against it or maybe had acquired it through illegal ways, he could put it in an auction and if the auctioneer knew and it was auctioned, it would be hung on the auctioneer and not the individual?

MR. WHELAN: — In any event the creditor would be liable, but if the auctioneer knew he would also be liable.

Section 21 agreed to.

Sections 22 and 23 agreed.

Section 24 as amended agreed.

Sections 25 to 29 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Chairman, before we begin our next Bill I wonder if I might engage the indulgence of the House to introduce to you and to the Members of this House, Mr. Gilbert Parent, the Member of Parliament for St. Catharines, Ontario. Mr. Parent as well is accompanied here today by his wife and sister who are located in the west gallery. As a point of interest I would like to point out that Mr. Parent, besides being a Member of Parliament for St. Catharines, Ontario, also bears the distinction of being the seatmate of Dr. Cliff McIsaac a Member of Parliament for Saskatchewan and former Member in this Chamber.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Committee of the Whole continued

Bill No. 46 — An Act to amend The Highways Act

SECTION 1

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — The intent of the Act, as I understand it, Mr. Minister, is that instead of just seizing the trucks you can now seize chattels and goods under this Act. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, would you tell me are there any limitations as to the upper end limit you could go on in finding this?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — Yes, the limitation would be the amount of the fine and far more helpful, both to the judge or the magistrate and certainly to the trucker, because the whole intent is that we should not be tying up his means of livelihood. It will be easier, for instance, to take his television and allow him to continue to operate so that he is not losing his means of earning a living.

Section 1 agreed.

SECTION 2

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Minister the last portion thereof, explain if you would please, “. . . no provision of the Criminal Code for enforcing an order for payment of a sum of money shall apply.” Could you explain that last portion of the sentence of Section 2(1B)?

MR. KRAMER: — The legal staff has inserted that and they tell us that this is necessary in order to remain within the letter of the law and it is standard procedure. I rely on the legal people in the House as to whether that is factual.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — It seems though that the province is excluding the application of the Criminal Code under this particular provision, which the province does not have the power to do. We are referring to clause (1B) in the printed Bill, “. . . and no provision of the Criminal Code for enforcing an order for payment of a sum of money shall apply.” Well that could be a lot stronger than the Minister has indicated, that you are really voiding perhaps a court order and under the Criminal Code of Canada the province does not have the power to do that.

MR. KRAMER: — All I can say to the Member for Qu'Appelle is, that is not the advice that we have. The intention of the changes, are simply to make procedure a little easier on truckers and to make it less difficult for collections. The only thing that a magistrate can do at present, and we have had difficulty with this, is to seize at the time of imposing the fine, which, under the old Act, would be the vehicle. Magistrates don't want to do that and we don't want to do that, we don't want to take the trucker's livelihood away. There is another factor in here and that is trucking companies. A company cannot be sent to jail and we have had instances where the truck driver for the company was charged rather than the company; this will prevent this kind of thing from happening.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, we are sympathetic to what you are trying to accomplish. What we are saying is that you may well be having more problems trying to exclude the operation of the Criminal Code which the province does not have the power to do than what you are trying to solve. My suggestion would be that this particular item be stood and go back for a legal opinion, because we think it is wrong.

MR. KRAMER: — In this case, I would pass to the Attorney General

who is more conversant with what we can and cannot do. I am afraid that I cannot pass an opinion on that. My advice was that this was necessary in order to do what we intended to in this Act. If you want it to stand or if someone else has an explanation they can possibly help the Member.

Section 2 as amended agreed.

SECTION 3

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman just one quick question to the Minister again to explain in a little more detail the intention here. I am a little bit concerned about tired long distance drivers, the long distance hauler that he may not have a proper facility or proper position on the highway to park his vehicle for rest. Could you explain what the intention is regarding these zones?

MR. KRAMER: — The intention is entirely one of safety. Anyone knows that the parking of a vehicle on the shoulder of the road presents a hazard unless it is properly lit and even then it presents a hazard. There is also a danger in areas where we have a very light surface on the shoulders. A heavily loaded truck parked for any length of time causes a depression followed by break-up and we just can't afford to have this happen. You are right, we are concerned about the tired driver. I can assure the House that there are areas that are safe to pull off onto and where they do not exist we will certainly see to it that there are adequate spots in the road to allow a trucker to take the necessary rest. I don't suppose that is going to take care of every particular instance. The main thrust of this is for an area like our No. 1 by-pass at Regina. When they went across the highway and started construction there, anyone who drove by there last summer especially when it was muddy found lines of cars on Trans Canada, both sides, cars and trucks parked for the day which presented a real hazard and we had no authority to do anything about it at that time.

