

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature
56th Day

Tuesday, May 10, 1977.

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

QUESTIONS

GENERAL MANAGER FOR SEDCO

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT: (Regina Wascana) Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister in charge of SEDCO I wonder if I might direct a question to the Premier. I am sure he is familiar with the information about the new director of SEDCO. I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether the director of SEDCO is the same Fredrick J. Flynn who was the director of Halgard Investments in Alberta, who is the same Fred J. Flynn who was the director of H.V. Analysis in Alberta and the same Fred J. Flynn who was the director of Agriplast in Alberta. I wonder secondly if the Premier is aware that Agriplast is a company which encouraged a large number of farms to grow high uric acid rapeseed. The company is now in receivership and owes to the Agricultural Development Corporation \$309,000. I wonder whether one of the reasons that this new director has been employed is because he is an expert on bankrupt companies.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) Mr. Speaker, firstly I am not aware of Mr. Flynn being a director of SEDCO. I understand a Mr. Flynn has been engaged as general manager. As far as I am aware he is not a director. In response to the second question, I do not know whether he is the same person as the Fred J. Flynn named and all the others. The general manager of SEDCO was hired by the board of SEDCO and I am not aware of his antecedents other than he is recommended by the board of SEDCO. They have advised me that they have done a search and that in their opinion he is the most qualified person. They have proceeded to the appointment of him.

MR. MERCHANT: A supplementary. Would the Premier, Mr. Speaker, be prepared to find out and advise the House or perhaps advise me by mail if the House is not in session, whether it is not in fact true that Mr. Flynn was managing Agriplast at the time when Agriplast went into receivership which as I understand it was just recently. He is fresh off that receivership, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, secondly whether the Premier wouldn't agree that it is curious to bring in as a general manager of SEDCO someone who has just come from an involvement with a government agency that didn't work out all that favorably for the government agency in Alberta.

MR. BLAKENEY: Again, I do not know Mr. Flynn's antecedents. My understanding was that he had just finished employment with CIDA which is another government agency of the Government of Canada. I do not know whether the Government of Canada is selective at all in the people which it employs for its agencies which assist industrial development abroad. I may again be in

error with respect to his antecedents in that regard. The allegations made by the Hon. Member are all the supposition that his facts are right. I am in no position to either accede to or contradict his facts, and accordingly I am unable to comment on his activities further. I see here he received his law degree from Dalhousie in Halifax in 1956. He completed a course in investment and security analysis through the New York Institute of Finance. He came to SEDCO from his predisposition as president of Halgard, Venture Analysis Limited, an Edmonton based consulting firm. A fact that is not generally known is that Mr. Flynn has just returned from the Netherlands Antilles where he established a development bank for the United Nations and the central government of the Netherlands Antilles. Prior to the position which he held from 1970 to 1971, Mr. Flynn held the position of director of Legal Services for Columbia Celulose Limited, of Vancouver. Prior to this position he was assistant to the vice-president of export services for the Bank of Montreal in Montreal. Between January 1971 and September 1972 he was executive vice-president of Pinex Mines Limited and was responsible for the direction of professionals in the exploration and development and promotion of copper, silver and oil programs in western Canada, Nevada, Texas, Greenland and New Mexico.

It may well be that he is the same person. He has as you can see a considerable background with the Bank of Montreal and Columbia Celulose and Pinex and the United Nations and the central government of the Netherlands Antilles and with Halgard, Venture Analysis Limited. I don't know whether he also has the background alluded to by the Hon. Member.

ENERGY MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

MR. S. J. CAMERON: (Regina South) Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources with respect to the forthcoming conference of energy Ministers. In view, yesterday, of the preference expressed by the Premier for open conferences, I presume you have indicated to the Federal Government that you would like to have this upcoming conference open to the public and the press.

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Mineral Resources) I indicated to Mr. Gillespie, a telegram was sent to all provincial Ministers in regard to whether the conference should be open or closed to the press. Unless the format of the conference is changed we can see some problems in regard to an open conference, not that we were against an open conference if the agenda would be changed to perhaps lengthen the conference so that the positions that were given by the provincial Ministers and the Federal Government could be more adequately conveyed to the press, covering what has already been covered. There would be room for, I think, confusion and misinterpretation as to what would be discussed at this particular conference that will be held some time tomorrow morning.

MR. CAMERON: By way of supplementary, do I take it from your answer then, that in view of the format of the meeting and in view of the agenda I gather you indicated you would prefer the conference closed.

MR. MESSER: I indicated that as Saskatchewan I think has always undertaken to take the position that we are open to press at our

conferences but that the agendas should be so established that it will allow the press an opportunity to find out what the positions of the provinces are so that if the meeting could be designed to accommodate the press, then we were in favor of it. But I think to pick up a meeting that is an ongoing meeting and expect the press to adequately understand what the Ministers are talking about, I think has some inherent dangers and I indicated that to the Minister. The Federal Minister ultimately made his choice as to whether it was going to be open or not.

FIRING IN DNS

MR. J. G. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) I should like to direct a question to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Is the Premier able to confirm the firing I believe last Friday of one Melvin James Laffrenere from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and if so for what reasons?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to confirm or deny. The Minister of Northern Saskatchewan is inquiring into this matter. There appear to be several companies with the same similar name of Nordic, I believe the base name is — the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan has advised he has not been able to establish whether or not the companies referred to are the same companies. He is pursuing that further.

MR. LANE: A supplementary. I am advised by Mr. Laffrenere himself that he was in fact fired last Friday on the investigation of the potential conflict of interest. Would the Premier not admit that the proposal for conflict of interest legislation which has been tabled would in fact be advantageous to the people of Saskatchewan to extend conflict of interest legislation to senior civil servants, civil servants in managerial positions throughout the Government and perhaps extend it in the way that was considered by the Parliament in Ottawa, that senior civil servants would not be able to contract back with the government within a time frame which is a matter of discussion say two years after their employment with the government. Would the Premier not admit that it would be advantageous to extend the conflict of interest legislation to the senior civil servants?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the Hon. Member that it would be advantageous to provide that anyone who worked for the Government of Saskatchewan could not enter in any contracts with the Government of Saskatchewan thereafter, for say, two years, anyone who worked in a senior position. That strikes me as absolutely too vigorous. I think of many, let us say, lawyers who are employed with the Government of Saskatchewan, and who subsequently leave the employ of the Government of Saskatchewan and who I think would quite rightly — ought to be in a position to take employment, take briefs, take prosecuting positions with the Government of Saskatchewan within a period of two years. I would think of a good number of other people who would be in a similar position.

The idea of having conflict of interest legislation which included senior public servants is one with which I have no quarrel. We have been fortunate here in Saskatchewan in having only very peripheral examples of breeches of conflict of interest rules. We have not had any deputy Minister resign as has happened in our neighboring provinces to the West. We

nonetheless feel that there are problems that should be dealt with and it may well be that more precise legislation is indicated.

EIGHT PER CENT WAGE SETTLEMENT FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

MR. W. H. STODALKA: (Maple Creek) Mr. Speaker, I would direct my question to the Minister of Finance but I see him leaving his chair.

In view of the fact that I believe it was established by the Member for Regina Wascana that the Public Service Commission contract offer was approximately eight per cent, also that and I think it is known that the offer to the teachers is 7.6 per cent and there are also fringe benefits which will be included in that, can we sort of preclude by this that generally we can expect, as far as the contracts in which the Government is involved, that settlements will be in the range of approximately eight per cent?

HON. W. E. SMISHEK: (Minister of Finance) Mr. Chairman, if the Hon. Member has been watching the press there have been a number of contracts that have been settled within the seven to eight per cent areas. Some might have been at 8.2 per cent because of adjustment — this is on the average — but it is fair to assume that settlements in the current negotiations have been between the seven and eight per cent area.

MR. STODALKA: A supplementary. Are these eight per cent increases subject to the Compensation and Price Board controls and regulations? Do they have to be submitted whether they are approved or not?

MR. SMISHEK: Yes.

MR. STODALKA: Have the increases of eight per cent been approved?

MR. SMISHEK: Mr. Chairman of the contracts that have been submitted up until now, I am not aware that the Prices and Compensation Board has not approved any of the increases. My information is that they have been approving these rates.

CONSTITUTION OF UNIONS IN THE PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

MR. R. H. BAILEY: (Rosetown-Elrose) Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Minister, from time to time I am assured that you or members of your staff would review the constitution of the various unions operated within the province. Is that correct?

HON. G.T. SNYDER: (Minister of Labour) No.

MR. BAILEY: Perhaps then you could answer this question. Are there unions operating within the Province of Saskatchewan at this particular time where the executive reserves the right in

the case of certain balloting to be able to use the non-returned ballots in the way that they desire, the way that they happen to want the vote to be placed. In other words, if there are 1,000 votes on a question of Yes or No and only 400 come in, the remaining 600 can be used by the executive to determine the sway of the ballot. Is that correct in the Province of Saskatchewan?

MR. SNYDER: I am not aware of that. I would be somewhat surprised if that were the case, but it should be remembered that the constitution of the Trade Union Organization is under the control of that organization in the same way as the Law Society or the medical profession has some jurisdiction over the way they operate and the way their professional organization operate.

The Department of Labour does not, nor has it in the past, nor do I expect to in the future, interfere with the internal workings or the constitution of the organization in question.

HAS DNS EMPLOYEE REQUESTED LOAN FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF NEWSPAPER

MR. G. N. WIPF: (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan.

Have any DNS employees, either formally or informally, requested a loan or a grant from the DNS to establish a newspaper in northern Saskatchewan?

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, I seem to miss the question. I thought the first question dealt with whether any employee had asked for a loan to operate a newspaper. I assume the Hon. Member meant that if he got the loan he would cease being an employee and he would operate a private newspaper. I am puzzled to think that the Member would feel that if he received such a loan, that it would somehow become a government newspaper. I wonder if he feels that the radio at Yorkton, which had obtained public funding when it was established, was somehow a government radio or television station. If that is the case its link with the Government has missed me. All that I can say is I cannot give the Member an assurance that no loans will be made for newspapers. We have been, I think, the Government has never made a loan for a newspaper in the past, that I am aware of, although probably print shops have got loans for all that I may know. We would have to consider the loan and consider whether or not it was in the best interest and I cannot give a firm commitment in advance, that a supposed application, hypothetical application, for a hypothetical loan, be hypothetically rejected.

HOUSEKEEPING SALARY IN REGINA HOSPITALS

MR. MERCHANT: I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Speaker, as you may recall, the Minister in dealing with Estimates and on a Motion talked about equal pay for work of equal value and I wonder if the Minister of Labour would investigate the situation in the Regina hospitals, where house men and housekeeping aids, or they are called by different names — housekeepers caretakers — but the fact is that in the

Regina hospitals, I wonder if the Minister is aware, there is a different amount of money paid to men from that amount paid to women, notwithstanding the fact that they are doing virtually identical work. The amount of money, if the Minister would check these figures, I appreciate his confirming it, but the amount of money is almost \$1 different between men and women. I wonder if the Minister would give us his assurance that he would check into this matter and so if over the summer something couldn't be done to make the words 'equal pay for work of equal value' in fact a reality.

MR. SNYDER: I don't believe, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that the Member is really talking about equal pay for work of equal value. He is talking about equal pay for equal work as between male and female employees in the same establishment.

I imagine the Member knows also that an evaluation study was conducted in the hospitals and their findings are being evaluated at the present time. I think he will know some of the people who have been involved in that evaluation job where the union participated with other people in order to reach a determination as to the extent to which there were some problems with respect to the equal pay for equal work concept. My understanding is that it is well along the way and an attempt is being made in the immediate future to sort out those difficulties, some of it involving negotiations by virtue of the collective bargaining process and I expect those anomalies, if I can call them that, will be resolved in the not too distant future.

MR. MERCHANT: Would the Minister indicate why it is that the first complaints were brought to the attention of his department two years ago and two years later we still have a situation where in the first year of employment the anomaly is an 85 cent differential, and the third year and thereafter the anomaly, as you call it, is a 98 cent differential. Would you indicate to me why, when you have three or four different unions and the Government controls the amount of money that is paid to these men and I women in their respective positions, it has taken the Government, through your department, two years in which to resolve what would appear to be a fairly simple and fairly obvious situation.

MR. SNYDER: I think that is just the point, Mr. Speaker, It is neither simple, nor is it particularly obvious. I think there is very little difficulty in determining that two employees are doing the same kind of work in the event that they are both stacking shelves in a grocery store. I don't believe that it naturally follows that two employees are necessarily doing the same work in a hospital because of the fact that they are classified in somewhat the same way. The Member will know, for example, that a nurses aid and a male orderly do virtually identical work on some floors of a particular hospital, however the situation may be entirely different. So that job classifications are not easily measured in terms of performing precisely and exactly, or even similar work and this is why the job evaluation study was put into place, with a sanction and with the assistance of the trade unions in question and, accordingly, I think the remainder of my remarks have already been added to the discussion and I accept that the anomalies, if I can again refer to them as that, will be disposed of in the not too distant future.

DROUGHT IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. R. A. LARTER: (Estevan) Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of the Environment and to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. You gentlemen are both aware of the water problems in three towns, Macoun, Midale and Hitchcock. I wonder if you had thought at looking into our Missouri River flowing basin between Macoun and Hitchcock for a water source. It is unlimited water and I have received tests from the Minister of the Environment's department and they prove not that bad. I think it could be developed and there might be an answer for three communities. Could the Minister tell me if you have looked into this possible solution in solving the water problem there?

HON. N. E. BYERS: (Minister of the Environment) Well, Mr. Speaker, I think most people are aware of the large aqua fortis to which the Hon. Member refers. It was one of the reasons why one of the air bases was built there seven years ago. In response to the Hon. Member's question, I want to repeat what has been said before that Government through its various agencies, municipal affairs, environment, and agriculture, is prepared to work closely with those communities. Because of the drought conditions we may need to allocate an alternate water source and for me to say here that in the case of Hitchcock I think which probably has a population of 63 people or something in that order that we are going to tap that particular Missouri aqua fortis is, I am certain not going to give any assurance for communities that are facing water problems. We are prepared to make the resources, the information of the government available to assist them.

MR. E. A. BERNTSON: (Souris-Cannington) A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As it relates to making this geological data available, how long should a farmer or community be expected to reasonably wait after application for this data to be made available to them?

MR. BYERS: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of information on hand in various places. The Saskatchewan Research Council has some of it and queries can be made directly to the Saskatchewan Research Council. We are prepared in Environment to handle such requests for information. I hope that the Hon. Members will appreciate that there are close to 1,000 urban communities in the province, that there are 70,000 farms in Saskatchewan, that we are faced with a large number of requests for this information. We will provide it if we have it as expeditiously as possible.

MR. LARTER: Mr. Minister in lieu of the possible grants that will be asked for and have been asked for by two different communities, would your department undertake to see if it wouldn't be more reasonable for the Government to go the other way though and look into this Missouri River and a permanent solution to their water problems?

MR. BYERS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Environment was not intended to replace the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Agriculture, DREE, PFRA and all

of those agencies. The Department of Municipal Affairs is set up to service municipal governments. That is its function. Municipal Affairs has the grant programs for developing water sources through the municipal water assistance board and if a community, which ever it may be, has a problem with respect to its water supply it seems to me that the proper approach that should be taken is for the municipal council to instruct its secretary or its secretary-treasurer to write either to the Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs, which this Government set up last year to specifically deal with these kinds of urban problems. We are then prepared to make available in the services of the other departments, Environment which has information about water and the Department of Agriculture through FFIB which has been doing electric logging for years and years and has a big backlog of information about farm water supplies. We are prepared to work with them and that seems to me to be the logical procedure that any municipal government faced with the problem would follow in approaching the Provincial Government to deal with.

RULE CHANGES FOR PROVINCIAL PARKS

MR. W. H. STODALKA: (Maple Creek) Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Provincial parks will be opening within a few days. Would the Minister indicate to this Assembly exactly what changes are going to be made with regard to fee structure and services that were formally provided free that now will be charged for?

HON. A. MATSALLA: (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources) Mr. Speaker, with respect to the fee structure the entrance fee to the parks is going to be the same. There is going to be no change with respect to that. There is going to be an adjustment in the golf fees and with respect to the other fees they're up next to nothing insofar as changes go.

MR. STODALKA: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the case of the south western portion of Saskatchewan we have been blessed with all the rain at this particular time and there still is the danger of a fire hazard. Have any contingency plans been made with regard to the Cypress Hills Provincial Park and what you might be doing if rain doesn't come to that area?

HON. A. MATSALLA: Mr. Speaker, as a fire precautionary measure, in any parks that are going to remain fairly dry there may be a restriction with respect to open fires, but we are hopeful insofar as the use of camping fires is concerned that they may continue to use the receptacle that is in the parks, but there might be a restriction with respect to open fires.

MARK UP ON DRUGS TO RETAIL OUTLETS

HON. W.A. ROBBINS: (Minister of Health) Mr. Speaker, may I answer a question that was asked that other day?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that we will take that next day, unless the

May 10, 1977

House wishes to hear the question plus one supplementary?

MR. ROBBINS: The Hon. Member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) asked me a question the other day with respect to the drug plan. His question was, "Is it true that the Government of Saskatchewan July 1, 1977 will not be allowing drug wholesalers to mark up on the sale of drugs to retail outlets?" The answer is, "No, that is not true."

STATEMENTS

CERTIFICATE OF CLEANLINESS

HON. W. A. ROBBINS: (Minister of Health) Mr. Speaker, I attended an awards banquet in Saskatoon at the University Hospital the other night where they were honoring people with 10, 15 and 20 year awards. The University Hospital presented me with an award that night and I thought I should let the Members of the Assembly know about it. It is quite an elaborate looking certificate and I may read it:

The University Hospital Certificate of Cleanliness

This certifies the Hon. Wes Robbins, NDP (no dirty places) Minister of Health, is recognized for his effort to rid the province of filthy hospitals despite the concerted efforts of the more conservative and liberal elements to stir up dust.

Dated this fine filthy Friday, May 6, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order! I am having some trouble relating this to an important Government policy statement.

MOTION

CONGRATULATIONS TO QUEEN ON 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day I should like with leave of the House to introduce a motion I have. I understand that it will be seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Malone) or the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) in his absence and I have advised the official Opposition and the third party of the content of the resolution and I would like leave to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the resolution by the Hon. Member Mr. MacDonald:

To The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty:

Most Gracious Sovereign:

We, the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in Session assembled, offer congratulations to Your Majesty on the twenty-fifth anniversary of your reign.

The people of Saskatchewan have been graced by your presence, and by that of Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and other

members of the Royal Family on several occasions during your reign. Your last visit to Saskatchewan, in July of 1973, on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, was viewed by many thousands of our citizens who retain happy memories of your gracious presence.

Canada's historic ties with the Commonwealth, of which the Monarchy is at the centre, have always been marked by a strong spirit of co-operation and friendship and we look for a continuation of that harmonious relationship.

The Members of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan assure Your Majesty of our continuing loyalty, respect and affection. We pray that you will continue to reign over us in peace, health and happiness for many years to come.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, before I formally move the Motion, I would like to add a remark or two. Members of the Assembly will be aware that 1977 is the year in which Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II completes the 25th year of her reign. Queen Elizabeth II succeeded her father, King George VI on February 6, 1952 and was crowned in Westminster Abbey in London on June 2, 1953. As we approach the 25th anniversary of that date, therefore, I am sure all Members of this Assembly will wish to join in paying tribute to a Queen who has grown in our esteem with each year of her reign. Many of us have vivid memories of the great Coronation Day, even if it was only through listening on radio or watching the newsreels of that era. Since that time we have watched the maturing of our Monarch and have been graced with her presence in Saskatchewan, several times.

Anyone who had the privilege of being present on our Majesty's most recent visit to Regina on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, has fond memories that will not be forgotten. I have many personal memories, not of course close, but nonetheless rich to me, of the Monarch and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip. I attended in the '40s, occasion of a garden party when Her Royal Highness and the Prince were there and I was studying at the university in Great Britain. Subsequently it was my good fortune to be in a sense the host on behalf of Saskatchewan at the time of their visit here in 1973 I and the Lieutenant-Governor of the day and our respective wives. Since that time I have had an opportunity to meet on a number of occasions with His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh. He was at the Royal Agricultural Society of the Commonwealth Meeting in Wales which I attended in 1975 at which time I tendered an invitation to the Royal Agricultural Society of the Commonwealth to meet in Regina in 1977. It meets every second year in co-operation with Agribition. That is going to happen. The Royal Agricultural Society will be meeting in Regina in November of 1977 and we very much hope that the President of the Society, His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh, will be able to be with us on that occasion.

The Monarchy has been a unifying force in the Commonwealth. The Monarchy is a strong institution. It has weathered a good number of shifts and changes in the Commonwealth since World War II, and shown that it commands a measure of loyalty and devotion from people all across the World that no other institution has been able to match in any governmental system, ours or any other. It is indeed a strong institution and the Monarch as an institution has been made stronger by the personality of her Majesty the Queen and that of His Royal Highness Prince Philip.

May 10, 1977

Each has served with great grace, with real vigor and with great distinction. And I ask all Members of this House to join with me in marking Her Majesty's 25th Anniversary as our Queen by passing the Resolution which I have just read. Let me read the last line again.

The Members of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan assure Your Majesty of our continuing loyalty, respect and affection. We pray that you will continue to reign over us in peace, health and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I so move this motion.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD: (Indian Head-Wolseley) Mr. Speaker, I only want to add a very few words to what the Premier has said and begin by saying that the official Opposition is delighted to join with the Government and Members of the Assembly in passing this Resolution and certainly the 25th Anniversary of Queen Elizabeth as Monarch of the British Commonwealth in England is a very historic occasion. And I too, like the Premier, have some fond memories of the fact of her most recent visit when I did have an opportunity to meet her personally, thanks to probably the Premier bringing her around and introducing her to many Members. But I know that it was quite a thrill for myself and my wife and there is no question that the British Monarchy has been a bond, not only for commonwealth countries but also a bond within our own country and the British tradition which is the very roots of the democratic system by which we operate in Saskatchewan. In Canada, certainly, it has been a very strong unifying force and a bond to bring Canadians together as well as to bring Members of the Commonwealth together. One of the things about the Monarch, Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip is that they have conducted themselves in their 25 years in a sure way and they have been an inspiration on many occasions to many people and to many countries.

I wonder if the Premier had considered whether or not he might forward to their Majesties a memento of the Province of Saskatchewan as a sign of our affection and I was thinking of perhaps a Saskatchewan scene painted by a Saskatchewan artist, whereby it would be a practical token of our affection and our esteem.

Once again I want to say it is a pleasure for me to second the Motion and a pleasure for the Members of the Opposition to join in passing this Resolution.

MR. R. H. BAILEY: (Rosetown-Elrose) Mr. Speaker, we are very pleased as well to support this because we feel very strongly in respect to Her Majesty and the Monarchy in Britain. The importance of this institution has perhaps become more valuable in the last 25 years and it has demonstrated its power, perhaps more clearly to everyone in the world during the last 25 years than it did previously.

So it is with a great deal of pride, of course, that we re-echo the words of the Premier as well as the words of the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley. We have a great deal of pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 6 — FARM COST REDUCTION PROGRAM

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):

That this Assembly regrets that the Saskatchewan Government has posed a further hardship on the farmers of this Province by reducing the rebate under the Farm Cost Reduction Program to 4 cents per gallon with a maximum of \$100, at a time when there has been a decrease in the net farm income as a result of declining wheat prices and unstable livestock markets, and urges the Government to: (1) leave the rebate at 7 cents per gallon (2) remove the maximum (3) apply the rebate at the dealer level, thereby allowing farmers to obtain an immediate rebate and relieve them from having to make individual applications for the reduction.

MR. E. KAEDING: (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make just a few comments on this particular motion. In the interests of getting along with the debate this morning, I think I would like to leave some of the prepared notes that I had intended to use and simply say that in regards to the Resolution from the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, I'd like to say that he would recognize that in the past, when the Fuel Cost Reduction Program was brought in that it was brought in at that time to balance off a reduction in the gas tax at that time of seven cents a gallon. In the intervening years, we of course, agreed that as the cost of government escalated, we should again return that gas tax back to the 1973 level and this was done in the year's Budget. Since the benefit of this tax reduction was removed from all of the other people in the Province of Saskatchewan, it was believed by us that it should also apply to farmers in Saskatchewan and that the grant which they had received should also be removed.