The main thrust of the amendment is to see that in congested areas where there is a high volume of traffic, that we have the authority to do something about it for the sake of safety. We are not intending to harass every tired driver. I think the law has to have some sense, and I am sure that the law enforcement officers have that commonsense. We do require this authority in areas like I have mentioned where there is congestion and where there is a danger that there will be an accident because of bad visibility and crowded conditions.

MR. ANDERSON: — I should like to ask the Minister, in this section, it does not differentiate between stopping and parking if you run out of gas, your vehicle stops and you are posted you are going to be in quite a bit of difficulty in differentiating between your parking and your stopping. If you stop to relieve yourself are you going to be parking or stopping?

MR. KRAMER: — I don't wonder the Member is concerned about relieving himself. Some folks' need is greater than others. It is the letter of the law, not the spirit, if you are going to take the absolute letter of the law, it would make an ass out of the law entirely. That is not the intention I can assure the Member.

Section 3 agreed.

Section 4 deleted.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Development Fund Act, 1974

Sections 1 and 2 previously agreed.

SECTION 3

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be kind enough just to explain what the intent of this particular section is?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Health): — This particular section, Mr. Chairman, proposed amendment, is that we provide an opportunity to the residents of Saskatchewan to invest a portion of their savings in shares of an undertaking involving a minimum of investment risk to such shareholders and others. And there was some discussion the other day when we were on this particular part of the Bill. The description of residents of Saskatchewan is too restrictive even to persons domiciled in Saskatchewan but residing elsewhere and that is on a temporary basis, of course, but did not come within the previous definition. I want to point out to the Members of the House that we have 24 investors who have made investments in the Saskatchewan Development Fund, but currently are resident outside of the province, and want to continue to make investments in the Saskatchewan Development Fund.

For example, there are people who have RRSPs who are no longer residents of Saskatchewan, but wish to continue to make contributions to the Registered Retirement Savings Plans operated by the Saskatchewan Development Fund, on the basis of the fact that our earnings are very high. Last year they were 14.58 per cent on a net basis. We have people who have Registered Home Owner Plans, and that is a once-in-a-lifetime deal, and they wish to continue those. We don't think it is rational or reasonable to cut them off. Perhaps you have some further questions on it, that's all I can say at the moment.

MR. THATCHER: — Yes I do, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, is it a fair statement to say that The Saskatchewan Development Act is, in effect, really a subsidized investment? Would you agree with that description?

MR. ROBBINS: — No, I would not, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is there was equity provided by the Government of Saskatchewan on a temporary basis, and those advances will be eventually paid off.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Loans?

MR. ROBBINS: — There are loans and equity as well. Both.

MR. CAMERON: — How much interest is being charged?

MR. ROBBINS: — There is no interest on the equity — there is interest on the loan being paid. But, they will all be paid off in time. The fund itself will generate sufficient management fees through the fund of the Corporation to pay off those loans.

That is not an uncommon practice, even in private business. When people make investments in equity, they don't expect an interest return. When a new business starts up they put in equity and they don't expect any return, perhaps, for some period of time. We said in the initial stages of the Saskatchewan Development Fund that within five years that equity would be paid off. We have every reason to believe that will occur.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, perhaps you could tell us, then, you have had advances from the Government, which you have put into an equity position. You have indicated that you are not paying interest on it, and I respectfully question your assertion that this is a common practice in private companies. I am not saying that it never occurs, but I would have to respectfully suggest to you that it is rather rare. Now, if you are loaning them money interest-free, any way you cut it, it has got to end up as some sort of a subsidy and it does not matter whether it is private or public, because it is still somebody subsidizing you in interest rate.

But you mentioned the repayment. And you indicated repayment over five years. Could you tell me the dollars that have been advanced to you in the past? What, roughly, has been your repayment schedule? How far have you gone in repaying it?