I think the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg could point out that the farm incomes have dropped somewhat substantially this past year and that the input costs have increased. I think that is probably true. But I think we should also recognize that because the cost of increase not only for farmers but to all other people of society that it would be wrong to reflect only a rebate to farmers and not to other people in society. We, therefore, felt that it was important that we equalize that and put farmers on the same basis as other people in Saskatchewan.

I think you should recognize that many things have taken place since 1973 when this Fuel Cost Reduction Program was brought in. Now there was been a substantial increase in the number of support programs for farmers and because of these support prices the farm income is not at risk as much as it was at that time.

You would know that we have a greatly improved crop insurance program which now protects farmers from crop loss and this year you will note that a very large number of farmers

May 10, 1977

are enrolled in that program, in fact we think that the majority of farmers are enrolled in that program.

Last year when it became evident that the farmers were suffering large losses in the livestock industry this Government moved immediately in response to their need and altogether differently than the Federal Government whose responsibility it was. We moved to provide a \$32 million beef industry assistance program. That was certainly appreciated by farmers. We have got the Western Grain Stabilization Program in place and that's a federal program. It is not what we want but is certainly better than nothing. The federal AFA 75 Stabilization Program is there to support farmers and we have also put into place now a Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program which we think will help support the price for farmers in that particular area.

I would want to move an amendment to the Resolution as moved by the Member for Gravelbourg, a motion seconded by the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Whelan) that Resolution No. 6 be amended by:

Deleting all the words after 'Assembly' in the first line and substituting therefore the words, 'commends the Government of Saskatchewan on its decision to assist the livestock producers by establishing a Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program and initiating the Beef Industry Assistance Program to provide direct support to the hard-pressed livestock industry in the province; and to congratulate the Government for its foresight in introducing programs which will enable the phasing out of the cost production program.

Debate continues on the amendment.

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse) Mr. Speaker, the amendment again is basically a nothing amendment, but a person cannot allow the comments of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) to go unanswered in regards to his argument in support of his particular amendment to this resolution. All of us realize when he read the amendment that it, of course, relates in no way whatsoever to the original Motion which was presented. They are not prepared to debate or vote on that particular Motion as presented, and for this reason they have introduced an amendment which clearly covers up and puts in the background any context of what the original Motion contained.

He said though in his remarks that the reason why they had decided to do away with the assistance in regards to farm fuel was because of the support programs which were available to farmers in the province. Let me remind the Minister of Agriculture that those two support programs which he is talking about are not support programs which were implemented by the Provincial Government. Those programs were implemented by a Federal Government . . . I am talking about Crop Insurance, Crop Insurance by Federal Government which guarantees the majority of the money that is put into that particular fund to reimburse farmers in case there is a loss; and, let me talk about the other support programs which, of course, is the Grain Stabilization Bill. These two programs alone will do more to safeguard and protect and economy of this province than any other program that any other government in the history of Canada or this province has every implemented. Especially in a year

like 1977, we will see the effect of what these two programs will have on this province.

He talked as well, Mr. Speaker, about some little programs they had brought in. And yet I think that if it was his intention to mask over the particular Resolution that is before us, why instead of commending himself, why did he not commend the Federal Government because those two programs alone will do more to save the skin of this Government in terms of financing in the next couple of years than any programs which he has mentioned in that particular amendment.

We talk as well about the cost of farm fuel to farmers and the reasoning that because of these support programs that support price on fuel is no longer needed and yet farmers' incomes are down this year. Why? Because their costs have gone up. Their costs have gone up because of labor; their costs have gone up because of machinery equipment and farm supplies. But on the other hand their income has gone down and the price of grain has gone down. They are not receiving the same for their product today as they did a year ago. We are being faced again with a possible \$2 a barrel increase in oil. What is that going to mean to the farming sector? Possibly that's another six cents a gallon increase in farm fuel.

The Premier yesterday, in his comments, said that he agrees with it because it is going to hopefully help or encourage the user to cut back on the consumption of fuel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: Let me say to the Minister of Agriculture that that may apply to the tourist. that may apply to someone doing a little pleasure riding, but it doesn't apply to the farmer. If that 80 acre field needs summerfallowing he is going to go out and he is going to burn that 30 gallons of fuel whether the price is high or whether it is low. If that crop needs combining, he is going to go and burn those 150 gallons of fuel whether the price is high or whether it is low, because he has to. And what we are doing by the actions of that Government in saying that they approve of that \$2 a barrel increase, and then not coming along and providing any assistance for the agricultural sector of this province, I think is a disgraceful indication of the priority (the low priority) which this Government holds for our farming sector in the province.

Amendment agreed to.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES — MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 72

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. S. J. Cameron (Regina South) for Return No. 72 showing:

The full details of a loan made by SEDCO to a company establishing a briquette manufacturing plant in Moose Jaw including: (a) the name of the borrower; (b) the names of the officers and directors of the borrower; (c) the total amount of the loan; (d) the interest rate of the loan; (e) the amortization period; (f) the monthly payments

required to be made; (g) the security, if any, taken by SEDCO for the repayment of the loan.

HON. N. VICKAR: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) Mr. Speaker, I should like to move an amendment to that Motion. I would like to move it, seconded by my deskmate from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) that the Motion for Return Hon. 72 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'showing' and the following substituted therefor:

That the details of a loan made by SEDCO to a company establishing a briquette manufacturing plant in Moose Jaw including: (a) the name of the borrower; (b) the names of the officers and the directors of the borrower; (c) the total amount of the loan; (d) and the sale price of the property.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT: (Regina Wascana) Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House should really ask themselves why the Minister has chosen to hide from my colleague (Mr. Cameron) the information that is requested, the interest rate on the loan, the amortization period, the monthly payments and the security? Pretty simple questions.

MR. ROMANOW: SEDCO has never revealed them.

MR. CAMERON: Let's start it again. You can go down to the Court House, the Land Titles office and get this information.

MR. ROMANOW: You cannot.

MR. MERCHANT: Well, certainly, you can.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The Member for Wascana.

MR. MERCHANT: Make your speech when you stand up, Roy.

MR. S.J. CAMERON: (Regina South) Mr. Speaker, to show the Attorney General how ludicrous is the response of Government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Member closing debate or speaking on the amendment?

MR. CAMERON: Speaking on the amendment . . . seeks to hide from us, as my colleague has indicated, the interest rate on the loan. What is the interest rate? If he is going to take security for his loan he is going to have to do a couple of things, One, I presume he has a mortgage on the property, which he is going to have to register at the Land Titles office. When he does that it will disclose the interest rate and the amount. If he registers his mortgage the amortization period and the

monthly payments those are all there to be seen. Aren't you going to do that? If you don't, then you haven't secured your security, and you would be terribly derelict. The second thing you are going to have to do, you are going to have to register under the Corporations Securities Registered. The Attorney General may not know what that is. It is a register maintained by the Provincial Secretary in respect of which you have to register all your securities, including debentures. If you don't do it, and I may educate the Minister in this respect too, if you don't do it you lose your security. Somebody else can come in and defeat you. If you have a first charge and somebody else, dealers of the company, they rapidly defeat you unless you register under the Corporation Securities Register.

Again, if you have taken a debenture, you have to register it. A couple or three months down the road I can go and look at your debenture and I can find the interest rate and I can find the amount of the loan. And if you have taken a debenture or whatever by way of security I can discover that too. Then it says 'the security' what additional security, if any, have you taken? Well, surely to goodness if I already know the name of the company, the officers and directors of the company, the amount of the loan, the amount of the purchase price of the property, the interest rate which I can find out, the amortization period of the monthly payments, why would you want to withhold from the additional security, if any, you have? It's stupid. You're so caught in this secrecy of SEDCO that you carry it to ludicrous lengths. That's the issue. You see how sort of unfathomable that is in a sense. I don't know where you get your advice from, but whomever you are getting it from I think what I would do if I were you, and I say this to the Minister, is to go back and rap their knuckles a little bit for leading you into these stupid trap situations. That kind of simple information Members ought certainly to have.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 74

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Cameron (Regina South) for Return No. 74 showing:

Whether SEDCO or the Department of Industry and Commerce or any other Department or Agency of Government owns or controls land in the City of Moose Jaw which has been sold or let or otherwise placed at the disposal or use of a company establishing a briquette manufacturing plant in Moose Jaw and if so:

(a) the legal description of such land; (b) the assessed value thereof.

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Speaker, again, I am not going to let this go by, although I am flogging a dead horse, but I will continue to flog it and maybe in due course we will get some reason over there, in somebody's head. Look, look, the question is to you as the Minister of SEDCO — do you have some land in Moose Jaw that you have made available to this company? That's the question. Now you are not prepared to tell us that apparently because the only answer you are prepared to give us is

May 10, 1977

whether or not you have land available, the legal description and the assessed value of the land. Well, I want to know in addition to that what is the market value of that land and I shall tell you in a minute why I want to know that, and then I want the details of whether you sold the land, or you have leased it, or you have otherwise put it at the disposal of the company? Reasonable questions? Why would you want to hide that information from me?

Now you are quite aware, I am sure, that there is a section in The Urban Municipalities Act that prevents municipalities from competing against one another for the location of industry, based upon the land grants, or selling land at a low market value and that sort of thing. What I want to hear determined, and this first occurred to me in respect of the Canasphere Industries situation in Moose Jaw, is whether or not SEDCO is getting into the habit of doing things which municipalities themselves can't do. Let me give you an example of that. Canasphere, for example, bought some land from the city of Moose Jaw, with SEDCO's concurrence. I have never been able to make a firm determination of this, so I have never raised it with you. The assessed value I know, the market value I am not sure of, but I think that SEDCO or the city of Moose Jaw had an appraisal done to determine the market value. The land, according to the record at the Land Titles office, was sold for something in excess of the assessed value, but I think less than the market value. If that was the case, the city of Moose Jaw is in breach of the terms of The Urban Municipalities Act, and SEDCO would be as blameworthy as the city of Moose Jaw for encouraging that because the law is that the municipality cannot do that. We said here, and it wasn't long ago, in this Legislature, that municipalities cannot compete one against the other for the location of industry on those bases.

Now I have never been able to determine those facts because the information is locked away. So what I here want to know is whether we have a similar situation. Did you make land available to them and what is the assessed value, and what is the market value of the land? Once you give me the market value I can then determine whether if you sold it for less than that, whether you are doing something that you ought not to be doing, or if you have leased it. I want to see to it that you charged a fair rent. Now how can I do my job properly, as a critic of the Government, when I get that kind of basic information.

Again, I say to you, I don't know what . . . I am not sure, what is leading you to these funny conclusions, I really don't. There is no reason why you shouldn't tell us the market value of that land and whether you have let it to the company, or whether you have sold it or whether you gave given them some other arrangement in respect of the land. As I say, I don't know who is giving you this advice, whether it is the Attorney General or some of the more experienced Members of Cabinet, or whether it is your officialdom, but whoever it is, if I were you, in the future, I think I would take a pretty hard look at some of the advice you are getting in these respects.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 12 — BRING FEED GRAINS MARKETING UNDER CONTROL OF CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Johnson (Turtleford):

That this Assembly urges that the Minister-in-Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board move immediately to bring the marketing of feed grains entirely under the control of the Canadian Wheat Board.

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Birkbeck:

That the following words be added after the word 'immediately' in the second line:

upon completion of a plebiscite of the producers of feed grains similar to the rapeseed plebiscite if it is the wish of the majority of producers.

HON. E. KAEDING: (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a speech on this particular subject but in relation to the amendments made by the Member for Moosomin the other day I thought I should correct just a few comments on that.

He will notice that he proposed an amendment which would call for a vote similar to the rapeseed plebiscite which was conducted a couple of years ago. We would not want to see a vote conducted in the same manner as that particular vote was conducted at that time. We think the vote was not properly done and as a result thereof, I think we are going to move a further amendment to that amendment and we hope that all people in this House would support it.