MR. ROBBINS: — We obviously, did not expect to be making any repayments in the initial stages. The fund has been operating for two and one-half years. At the end of its first year of operation, it had roughly \$1.5 million of investment in it. In the initial stages, of course, the equity advanced by the Department of Finance had to be available to get the organization started. The same as if you and I invested in a private company in terms of equities we would put in money and we would not expect any return in the initial stages. That is no different than what happened in the particular situation with regard to this. The fund is operated by the Corporation on the basis that as the money flows into investment, the management fees will eventually repay that equity. None of it has been repaid to date. That is a fact. But we have had loans, and repaid the loans. Obviously the loans are borrowed at the going short-term rate — in terms of short-term money. The last one was at 8.68 per cent. That loan was paid off on March 22, 1977; after the end of the fiscal year.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, could you tell us, in the investments that this fund is making are they all being made in Saskatchewan, or are they being made elsewhere? And, could you give us some indication of approximately what percentage of these investments are made outside the province, if in fact there are any?

MR. ROBBINS: — Obviously, the Member was not here when I answered that question for the Member for Regina South, the other day. About 40 per cent, at the present time, but . . .

MR. PENNER: — Shame!

MR. ROBBINS: — Well, yell shame all you like, but you also have to

realize that we are in the process of picking up mortgages in the province, and that is a rather slow process in terms of making all the arrangements, and there is a sizeable chunk of money that will be available to the Saskatchewan Development Fund through mortgages as they come available. That will increase, the percentage that will be utilized on that basis. I suppose you could use other arguments with respect to where that money is invested. A lot of it is in short-term funds on a temporary basis. That is common in terms of investment of funds.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, perhaps you could tell me, why when 40 per cent of your investments are being made outside the province, as far as I can see to the non-benefit of Saskatchewan people, what is the point of the fund in the first place? Why did you feel that you had to go outside the province for 40 per cent of your investments? Is it fair to suggest that perhaps you indicated that Saskatchewan was a lousy place to make an investment? Would this have anything to do with it? If this is what your intention is to continue investing outside the province, why have the fund? There has got to be something better than this thing.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, Saskatchewan has been a lousy place to make investments in the past. We had a Liberal Government for seven years, but it is improving ever since that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — I know the Member for Regina South the other day was putting up the argument that we should not have gone into this because there are mutual funds available. But, I can tell you that mutual fund results for the people in this province have been lousy down through the years. I can cite you many examples of individuals who have placed sizeable sums of money in mutual funds, with very poor results through the '60s and '70s. I would contend, on that basis, that there was some merit in setting up a mutual fund with some government backing, with the intent of attempting to keep more investment funds in the Province of Saskatchewan. I would not suggest, for one minute, that it has been highly successful to date, but I would say it is on the road to success.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how he squares the fact that he invests 40 per cent of the fund, outside Saskatchewan, with this provision of the Act that was passed in 1974? Bear in mind, this provision is mandatory. It is a mandatory provision of this Act. It says the Corporation shall establish a fund to be known as the Saskatchewan Development Fund. The fund shall be used to provide a source of capital to assist in the retention of the control of the Saskatchewan economy by residents of the province.

Now, I wonder, in view of the words — the fund shall be used for that purpose — how then the Minister can justify investing 40 per cent of the funds outside the province?

MR. ROBBINS: — We are in the process of moving in that direction. Obviously a new fund when money flows in, it has to be invested,

and has to be invested in the opportunities that are available at that particular time. That is why I stressed the fact that a large portion of the fund was invested in short-term certificates, on a temporary basis, and they roll over very rapidly. As we get mortgages in the province, and we are getting an increasing number of mortgages in the province, a larger percentage of the total sum of money will be invested in the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Chairman, would the Minister not agree that the most significant form of subsidization is the fact that the Government guarantees that anyone who goes into this investment, will receive his investment plus five per cent. The result, Mr. Chairman, is that somebody who invested in this program in December 1975, a year later had 14.5 per cent, I forget the exact number, increase in this equity. Indeed he had an even greater increase than that because that is taking into account the four per cent that was deducted as an acquisition cost. So, in fact, the fund did about 19 per cent during that period of time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that says that the fund was either well run, or it says that the fund fell upon pretty prosperous times. In fact, the fund fell upon good times. Mutual funds, all these sorts of investments, did very well during that calendar year. I am not saying it is badly run. It may well be well run. But those kinds of funds can have a similar reversal, and we the people of Saskatchewan, are guaranteeing that if there is a reversal — if somebody buys today and during the next year there is a reversal — they get their money back and they get five per cent in addition. Now they would have to hold it, I think, for two years, in order to get their money and the five per cent, but that is a very significant subsidization. It could be a massive subsidization by the taxpayers of this province.