The amendment reads, moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Whelan (Minister of Consumer Affairs):

That the amendment to Resolution 12 proposed by the Member for Moosomin be further amended by:

deleting all of the words after 'plebiscite' in the first line and substituting therefor: of the eligible producers of feed grain in a designated Canadian Wheat Board region and supported by the majority of those producers.

Subamendment agreed.

Amendment agreed.

Resolution as amended agreed.

MOTION

PRINCE ALBERT RAIDERS

MR. G. N. WIPF: (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) Mr. Speaker, by leave of this Assembly, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Feschuk (Prince Albert):

May 10, 1977

That this Assembly convey their best wishes and good luck to the Prince Albert Raiders in their game against the Pembroke Lumber Kings in Prince Albert tonight which could be the final game in the Centennial Cup hereto championship for Canada.

Most of the MLAs here I believe have players on that team. They have won three straight games. The Premier was at the first game on the official face off. I would like to urge the Members to support this Motion.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — BILL NO. 45 — An Act to amend The Engineering Profession Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 78 — An Act respecting The Institute of Accredited Public Accountants of Saskatchewan.

Sections 1 to 46 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

SECOND READINGS

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 109 — An Act to amend The Statute Law.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to The Statute Law Act which is kind of an end of the Session Bill and I will make my second reading speech very short to indicate that all of the proposals that are before the House in printed version are typographical errors. There is one dealing with a proposed Section 17, subsection 2 which we also maintain is in that category but I must say that it might have a slightly different connotation to it. This is the question of the matter of the addition of a semicolon. We take the view this represents a correction. This request came from the Minister of Social Services from the Statute Consolidation and Revision Committee. It was the committee's opinion that the words, "in the performance of his duties", in subsection 2 of subsection (a) of Section 2 of Section 17, were originally intended to apply to both (i) and (ii) and the semicolon was suggested and the Department of Social Services agreed that this was intended in the original section and, therefore, proceeded with the amendment at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will also be asking the Members of the House when we get to Committee to come in with a House amendment which is not before you on the printed Bill and this relates to The Mineral Taxation Act which we passed several days ago. I will be proposing a House amendment to add a section to Bill 109 to correct and clarify an amendment to Saskatchewan Regulation 290 of 74.

[Now this regulation, 290 of 74, was amended by Saskatchewan Regulation 96 or 77 and the amendment was ratified and confirmed by Bill 99. The definition of capital investment factor in Clause B of subsection 2 of Section 5, erroneously reads in the third line, "but the rated annual productive capacity and multiplying the resulting quotient by 100", when really it should

have read, and the intention was as explained in second reading to divide the gross investment by the rated annual productive capacity and multiply the result by one — one hundredth. This error was detected by the officials of the Department of Mineral Resources and as a result what I would categorize as an amendment would be necessary to clarify the situation.

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

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT: (Regina Wascana) Mr. Speaker, let me again say to the Attorney General one of the amendments, I believe it is the amendment where you add a semi-colon, deals directly with an area where the Government I suggest is very wrong in the substance of the matter and since the amendment gives me an occasion to again speak to the matter, let me do so.

That section in Bill 109 is Section 4 and it deals with the right of courts to bring before them Social Service personnel to give testimony. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hate to say it but since I am addressing my comments only to the Attorney General, only the Attorney General is going to have to listen to them, they will be brief . . .

MR. ROMANOW: . . . an argument . . .

MR. MERCHANT: Well why don't you do something about the argument? The argument is a good one. The argument is that in nine provinces in Canada you can use social service personnel as the eyes and ears of a court. You can bring social service people before you to tell the court what is going on in a marriage, who should have custody of these children. You shouldn't be handing children between one spouse or the other based on some judge who was appointed very likely because of some political involvement, who at 55 or 62 sits there for an hour, hears the evidence that is brought before him by learned counsel and says, "I like this woman", or "I like that man". "You have those children". There has got to be a better way, and a better way in every other province is that they say to social service personnel, spend some time with these people, get to know them, find out what is going on in the neighborhood, interview them, spend the time that is involved so that you can give me an indication of who would better have custody of these children. If it's a marital matter, spend some time, be my eyes and my ears and come back to me, tell me what is going on.

Now the judge can ignore that. What the judge does is he considers the evidence in the same way that the judge considers the evidence of a doctor in an automobile accident case. But what you're doing is not only do you say that the social service people are non-compellable, but you go even further and say they are non-competent. To a non-lawyer what that means is that even if the social service person wants to come before the court voluntarily our law stops him from being able to come before the court. Our law says that they may not testify. Not only can't they be compelled to testify but they can't voluntarily testify. It's a ridiculous situation.

Some of the judges know that it's a ridiculous situation. I think I've brought that to the attention of the Department of Social Services, and perhaps the Attorney General.

I think for instance of a Mr. Justice McPherson who has many times said to me privately, "Good heavens Tony, this is something where we have to do something about it." I consider him competent, but he faces the problem of really by guess or by golly, deciding who should have custody of children, when what he would like to have is the social service personnel coming before him.

I have brought this to the attention of the Ministers in charge and now a year and a half after that, I see the Government dealing with that very section, obviously considering that very section and maintaining this silly protection, protection which works a disservice to the operation of the courts and works a disservice to the men and women who are involved in those kinds of disputes before the courts. It is something that the Government should look at.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — Bill NO. 105 — An Act respecting the Superannuation of Certain Persons under Certain Superannuation Acts.

Section 1 agreed.

SECTION 2

MR. J. G. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) I had asked questions before Orders of the Day about the definition of pensionable employment. I had asked about the practice of the Government seemingly at its own discretion defining pensionable employment. I raised the matter for example of a person who had been previously employed with Glasgow City Police getting the time of his employment in that outside non-government occupation, determined pensionable employment. Another one who has been employed by the Department of Health since 1955, Moose Jaw Union Hospital, prior to that, was deemed to be designated pensionable employment.

Now there are two questions which arise. First of all, what are the criteria you use to determine what is pensionable employment? Secondly, when you allow some people to include previous pensionable employment, why couldn't you do it for all civil servants that have come from outside, give them the option. I don't think this was publicized to the civil servants. I think you had to dig around to become aware, then try to get Cabinet approval. I would like to know the criteria you use to determine what outside employment becomes pensionable employment under Order in Council?

HON. W. ROBBINS: (Minister in charge of Public Service Superannuation Board) The basic criteria Mr. Chairman was associated with hiring a new person. The particular employee and agency was anxious to get that person and that person raised questions with regard to the previous pension and the opportunity was given to him to buy that pension into the Public Service on the basis of perhaps he would not come to employment if he wasn't granted that right.

Now we have accepted people from the British Health Service. We have accepted the person you mention as an employee of the Glasgow Police Force. We have accepted people with pensionable

employment from Imperial Oil, Ford Motor Company and various others. We don't think it is a very satisfactory approach in many respects and we propose in this Bill to take that section out.

MR. LANE: In fact the Orders in Council I have, and I can give you the numbers, 586/77 and 599/77 were not situations to which you refer. One particular employee had been employed in the Department of Health since 1955, so it is not an enticement to join the Government.

The second one had been employed with the Government since June 30, 1949, again not an enticement to join the Government. Both of these Orders in Council are dated 1977. So I suspect what really happens is the Government is really doing these people a favor. That may be fair and that may be proper. What is favor for one should be favor to all. That's our point that there should be some consistency of the position. If we are going to allow it for some, we should allow it for all; the rules apply to everybody.

MR. ROBBINS: Mr. Chairman, the opportunity has been there. I suppose it's a case of a person already in employment suddenly discovering that situation. I don't know the two that you are speaking about particularly, but I realize that there are people that have been picking up some service. That's where we are constantly, under a certain degree of pressure in relation to Section 21. We think it unreasonable to have that section in there, and we propose to take it out of this Bill.

Section 2 agreed.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed.

SECTION 5

MR. W. H. STODALKA: (Maple Creek) I would like to ask the Minister as to what happens to people who are presently employed, or what section of the Act it comes under, Section 5? What happens if a person has been employed in the civil service for 25 years wants to withdraw his or her pension because he or she is changing jobs and wants to move to take the funds out?

MR. ROBBINS: He may take it out, or defer it. Under the old Act that has no effect.

MR. STODALKA: Anybody working under the Act has the right to withdraw his or her fund. There's no limitation on anybody withdrawing funds?

MR. ROBBINS: If he terminates employment. Yes, that's right.

MR. STODALKA: Okay.

Section 5 agreed.

Sections 6 to 11 agreed.

SECTION 12

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a House amendment applicable to amend Section 12 of the printed Bill by striking out 7 per cent in the eighth line and substituting therefor 6 1/2 per cent (b) by striking out 8 per cent in the ninth line and substituting 7 1/2 per cent; (c) by striking out '9 per cent' in the tenth line and substituting '8 1/2 per cent'; (d) by renumbering Section 12 as subsection (1) of Section 12; and (e) by adding after subsection (1) the following subsection: (2) An employee who is eligible to contribute for superannuation shall, on and after the first day of January 1978, by reservation from his salary, contribute to the superannuation fund a percentage of that salary, according to his age at the commencement of the period of employment as follows:

Age at Commencement of Employment	Contribution Percentage
Under 30 years	7
30 years and under 40 years	8
40 years and over	9

MR. ROBBINS: I should perhaps give a word of explanation with respect to this proposed House amendment.

It should be evident to all Members of the Assembly that changes with respect to war service, widow situation etc., and the fact that we propose to change the benefit formula in the old plan from the six best earning years to five best earning years, adds costs. In consultation with various groups they came to the conclusion that in looking at one actuarial study in relation to one of the groups it should be roughly one per cent increase. However, the change in the benefits formula from best six earning years to the best five earning years is on a phase basis, if you look at clause 22. Therefore, we think it is reasonable to also phase in the increase in the payment rate. This payment rate based on this House amendment will be 6 1/2, 7 1/2 and 8 1/2 and will later change to the 7, 8 and 9 which was in the original bill.

MR. STODALKA: The reading was rather quick and I couldn't follow some of the readings, is it 6 1/2, 7 1/2 and 8 1/2?

MR. ROBBINS: Yes, in the initial stage but eventually goes to 7, 8 and 9 on a phase basis.

Amendment agreed.

Section 12 as amended agreed.

Sections 13 to 27 agreed.

SECTION 28

MR. STODALKA: No, Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest the other day when the Minister tried to justify leaving the disability benefits at 50 per cent rather than raising it to 60 per cent in the case of dependants. The Minister indicated I believe that the fact that the employee was going to be able to average the top five years of his salary rather than the top six years of his salary, would, of

course, give some benefit. It would have the effect of raising one of the factors that determine the pension. This is true but I don't think that the effect would be as marked, even if this was true. I think that there are other pension plans that are government sponsored in which you average maybe not even necessarily the top five years. There is one plan which is the top four years which are used in determining the average. So in that particular plan we certainly have an instance there in my own personal opinion which smells of discrimination. In some cases it's 50 per cent and in some cases it is 60 per cent, therefore we have a strong feeling in our group that we should be treating everybody fairly or everybody the same, therefore we are going to move an amendment. The effect of the amendment is to change the benefit of dependants from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. I would like to move this amendment, seconded by Mr. Wiebe, the Member for Morse:

That Section 28(1) be amended by deleting the reference to 50 per cent in the second line thereof and substituting the words "60 per cent".

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have read the amendment, and it involves the expenditure of money by the Government, and therefore I rule the amendment out of order.

Section 28 agreed.

Sections 29 to 34 agreed.

Section 35 as amended agreed.

SECTION 36

MR. STODALKA: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I am going to be ruled out of order for the amendment which I make. We feel very strongly that the \$12 suggestion that we have in clause (a) certainly isn't sufficient for people who are presently on a provincial pension plan, or the people who have superannuated. It certainly doesn't take care of the increases that we have had and the costs of living over the last two years. We think it should be doubled at least to \$24 we are suggesting that might be a figure that you could consider. With that in mind, I have an amendment here, again and will ask the Chairman to rule on that particular amendment I presume it may have the decision as we had in the past one, but we will ask the Chairman to make that decision.

I move, seconded by the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) that:

Section 36 of subsection (3) be amended by deleting the reference to \$12 per year and substituting the words "\$24 per year".

Amendment ruled out of order.

Section 36 agreed.

SECTION 37

MR. STODALKA: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to clarify my own thinking on the matter here. This is the section that describes the

superannuation plan, the plan that people who will be starting to work for the Province of Saskatchewan after this Act is proclaimed will be under.

Now under the old plan I believe, basically, you can say a person's superannuation pension was determined by multiplying the number of years of service that he had by the average of the top five or six years of service and in turn multiplied by one fiftieth. This determined what his pension would be. Now if I understand this correctly, under the new pension plan there won't be any such guarantees like this at all. The pension plan will be determined by an amount that was put in, a dollar for dollar match in contributions by the Provincial Treasury and the employee and the amount of money that accumulates over the period of years in which this has been invested. This is the way that I understand this. In other words, the dollar today as compared to 35 years ago is probably determined by what inflation is going to be — whether the pension is going to be substantial enough, whether the inflation rate in the next 35 years will be as extensive as it was in the last few years. I have some reservations and the more you think about this, I wonder whether or not these are going to provide substantial pensions. I know right now you consider contributing for 35 years and figure the interest that the account is going to earn, also the contribution of the employee and the matching contribution of the Provincial Government, but 35 years later is this really going to provide a substantial pension for people who retire from the various five corporations and the Public Service pension plan. I should like to hear the Minister's comments on that.

MR. ROBBINS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few comments with respect to the Hon. Member for Maple Creek observations. I will give you just a couple of examples to illustrate and I know that there is some difficulty for getting these on a completely comparable basis. Let's assume that you had an employee with \$16,000 per annum being his best earning years, on average, that employee under the present set-up would have a pension of \$4,200 per year or \$350 per month if he has 35 years of contributory service. If that same person was in the plan proposed in this section of the Act, and that plan earned five per cent, compounding interest which is a pretty nominal rate, over the same 35 years, contributing five and five, matched, locked in and vested to him. He would not have a pension of \$4,200 a year but a pension of \$5,892 a year, or \$491 a month rather than \$350 a month.

If you work that out on a six per cent compound basis, and obviously the interest factor here is a very important one, that individual's pension would be \$605 a month instead of \$350 under the old plan or \$7,260 per year. If you work it at seven per cent, which we contend is a reasonable figure to expect, that individual's pension would not be \$350 a month, it would be \$753 a month.

Now obviously in a plan of this type you must have a long period of service and that is the key, that is the key to get a pension for pensionable service.

I want to use one other example to illustrate this. I go to a \$12,000 per annum best during the years, which today under

the present plan, before the amendments occurred, would have a \$700 a month pension — 70 per cent, 2 per cent times his 35 years. That same person in the proposed new plan with 35 years service, and compounding five per cent annual return, would have a pension of \$11,784 a year or \$982 a month. If that person had six per cent earnings on that plan, his pension would go up to \$14,532 per annum or \$1,211 a month. I am using current annuity rates which obviously can vary. If that person had a seven per cent return over that 35 years on a compounding basis, on the basis of five and five match locked in vested clause, his pension would be \$18,060 a year, or \$1,505 a month. Now the key is the contributions, the time, and the earnings and the real key their earnings relation related to the time factor.

So I ask Members to fully realize certain factors. If you have a severe inflationary trend interest rates will be higher and the earnings of the fund will be higher. I am not saying that it is perfect but it will bear a relationship to reality and on that basis, in my contention, it is not only realistic, it doesn't involve any subsidy, it will better results over the long term for the majority of employees than the current plan does.

MR. STODALKA: I agree with the Minister when he indicates, I think, in the course of his remarks that probably we have to do something about pension plans with cost of living index features built into them and some of the problems that they are causing. I also felt, being a member of a pension plan, that if I had to take the one that you are offering and the one that I am presently in, I would much sooner have the one that I am presently in because of the protection that it provides against inflation. You take the guaranteed annuity idea, if you are 55 years of age and you weigh this present program as it reads, or as I understand it, your contributions would not change in the 20 years if you live to 75 years of age. You retire at 55, you buy yourself your guaranteed annuity, whatever that guaranteed annuity is going to be, you are going to keep receiving that same amount of money for the next 20 years. Now what you have been doing with some of the other ones, like the amendment that you brought in here where you changed existing pension plans by bringing in that \$12 clause, when you get into this new program are you going to come back again with such clauses or will somebody 35 years down the line from now be expected to come back with a \$12 clause or something like this to take care of these changes.

MR. ROBBINS: It is obvious that inflation creates real problems for pensions. That is not the fault of pensions. It is part of the general economy. The fact remains that we will be looking at that factor down the road. In some of the original proposals put forth we looked at the probability of a person attaining his middle years being asked to make additional contributions to the fund, which would be matched, to offset inflation, if, in fact, probable inflationary trends were evident. I want to stress, again, that there is some measure of protection in this, in terms of the earnings which accrue to the pension plan and if you have inflationary trends your interest rates will be higher and will protect you to some degree. Where the person gets caught is when he has retired. Now that is obvious in any plan. I know the Hon. Member for Maple Creek talks about the plan that he is in and it has indexation. That is of value to the person who is going on pension, but it also can have catastrophic

results in terms of the total funding costs. I think that he is well aware of the fact that there are some basic problems there that have to be looked at very hard.

MR. STODALKA: There are other questions that I want to ask about this fund. I think we can just clear it up in the beginning of this and then we will move rather quickly afterwards.

The cost of operating this particular plan, is it going to come out of the contributions that are put into the plan by both the employee and the employer, or is the cost of operation going to be absorbed by some other branch of the Government?

MR. SMISHEK: It is going to come out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. STODALKA: A final question. Let's say that someone takes the guaranteed annuity and lives for four or five years and maybe his spouse has died before him. What happens to funds that are left within the account. Are they going to be payable to the estate or do they just stay within the fund? For instance, you are guaranteed and as I said you have contributed for 35 years and you may only collect for two or three years. Then there would be a substantial amount of money left in that fund. Is that money to be lost to the estate or is it going to be paid into the estate of the individual?

MR. ROBBINS: Pensions will be bought with a guarantee attached for long periods, 10 or 15 years or more, or they may be bought on a joint and last survivor basis, which simply means — and maybe I am going back a little bit, but I want to illustrate this. Suppose a person who died who was superannuated under the present plan and got a pension of \$500 a month and that person died three months after his pension started. His widow would get \$250 a month under the current rules. That person would have a selection in here, if he wished, to say to us — how much money is required to buy a pension for \$500, or how much money is required to get a pension equivalent to that \$500? He could name himself and his wife and he could get a pension for \$480, say, some figure a little bit below because there is a woman involved and there is a problem there in the actuarial tables. Then if he died three months later, his widow would continue to get \$480 per month and if it was joint and last survivor, as long as she lived or if it carried a long term guarantee, you could make sure that all of that money was paid out.

MR. STODALKA: I regarded this as just being a little bit different than the old pension plan. You are putting in a dollar as the Provincial Government and the employee puts in one dollar and, of course, you accumulate the interest and then you have this amount of money in the end. I also understand, if I read this correctly, that at the person's retirement age of 55 or whatever he decides, he cannot take out that lump sum of money, which to me seems like it is his money. He is going to have to go and pay for this guaranteed annuity. If he and his dependants, his wife, or his spouse, don't live very long, the contributions that he had made on behalf of himself and the contributions that you had put in could really be used, I suppose to keep the

pension plan operational for other people. Is that correct?

MR. ROBBINS: There is a minimum guarantee. They wouldn't be buying straight annuities. They would be buying the minimum guarantee of at least five years. We would argue for 10 or 15 or for the joint and last survivor with the guarantee attached to it as well.

Section 37 agreed.

Sections 38 to 43 agreed.

SECTION 44

MR. ROBBINS: Mr. Chairman, I should say one brief word about this, joint and last survivor annuity. It is possible that a man could be retired and he and his wife choose to go on holidays and be killed in a car accident and the joint and last survivor would eliminate that pension, or we could put a guarantee in it. It is going to be paid to the estate for whatever the selective period is, 5, 10 or 15 years.

MR. STODALKA: I missed one section and if the Minister would just permit me to go back, Section 43. We understand that anybody who is in three years will be able to withdraw his funds, any employee of the Government or Crown corporations, after the first three years will be able to take out any of the contributions he paid into it, but not after three years. Any contributions that are made if the employee stays four, five, six or seven or whatever the case may be, he then will someday have a guaranteed annuity at his disposal. He will not be able to take out any of the funds that he contributed or the government contributed.

MR. ROBBINS: Correct, it is locked in like the Canada Pension Plan.

Section 44 agreed.

Section 45 agreed.

Section 46 as amended agreed.

Section 47 as amended agreed.

Sections 48 to 58 agreed.

Section 59 as amended agreed.

Section 60 as amended agreed.

Section 61 as amended agreed.

Sections 62 and 63 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 110 — An Act to amend The Condominium Property Act, 1968.

Section 1 agreed.

Section 2 as amended agreed.

Section 3 as amended agreed.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed.

Section 6 deleted.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 104 – An act to amend the Vehicles Act (No. 2)**SECTION 1**

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Chairman, we had indicated here throughout that we were opposed to aspects of this Bill to force people to wear seat belts and the position that we've taken throughout is that we feel that the Government hasn't placed really a sort of reliance in trusting people that we ought to be encouraging instead of not encouraging and forcing in this early and precipitous way. Our position you will recall is that we have been supporting the educational effort by the Government to persuade people to wear seat belts, and that process hasn't gone on very long, and already we are moving, given only the short time we've attempted to persuade, not to force them to do it. We think there ought to have been additional thought given to other ways in which one might accomplish the same end short of forcing people in this way and we want to put forward to Members of the Assembly a suggestion which they might find a bit novel in some ways. They may resist supporting it because there are already committed to forcing the matter. Our suggestion we think may have some merit, and if we could persuade you to accept a position short of forcing for a period of time we would see how it works. The amendment we propose to make to the Act is to vest in people a greater trust by Government; to say to people, for a change, instead of forcing you to do something, we're going to make some additional efforts to persuade you to do it. In other words, come to your own decisions in this respect, in an honest way, and live by them and let the community bring some pressures to bear on you with respect to them.

So we propose, Mr. Chairman, to move a major amendment to this Act as follows:

That all sections requiring the mandatory use of seat belts be deleted and replaced with a section which would encourage people to wear seat belts, to leave them the freedom to choose for themselves whether they do so or not by requiring that each year when a person applies for a vehicles licence, that person answer one simple question. Do you or members of your family regularly wear seat belts by providing if the answer to such a question is Yes, then (a) that person be entitled to a premium reduction, and secondly, that that person be issued with a special sticker for the licence plate indicating that that person has received a premium reduction and regularly wears seat belts, going on to provide if the answer is No, that no premium reduction be earned, and no sticker be issued.

Now let me tell you Members what this would do. And I want to move that amendment Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Member for Maple Creek. What it would do is put people on the honor system. They would be required each year when they apply for a licence to indicate as the resolution says on the form, do you regularly wear seat belts? If you answer Yes, I do, you get a premium reduction as an encouragement to do it. Then the second thing is that you get a sticker that goes with it and you stick it on your licence plate. Now suppose then you do that. Suppose a person says, Yes, I regularly wear seat belts. He gets a sticker and attaches it to his licence plates, but he doesn't do it. Now can you imagine the pressure that's going to be brought to bear by his community upon him for not doing it? Certainly,

well, the Member laughs. He comes from a small town where it would be most effective such as the town of Davidson, for example, any resident from Davidson who said on his application for licence that he regularly wore seat belts and you trust him to be an honest man, but if he didn't do it, he has his sticker on his licence plate saying he took the reduction. How, in fact, if he drives into town without his seat belt on and goes to the local beer parlor for a beer you know what they are going to tell him. You know, we see the sticker and you took a reduction in premium and yet we see you are not wearing your seat belt. The same kind of pressure would come from family, wives and children and neighbours. Rather than force, let us experiment with some ways that are based on a basic trust of people and allow them in a sense, to police themselves. Some small number, I suppose, may cheat but a great number will feel the pressure to be honest in respect of it because if they said they wear seat belts, they get a premium reduction.