Now what kind of people are we subsidizing after this amendment is passed, because this amendment extends the group that we are going to subsidize? Not only, are we now subsidizing those who have the money to invest — I've got money in this fund, my mother has money in this fund. You know I told her three days ago that if this Government is defeated, the first thing we will do is sell our investment in this fund, because the first thing that a government would do which is trying to protect the taxpayer is take off the guarantee, and that is the only reason that anyone would buy this kind of investment, is because of the government guarantee. You are guaranteeing to me, and to my mother, and to others who have a few thousand dollars to invest, who have that spare cash floating around, you are giving a guarantee that we will get back our money, plus five per cent. And, that could be a very, very significant cost at some point down the road. The Members opposite do not know the direction in which the bond market will move, for instance. Why did it have this 19 per cent improvement? Because they bought bonds when interest rates were higher, now interest rates have gone down. And the result is, that as with all corporate bonds, this investment has improved in value. But during the year inflation might take off and this fund could go down, and the taxpayers would be stuck.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, goes even further. At least we could say we were subsidizing the fat cats of the province. At least we could say that five per cent was going to be subsidization and protection for people like the Minister introducing the Bill and the Hon. Minister behind him, who have a few tens of thousands available to make these kinds of investments. At least, we could say that. Now this amendment will allow people from all over the country to cash in on the guarantee of the Province of Saskatchewan. And that is what it means when the words "and others" are added after "Saskatchewan." It means that anybody with \$10,000 or \$15,000 to invest can call upon the guarantee of the people of Saskatchewan that they will get their money back, plus five per cent. They have all of the up-side, they have all of the potential increase that flows from buying an investment that may well appreciate (as bond circumstances change) may well appreciate depending upon the vagaries of the market. And for the down-side, they have got not only the guarantee of the return of their money which they receive in no other mutual fund and no similar investment, but they also have a five per cent guarantee. And, then what do the taxpayers get for that? Well, amongst other things, they get almost half of the money invested outside of the province.

You know, Mr. Chairman, people ask us in the Liberal Party, from time to time, well, what kind of a Crown corporation might you abolish? What kind of government employees do you think we do not need in this province? I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of program that we do not need. We do not need government subsidizing people with money to invest, to employ public servants, who I suspect, Mr. Chairman, probably do not do as good a job of handling financial matters as the people in the private sector who have experience in the industry, who have come up in the industry.

Mr. Chairman, in fairness, and I would like from time to time to ask the gentleman sitting beside the Minister as this Bill goes through, but what experience does he have in the money markets? None at all. It is an on-the-job training program for the Chairman of the Board. Probably an on-the-job training program because he earned his position by losing so dismally to my colleague, the Member for Lakeview in a by-election. Now should Saskatchewan taxpayers' money be used to subsidize that kind of program, and to employ people in this province in the employ of the public service? Mr. Chairman, I suggest that they certainly should not, and that this amendment which will now extend that protection, make it possible for people with money all across Canada, to cash in really on the guarantee of the taxpayers of this province. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that that kind of an amendment is a wholly wrong amendment. The concept is a bad concept and the amendment almost makes things worse. At least before there was an amendment, we knew that we were helping the fat cats of the province and not helping the fat cats of the whole country.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this is an amendment that should not be passed, and this is a Bill that should the Liberals be in power, this organization would forthwith be abolished. We do not believe, I say to the Hon. Member for Saskatoon, we do not believe that the taxpayers' dollars should be used to subsidize people like me, who have a couple of thousand dollars to invest. And, I suggest to the Hon. Member that he examine the operation of this Bill in depth, instead of just sitting blindly in caucus meetings and listening to the Cabinet. If you examined the operation of that kind of a Bill, the Hon. Member

and most of the Members on the other side of the House, would realize that this kind of legislation is exactly contrary to what that party usually believes in. I find it offensive, and I am sure that the people who support your Government would find it very offensive if they only had the message specifically in their minds, of the way this Bill operates and of the way this amendment will operate.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I may have further comments to make and I call it 5:00 o'clock.

Progress was reported and Committee given leave to sit again.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:04 o'clock p.m.