We therefore encourage by persuasion and by moral force to do that which we say they ought to do rather than conceding we cannot persuade and forcing by law our opinion upon them. That's the notion, a part of this suggestion to continue to attempt to persuade people and to have them to persuade one another as to the value of wearing seat belts instead of exposing them to conviction for an offence, to fine and even in some circumstances, to more serious consequences than that. I hope seriously you'll give it a chance, seriously give it a chance for year or two see how the thing works; see if people couldn't persuade one another to wear a seat belt, and that ought to be an option open to you, because as we've indicated, you hurt no one but yourself if you don't, then you answer your question on your annual licence return, "Do you regularly wear seat belts?", you answer 'No'. In those circumstances you don't get a premium reduction and you don't get the sticker which indicates that you don't regularly wear seat belts. You're a person who might as well attempt to persuade to do it.

Now you see the philosophy of that amendment is based upon self policing among people. It is based upon a basic trust in people to do the right thing and be honest in respect of it. In other words put them on their honor to bring the pressure of right in the community upon those people, and of course, always avoid the harsh forcing of the law. I hope the Members will give some thought to this, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For Regina South moving this motion. Are you moving a motion? That requires a seconder. There are a few things wrong. I agree the motion is admissible in principle but the problem with the motion is that it doesn't apply to a specific clause of the Bill, and if you wish to reword the motion I find it in order. However, the way it is now, I'd have to rule it out of order. You would have to apply to a specific portion of the Bill, a specific clause.

MR. CAMERON: May I amend it by referring to that Section 132 (1) be deleted?

MR. CHAIRMAN: After the word mandatory, would you want to correct this other error. All right, I find this amendment in order.

MR. MacMURCHY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to quibble, but it would seem to me that the amendment would not be in order since it's involving an expenditure of money. However, I will not raise a large issue. I would raise the broader issue as it relates to the amendment and the arguments put forward. I don't think there is any question in the minds of the Members on this side of the House that we have tried and tried in a very serious way, the educational approach. There has been a concentrated effort of advertising both through radio and television and additionally through the newspapers since December 1975 relating to the use of seat belts. I think that that has brought some results but not the results that are necessary when one examines what is going on on our highways and on our roads. The persuasive approach simply has not done it and certainly as an individual I was one who considered education and persuasion, Mr. Chairman, as a sensible route. But since I think I am involved in a very serious way in Safety '77, my mind has been changed. When I look, as we all look at the 300 deaths of the 20 to 25 people completely paralyzed, at 10,000 injuries, when I look at the RCMP reports that come to me, that have been coming to me over the last month, there is no way that I cannot support the use of seat belts. I think it is just there and if the Hon. Members wish to oppose this approach, then that's their prerogative. For my part, I have no other alternative but to support it. I think that Members on this side of the House who have been involved in the development of this program just wholeheartedly agree and really it is one of the keystones of Safety '77 and as one of the keystones of Safety '77 it would seem to me that our Opposition Members are not inclined to support it then they are not inclined to support Safety '77 as a total program.

HON. E. B. SHILLINGTON: (Minister of Government Services) I would ask the Chair to rule on the question of the Point of Order. It strikes me that expenditure and taxes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe I missed something. I didn't hear a Point of Order.

MR. SHILLINGTON: It seems to me that to decrease the payments is a matter for the Treasury Bench. Only the Treasury Benches can bring it forward. It seems to me it is a matter of public expenditure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In my view the motion is in order.

MR. R. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a few words to the amendment. I wouldn't suggest that while we all agree on the wearing of seat belts, it has been proven your advertising program has been a failure or you wouldn't need the law here now. What we are suggesting is that rather than force people to do what you can't persuade them to do that you give them the opportunity in this manner as the amendment suggests of stating their preference as to wearing or not wearing seat belts. I think you will find, as has been suggested, that peer pressure or neighbor pressure or family pressure on someone who doesn't apply for a sticker on seat belts that he wears them, will force him into doing it. Once he has that sticker he is going to get pressure from his neighbors, from his peers and the advertising pressure will be such as to say, "Wear your seat belts. Why aren't you wearing them?" I believe in this way you are going to get a much

greater feeling of participation, a much more positive feeling from the people who are going to be affected by the seat belt law than you are by putting in a law that says you shall wear them.

When the fellow, or the person or the driver is not convinced that he should wear seat belts and you force him into it you are not having good public relations for one thing; you are not having that law very well liked. It is more apt to be called a law that is forced upon me stupidly and I will ignore it as much as I can. But if you take the other route as is suggested in this amendment, I think you find that the people will feel that they are working with the program, in the program to convince neighbors, convince parents, convince friends to wear seat belts. I honestly believe that the amendment achieves in a much better manner than what is being tried to achieve the way the Act stands now.

Amendment negatived.

Section 1 agreed.

Section 2 as amended agreed.

SECTION 3

MR. MacMURCHY: I just might explain that this matter came up during second reading debate and it permits the medical practitioners the option of reporting to the board. It removes the element of compulsion.

Section 3 as amended agreed.

Section 4 as amended agreed.

Sections 5 to 22 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 109 — An Act to amend The Statute Law

Sections 1 to 6 agreed.

SECTION 7

HON. R J ROMANOW: (Attorney General) Well, as I said in second reading of the House there is either a potential for confusion or indeed an actual error because really what the thing should read is "one one-hundredth". The way it is printed it is open to interpretation of 'one hundredth' which would make it a very much larger sum than what the Minister in second reading or anyone else intended. In other words it is correcting the thing to be beyond any doubt than making it open to the interpretation of 'one hundredth'. It is therefore interpretation of .01 which is the equivalent of one one-hundredth.

Section 7 agreed.

Section 8 agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS:

HON. E. B. SHILLINGTON: (Minister of Government Services) Mr. Speaker, just before we move into Committee of Finance I wonder if I might, with leave of the Speaker, introduce a number of students who are with us from the Regina Plains Community College. They are accompanied by their teachers, Sharon Cameron and Sheila Malloy. They will be with us for a few moments and I hope to meet with them downstairs. On behalf of yourself, Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome them here to the Chamber.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT: (Regina Wascana) Mr. Speaker, I too, before you leave wanted your assistance and the assistance of Members of the House to welcome a group of students from St. Andrews School who are here and I am sure that all Members here hope that they will enjoy their visit to the Legislature and I will be talking to you later.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. H. BAILEY: (Rosetown-Elrose) Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my desk mate and colleague the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) asked me to join with the Hon. Member Mr. Shillington in welcoming the people from the Regina Plains Community College. I understand a number of them are from the constituency of my desk mate so I join with this Assembly on behalf of my desk mate in welcoming you to the Assembly and we trust that you will enjoy your day here.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE — VOTE 1

HON. E. KAEDING: (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Chairman, sitting beside me is Mr. Jim Webster, the Assistant Deputy Minister of the department. Of interest to note that in the sports pages you have seen reports of Brenda and Craig Webster as being outstanding athletes this year and these are the children of Jim Webster.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: On my left is Ernie Spencer, Director of Production and Marketing, behind me Doug Grant, Extension of Rural Development, Bill Polischuk, Farm Resources Division, Lane Hedland of the FarmStart Corporation, Don Layman from Agriculture and Implements Forum, Rick Knoll, Administrative Services, Gib Wesson from Land Bank and Gil Shamble from Crop Insurance Corporation.

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse) Mr. Chairman, let me first of all welcome or extend my welcome to the Members of the Agricultural Staff to the Legislature this afternoon. I'm sorry that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture is not with us this afternoon as later on in Estimates I would like to deal with some of the statements which the Deputy Minister has made but I am sure that the Minister will

be able to answer any questions that we have in that regard. Just initially to start out with agricultural Estimates I find it rather difficult or possibly appropriate we might say that we are dealing with the future of the agricultural industry as it pertains to this Legislature at the same time when farmers are busily out while the rest of the Province is dealing with their livelihood in terms of their future for this year 1977 and that they are busily putting their future into the ground for this year.

I find the Agricultural Budget which we are here to approve today being, of course, very disappointing and one on the outset which really deserves very little comment. We can get into the aspect that may gain a few headlines in terms of what's happening in Land Bank or FarmStart or a few things along that line but I would like to first before we get into that, deal with the trend of what is happening in agriculture in the province today as it pertains to the Provincial Government. And I hope that the remarks which I make today will not be looked upon as detrimental to the Minister of Agriculture because I don't believe what's happening to Agriculture is his fault. Treasury Benches and the philosophy of that Government I think must take full responsibility to what is happening in agriculture.

I think it's reasonable for all of us to assume that any further reduction or erosion of the farmer's contribution to the overall balance of society will have a very detrimental effect on the kind of life which all of us enjoy in this province and this country. The Agricultural Budget does not lend itself towards that thinking. The Agricultural Budget does not lend itself towards developing and further enhancing our agriculture industry in this province, and I will get into statistics later on that prove that. The trend is that we are going away, we are going away from providing funds and moneys for research and development and enhancing and building an agricultural industry and we are diverting those funds instead to enhancing and increasing our bureaucracy. And as we go on further down the line, I'll deal with those figures. But let me say all segments of society, especially governments, I believe, must reassess their position as to what damage could result if there is a further decline or even the status quo remains in farm production.

We can survive in this country without steel but we cannot continue our life style or our way of living if we have less food, and I'm not speaking in terms of less for the people of Saskatchewan, I'm speaking in terms of less food for the people of Canada and less food for this world. We are blessed in the province and this country with capabilities of producing unbelievable amounts of food but we are not accepting that responsibility and I think governments must be turning more attention to agriculture and its priorities in agriculture, and as I said earlier more attention towards research. We've had small increases in the budget for research. They hardly even cover the cost of inflation. How about irrigation? It's a pet project of mine and yet each and every year there's less and less and less money being spent on irrigation. We've been fortunate that we've had around 1 and 1/2 inches of rain in this past week. What would happen if that rain hadn't come or if no more rain comes in this province? We are a dry-land province in terms of agriculture. Yet we have got the capabilities in this province to change that. We have got two major rivers flowing through this province, the North and South Saskatchewan Rivers.

You have hundreds of other rivers that you could be damming and you could be storing the water in wet years to serve this province in years like we could have this year or as experts are predicting that we will have in the years to come. Irrigation will provide that kind of stability in this province that the agricultural sector needs.

For example, the beef industry is still in dire trouble in regard to feed for that industry. Why should we be concerned about trucking cattle as they are in Manitoba from the southern part of the province to the northern part of the province. Would it not be much better to have a storage of feed at Outlook or around Rush Lake where they have a great irrigation project or areas in the southwest so in case it is dry that this feed could then be brought out to those particular cattle.

Land tenure and land transfer, these are other areas that the Government has not taken itself to task on, has not agreed to deal with urban sprawl and other areas. I could go on, Mr. Chairman, to list many ways in which this Government could be looking at improving and enhancing our agricultural segment.

What is happening with our budget? Let's take a look at that, ordinary expenditures. Last year the total for ordinary expenditures was \$44.2 million. This year it — pardon me, last year it was \$42.8 million. This year it has gone up to \$44.2 million, an increase of \$1.4 million. That doesn't account much for inflation does it. Yet that is all that agriculture was able to obtain from the Treasury Benches for ordinary expenditures for agriculture, \$44.2 million. Last year the Provincial Government spent \$22.2 million on staff, office expenses and so on; it amounted to 52 per cent of the agricultural budget.

What are they doing this year? The budget has only gone up \$1.4 million. Yet in 1977-78 this Government is planning on spending \$29.5 million on salary, office space and operating supplies, 67 per cent, more than two-thirds of the total agricultural budget in a province whose livelihood depends on agriculture. This Government is deciding to spend two-thirds of its money on a bureaucracy that does not enhance or increase or add to the overall production of this province.

Will that bureaucracy increase our total gross national product for this province in 1978? I say, No, it won't. Will it help to calm any losses which the farmers now have in regard to increased expenditures? Will it aid in that production, Mr. Speaker? It will not. Capital budgets, of course, an increase of — pardon me, a decrease of \$7.1 million last year to \$6.1 million this year.

I think these figures alone demonstrate the priorities which the Treasury Benches on that side of the House place towards agriculture, more money to operate that bureaucracy, but less money to build for the future of this province. Maybe that is the philosophy of the NDP. If someone else doesn't come in and build it so that we can buy it out or take it over we are not prepared as a government to go out and build or construct anything ourselves. Why not more capital money for dams as I mentioned a bit earlier? Why not more capital money for irrigation projects? Why not build this province into a province that can meet the challenges that are going to come in terms of world production, but also to meet the challenges that we are going to have in the years ahead in case it should be dry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: But instead, Mr. Minister, and again let me say that I am not blaming you for it because I believe in conversations with you that you have tried to change the trend that this Government has of only giving three per cent of its total budget towards agriculture. That trend is more concerned in looking after the lazy and those who are not capable of looking after themselves; that is where the Government's money is going. Is it going to a department that is going to generate future production, future jobs and future stability of this province?

Again, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that these few figures have certainly indicated the Government's priorities in that regard and I think it is extremely bad.

MR. COWLEY: Question.

MR. WIEBE: You would love to have a question on this wouldn't you. It is about time that this Government sat down and took a hard look at what is happening to agriculture in this province. You are demanding more money to operate the Potash Corporation of this province. Why? Because you are prepared to go out and spend money on something that is already here, something that is already providing jobs for people in this province and you are not prepared to provide part of those funds which you take into your department to give them to the Minister of Agriculture to allow him to grow and enhance and build our greatest industry in this province.

My first question to the Minister is if this trend continues where we have an increase from 52 per cent of our budget going into the operation of that bureaucracy to 67 per cent this year are we looking forward to 1979, 1980 to where 85 per cent of our budget will be allocated toward the operation of that bureaucracy and less for the development of this province. I am afraid that is what is happening. We are staying within the amounts of money that the Government gave to agriculture last year. That amount has only increased by \$1.4 million but there has been a drastic decrease in the direction in which this Government is guiding agriculture in this province.

MR. KAEDING: Mr. Chairman, first of all in reply to that last question about the staff and the bureaucracy in the Department of Agriculture, I can tell you that basically the Department of Agriculture does operate as a service department. We find it necessary to maintain a fairly large staff of people in the Department of Agriculture throughout the province in the regional offices to provide the services to farmers which they need out in the country. I think it is much more important that we provide the people with the expertise out there to help farmers to solve some of their production and marketing problems than it is to give them some cash injection which is gone in a couple of days. You pay a bill with it and it is gone. I think it is very important for us to have that kind of staff and expertise in the department. If you will look at the figures you will even identify the fact that our staff complement is down this year from last year by a few people.

With regard to the direction agriculture is going, and again I think I have pointed out earlier today that what we are looking

at is trying to get some stability into agriculture. It is rather disappointing for some of us to have to sit over here and listen to some of the arguments that have been going out into the country particularly fed by the people opposite, that farmers, particularly beef producers, don't want any stability in the beef market, that they want to be free enterprisers and simply continue to operate on a free market. I know that there are many farmers who do not believe that. However, we think it is important that we do get some stability of income. We think that is the most important item when you come to getting long-term production of food.

With regard to the amount of money we might be putting into drainage and flood control projects, I agree that any amount of money you spend in that area would probably not be enough because there is a tremendous need in developing water-controlled projects in this province and all over the western region. I think, though, that you would also agree with me that the route we have undertaken to have a full scale drainage and flood control study to examine what the best way is to handle this kind of drainage and flood control project is very important. For us to go on a piecemeal basis would not be very productive.

It is interesting to note that although you criticized the amount of money which went into agriculture last year, around \$42 million, actually through the beef industry assistance program with that added on, we spent around \$75.5 million last year on agriculture, so that we were there when there was a major need required in the agricultural area. We did provide that extra support for them. I think all in all our program has been fairly constant. We are maintaining a good service in the country and I think that is the most important area in agriculture.

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Minister, your remarks certainly emphasize the point that I was trying to make. You started out by saying why should the Government bother spending money on programs that provide a grant and it is gone and spent in two days. While I don't disagree with the program that you had in terms of your grant to cow-calf operators but here is an example where a fantastic amount of money was spent and it is gone within two or three days. But let's look at it. Say that we agree that \$74 million is what agriculture spent last year, but why are you cutting it way back down to \$40 million this year? If it was good enough to spend that much on agriculture last year, why doesn't agriculture maintain the same priority for this year? Why do you put that priority so much further down? You talked about government being a service industry. The service industry will not give stability. Service industry will not provide water. All the civil servants that you have will not produce one bushel of grain in this country if we don't have rain or the water to produce that grain. Not one of your civil servants is going to aid towards increased production in terms of your cow-calf operation of your dairy herd or your feed lot operator or your hog operator. You talk about priority in that civil service, and you're right; it is a very heavy priority.

Let's go back to 1970-71. The Department of Agriculture had a total staff of 413 people. Last year, not this year, under last year's budget the staff was increased to 682 people. You are certainly putting your priorities on service. Let's look at the square feet of floor space that the Government needed to provide for that civil service. In 1970-71 it needed 98,000 square feet. This year it needs 196,000 square feet to house

that bureaucracy. In 1971 you owned 40,000 square feet; you now own 120,000 square feet of government buildings. In 1971 you leased 57,000; this year you lease 75,000. So the Minister is certainly right when he says that this Government's emphasis is certainly on service and that bureaucracy, but what does that service do? Does it increase production? You talked that your emphasis is on stability. How does the civil service stabilize the production of crops in this country? Your Government has done nothing in terms of stability for the agricultural sector in this province and as I said earlier this morning that if it wasn't for the Federal Government, where would agriculture be in this province? Where would agriculture be without The Stabilization Bill in terms of grain? That bill is going to have a major impact on the total economy of this province. That wasn't a provincial program; that was a federal program.

Look at crop insurance. Was that a provincial program? What the province does is hire all its people to run around the province, but the major amount is spent by the Federal Government, another federal program. So what the Federal Government has done to the grain section of this province is said look, we will guarantee you a fair price on quotas, on the grain that you sell. We will do that through The Grain Stabilization Bill; we will guarantee farmers that. We also guarantee farmers that if they buy crop insurance we will ensure that they are protected against weather, against the elements. Those are two very major protection programs and yet you have the gall this morning to implement a resolution commending the Provincial Government on what it is doing and completely ignoring what the Federal Government has done in regard to protection of our industry in this province.

You talk about where money could be spent. Let me suggest something to you. I suggested earlier, instead of spending dollars, they may be necessary for this bureaucracy, I don't know. Some of the people in your department I feel are doing an excellent job. The farmers throughout this province need the service that they are providing. I'll grant you that. I'll agree that you need 682 civil servants. I'll grant you that you need 196,000 square feet of floor space to house those civil servants. But I won't grant you the fact that only 33 per cent of your budget is being spent for development of this province. Why not take for example — you have 17 other departments — why not take a couple of million dollars from each other department. That would give you another \$34 million. Take that and build a dam somewhere, build a dam to provide water. That dam will be there for years and years to come. You are building for the future of this province. Take that money and say to a farmer in the southwest part of the province, look you have 120 acres that can be irrigated; you have a jumbo dugout there or you have a dam that is close by. If you have enough belief and you feel strong enough about this province that you want to invest some money in irrigation for those 120 acres, we will give you a grant. We will let you get an irrigation system set up. In good years or bad years he can produce the feed that is necessary to feed his cattle and grow his crop. That is where the emphasis should be directed. You shouldn't be cutting back in those programs. If you feel that out of a budget of \$1.5 billion that you can only spend \$50 some odd million in agriculture, I think that is pretty sad.

Let's look at the other side of the coin. Let's look at how much money this province receives in revenue that is related directly or indirectly to agriculture. This province again

could not exist if it was not for agriculture. We would be relying on Ottawa again to come along and bail us out with equalization grants.

Again, I say this to you, Mr. Minister, and the other 17 Members on your Treasury Benches, that you have to get off this kick of looking after the lazy and those that are not able to look after themselves. Let's start diverting some of our cash and our energies and our thoughts toward developing our basic industry in this province. Give the farmers the tools and the dollars to use those tools and you can rest assured that the farmers in this province will make agriculture hum like you wouldn't believe. Give them that opportunity and they will prove to you that they can provide their own stability program and they can provide their own areas in which to make this province grow.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I can't for the life of me understand why the Government — it's something that we talk about each and every year; it is something that each and every year we receive the same answer. I think it is time that we stopped the approach of saying okay, we'll let the Federal Government solve our problems. If things don't happen today, we will say that we feel that something should be done but we are not prepared to do it as a province until the Federal Government does it and all other provinces come along. Let's bite the bullet. Let's try and do something on our own. Let's prove to the rest of Canada that we can produce and we can develop and we can do something in this province without running hat in hand to the Federal Government every time we want to have something done.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that outlines the position which I feel in regard to agriculture and the position which our caucus and our party believes that the direction of agriculture should be going in this province.

Before I take my seat there is one more item I should like to raise in regard to the Government's feeling toward agriculture and the Minister explained it a bit earlier that it is to be a service industry and to hire that bureaucracy instead of spending money on capital expenditures. There is an article which appeared in the Saskatchewan Agriculture magazine, I am sure that the Minister is aware of it, the April, 1977 issue, in which we have an article by Mr. Ron Dalgleish, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, "Farming in the Future". And the trend so far towards policy that is coming out of the Department of Agriculture and one reads between the lines of this particular article, one has to sit back and wonder where exactly this Government wants agriculture to go in this province. I see by reading between the lines in this article, for example, let me just quote:

The reason is inflation. The cost of tractor fuels, fertilizers, pesticides, germicides are likely to increase at a rate much more quickly than the cost of labor. Men are renewable; our population is increasing.

You go on to read further on down the line. Mr. Dalgleish is saying, look, maybe we should do away with the tractor, maybe we should do away with the section farmer, maybe we should go back to the one-quarter farmer where you can go out and have men come out and do the work that is necessary to produce some kind of a crop, using sons and daughters and so on. Is the Government's trend and their philosophy for agriculture in this

province to move away from a type of a system that has produced enough food products in this country to help feed a hungry world to one which we now see in China, for example, where you are going back to your small little farm, where you are going back to no mechanism, no fertilizers, no pesticides, where the farmer has a couple of acres which he goes out and hoes by hand or maybe pulls behind a horse, or gets a small tiny little tractor to do it and the daughter raises a dozen chickens and the other daughter raises a few pigs. Is that the kind of a farm that you envision in the future for the Province of Saskatchewan as outlined by your Deputy Minister in "Farming in the Future" in this province?

MR. KAEDING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think again the Member has been reading between the lines too much. But I would suggest that he is overstating the content of that article. I am certain that the Deputy Minister did not suggest that that is the kind of agriculture that we wanted in the future. I think, also, though he should recognize that there is another kind of agriculture developing in the western world which is the entire opposite of that and of which we also have to be careful. That is the kind of agriculture which is developing just south of us, south of the border, where very, very little of the farm land is still in the hands of the actual farmers and where most of the land is in the hands now of industrial groups and land development companies. I don't know whether he wants that to happen in Saskatchewan either. So I think that there has to be a middle ground between the two.

What we are attempting to do in this Government is to try to provide the maximum assistance to family type farms. If that means that we have to put some road blocks in the way of large corporate farms, well so be it. I think that we have to recognize that that is an ongoing problem, one which I discussed with the SARM as well and talked to them and outlined to them some of the problems which I thought existed in rural Saskatchewan if we were to go to an uncontrolled kind of society where any amount of land might be held by corporations or an investment company. Certainly I don't think that the Member for Morse would suggest that that is the way agriculture should go. South of the line where it is more developed than it is here, this is the kind of situation which is now taking place. I was rather interested to note that the Member for Moosomin whom I am sure is not a socialist, warned us about the same thing, about the uncontrolled use of land and the uncontrolled holding of land in large corporations. I think that we have to look at the two alternatives and see how we can best serve the needs of our province and try to best serve the needs of the family farm. This is what we are attempting to do through FarmStart and the Land Bank Program and so on.

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Minister, not to belabor the point, I am sure if the Minister has read this particular letter or if he wishes me to quote the whole thing into the record I can certainly do it this afternoon to emphasize the point that I was trying to make, but I think the Minister is trying to raise a red herring, talking about the bogey man in the States or the fact that the farm land in the States is going over to investor groups and huge, large corporations and that this is what's happening in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Let me remind the Minister of Agriculture that he and I

spent a year and one-half together on the Ownership of Agricultural Lands Committee. We were instructed to look into the use of agricultural land in this province. We couldn't find any corporate farms in Saskatchewan to go to look at and investigate because they weren't here. What we had to do was go down to the United States and have a look at some of the corporate farms, the ones that are owned by Good Year Tire and by some of these investment groups and so on. We visited five of them and I invite the Member to look back at the report which we made. Of those five corporate farms that we visited in North Dakota and also in Colorado there was only one that was functioning well. All the rest were either in the process of dissolving or had dissolved already and the reason given was that agriculture on that large a scale will not become economical or function because of manpower requirements. You cannot operate a farm on an eight hour day, 40 hour week and we will never have that problem in this province for the same reason that they are not going to have that problem in the States. I think that all of us can safely say that farms have reached their maximum size in this province. Because of manpower requirements, a farm is only going to be as large as a farmer can operate that farm officially by himself or himself with two sons or three sons.

Whether you have a corporate farm or not what's wrong with a farmer, a father and four sons, operating five sections of land? For some reason that looks terrible. You know, the people say, look, here is a farm; it is a corporate farm, five sections of land. It's terrible. Yet, they don't bother to realize that there could be five families making a living off of that farm, but because they have decided to get together under The Corporate Act, we call it bad. Had they gotten together under The Co-operative Act for some reason we would say it's all right and yet it is exactly the same structure. The only difference is that under The Co-operative Act it costs you \$15 to incorporate your farm whereas under The Corporation Act it costs you about \$500; that's about the only difference. We will not have that problem in this province, mainly because labor demands will not allow it and I think that we have reached the maximum size of farming in this province because it is becoming more and more uneconomical for the farmer to continue to buy the four-wheel drive tractor and he will only buy that four-wheel drive tractor as long as he and the machinery which he pulls can do it himself. He cannot rely on hired help to do it because hired help will not work longer than the 40 hour week or the eight hour day. It is not that great a problem now but it will be a greater problem in the future.

MR. BAILEY: I'll . . .

MR. WIEBE: Well, the Member for Rosetown, I can certainly use a man to put my crop in this year. If you want to come down the job is available tomorrow and you will be working longer than 12 hours a day too, I'll tell you if you are on my farm.

So Mr. Chairman, that's a red herring that you threw in our face about the fact that we have to worry about corporate farms coming in and farming our land. That is not going to be the case. You talk about investing groups, yes, that is a problem but it is a problem not out in Herbert, it's a problem not in Shaunavon, it's a problem around the city of Regina, it's a problem around the city of Saskatoon but not only investment groups but cities go out and buy huge acres of land around that

city for future development. That's where our problem is and that's the problem that we should be tackling. If we don't we are going to have a lot of good prime land in this province and it is going to go under concrete and pavement instead of under the four-wheel drive tractor if that's the area that we want to go.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave this subject for a moment. I am sure that the Conservative critic for Agriculture has a few comments which he has to make and later on I will be getting back into other questions in regard to agriculture.

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK: (Moosomin) Mr. Chairman, I would first like to welcome the Minister's staff. I am sure that they will be a real asset to the Minister today in answering any of the questions that the Opposition may have on the Estimates as we go along item by item.

It is not often that I can agree in such totality with what a Member from the Liberal Opposition has to say but the Member for Morse today has outlined some valid points and very good points and as has been the case in other Estimates, in agriculture the answers have been coming back the same. They have not been answers, quite simply put. The total for agriculture in our Estimates is without argument, without question, totally insufficient. And, Mr. Minister, rather than having you stand up and reply to that assumption that I make and the Member for Morse makes, I would rather that you stand up and try to justify why that Estimate is at that figure, why you have not been able to work through your Government and obtain greater funds contributed to this department. It is not a question which you can argue with. You know it is insufficient so why try to justify it. Try to get some argument as to what efforts you have been making and I really do believe you have been making efforts to get more funds into your department. Tell us more about that, Mr. Minister. That will give us some indication as to whether or not the Department of Agriculture in this Government has any priorities whatsoever and by the Estimates obviously it doesn't. It doesn't seem to have the kind of priority which it should have in this Province of Saskatchewan which relies almost entirely on agriculture.

Your Government has been talking of this buoyant economy and of good things that have been in Saskatchewan and they have, but you know and I know and the Member for Morse knows that they have been good, they have been buoyant for all people in this province, because crops have been good. We have come to a situation where we have not had rain for a long time until just recently. We had, generally speaking, a good rain across the province with the exception of the northern part which was not as dry as the south. We started to question you as to what programs you may be looking at to resolve some of the problems which this drought is going to bring about as it relates to agriculture. You have had about a year, almost a year of drought and only now you are starting to implement a program to deal with the problem relating to the drought. What I fear now when that much needed rain came to Saskatchewan I thought, oh, my goodness, there goes the Government program. I am only saying that I feel that in so many areas in this department that you look at short range policies, not long range policies. You will recall that the Member for Souris-Cannington had a great number of arguments relating to flooding, flooding one year, drought the next and I am saying, Mr. Minister, look seriously at these problems and develop some good solid long

range policies which will deal with these problems of drought or flooding or whatever they may be, get them ready to put into motion, rather than having them implemented from pressure from Opposition or from pressure from the various agricultural groups in the province as it pertains to their respective problems. It may not be something relating to the weather, it may be lease lands or grazing rights or whatever. Have those long range policies ready to move.

Basically my deep concern lies in the overall direction which your Government and you, Mr. Minister, for your department seem to be taking in this very vital industry, and not just in Saskatchewan, but in Canada and the rest of the world. I look at a Government which is setting up programs that are only going to enhance the bureaucracy which you already have now. You feel in your statement Mr. Minister that you must have total control over the agriculture industry for the maintenance of the family farm concept and, in fact, for the maintenance of the general economy of agriculture in the province. That statement in itself I take that and I have to interpret it as being that you, Mr. Minister, feel and your Government feels, that you must have that absolute control over this industry. And I only ask you to look at other countries where governments have that kind of control and you cannot argue, Mr. Minister, and I hope you don't try to argue it that it is not as efficient as the system that we have right now in Saskatchewan and the system that I want to remain in Saskatchewan. Let this industry grow and promote as individuals. If you are going to get into it and take it over I tell you, you are going to have a decrease in efficiency. I can't see how you can go any other direction. You just have to look at these other countries.

The other area which is along that same line is what seems to be a trend from land ownership to land holdership. Again taking it out of individual hands and placing it under the control of Government, putting yourself in a position where you will be able to dictate to those individuals, that is what I am objecting to in this overall long range policy or philosophy really is what I should call it.

Marketing boards have been bandied around in this Legislature this spring Session. Your Government is supporting that concept. Our Opposition has been simply saying, let the farm producers, the people that marketing boards affect, look at those marketing boards. Let them decide by a vote if they want it, and if so then let them have full control of that concept. And you, Mr. Minister, through your department, act as a government should, as an administrative body. That would be acceptable to the producers, possibly. You have observed the vote in Manitoba; you have some arguments with that. You say, well, that does not necessarily reflect how our farm producers here in Saskatchewan would go on a marketing board vote. Mr. Minister, why don't you call a vote on marketing boards if you believe that that is what the beef industry requires. If you believe that that is what's good for farm producers, then put it up to the farm producers and call a vote as they had in Manitoba, and let's see whether or not the farm producers want it. If they want it I'll surely have no objection. But, Mr. Minister, if you see, and you do now, clearly, that that particular concept is not acceptable, it doesn't appear to be acceptable to farm producers, then go back to the drawing board and do a little bit of thinking about this and come up with some other solution, some other proposal to put to the farm producers that maybe

would be acceptable to them, rather than staying on that one dogmatic concept, trying to jam it down their throats, force them into that way of thinking. I don't believe that that is the route to go.

Financing — you know, Mr. Minister, and you cannot deny it, if you take bank loans outstanding right now in agriculture I believe it is about \$650 million. We have this agricultural industry in this province in debt to the federal lending institutions, to the provincial lending institutions, the banks, the machine companies and the suppliers, and I tell you, Mr. Minister, and you know it, that our farm producers are losing control on that very aspect alone. And you are not assisting them in that area, rather you are only encouraging it. You are taking them more into debt and they get into debt and they have lost control and, Mr. Minister, it is a fact because I've got them in my files.

Mr. Minister, let's take a look at energy. You attended the conference here in Regina. I attended a similar conference in Saskatoon. We were discussing energy conservation in agriculture. My conclusion as the summation of that conference was that it was a negative attitude that was being taken, a very negative attitude. Three basic things — (1) we recognize that we are in an energy shortage, and that is good. We have recognized that as a fact. (2) We are taking measures to conserve energy, and that is good. Better insulation in our homes, which maybe we should have been doing 20 years ago, I am sure.

MR. THOMPSON: How is that motorcycle of yours? Is it good on gas?

MR. BIRKBECK: It is very easy on gas and maybe you should be riding one too. You are the one that is energy conscious.

Now, Mr. Minister, someone over there hollered — wear helmets. That comes under another item, but I'll tell you as far as helmets are concerned, the NDP Government in Manitoba did not make it compulsory. And they are not wearing them over there — the vast majority. But anyway, getting back to agriculture, this is an area in which you have looked at two of the basic problems — (1) we are short of energy, (2) we are going to conserve it. We have suggestions of maybe only energy reserves for 20 years.

Now what about a young farmer who takes out a 29-year mortgage on a farm? He's got enough fuel for 20 years. Now surely it is a serious problem. My concern in that area of energy is that you are not looking at new areas. What other sources of energy could you be developing? You are just going to say, "Well we've only got so much and when that all runs out, well we are all going to," and the phrase that has been used many times before, "freeze in the dark." Well I don't believe we are. I have said before, and I will say it again, that the good Lord when He put man on this earth, provided all the sources of energy available. He made those available to man, through development of man on this earth, but He left it up to us to harness and develop those sources of energy and, Mr. Minister, that is where I criticize your department and I criticize the Government as a whole, that they have not developed those new sources of energy. Very simply, one of them is the methane gas plant theory. What effort has your Government made in that area alone? Where we are now, in particular, having a large number of

livestock operations intensified and concentrated, that system would work. How much money, Mr. Minister, are you putting into areas of development of new sources of energy? Wind energy is another one. The Member for Morse suggests that we should have an irrigation policy and that is a good suggestion. One of the ways that we could possibly supply irrigational needs, the need to farm people is through wind power. Now then, you have got to have an idea. Well, I can understand, you may be a little short of ideas on this side of the House, maybe we are. I think the Minister of Agriculture has come a long way because he recognizes that I am not a socialist. He is right there. So I have really got hope. But I am going to give you an idea, Mr. Minister. And it is my idea. It is something that I think could be a possible working solution. It could be a source of energy. I would like you to look at the possibility of wind energy as a source. I would like you to look at that possibility — wind generators. We have a lot of wind in Saskatchewan. Most days it is blowing good and hard, and I suggest that you could possibly look at taking a number of municipalities in the province, erecting a wind generator, and there is no question that it can be done, if we can put man on the moon there is one thing for sure — we can build a wind generator, in a number of these municipalities and you could, Mr. Minister, inject electricity into this SPC system in Saskatchewan which is a good system. If the wind isn't blowing, it has to feed back the other way. Very simply, it would have a meter that would indicate — at the end of the year, if you like — who owes whom, and it could be that the Government of this province, the people of Saskatchewan, would in fact owe sums of money to the municipalities and you know, Mr. Minister, that they are short of money, and that they sure wouldn't be wondering what to do with that source of money for any number of things — roads, bridges — they could use it for social justice programs including health and education, a whole vast majority of programs.

Now, today that might be something far out. You may think that that is just a shot in the dark. Well, maybe it is. But I am saying, take a positive attitude instead of a negative attitude, as it pertains to energy in this province and to agriculture.

Let's look at some new ideas. I understand that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has a program in his department which provides certain sums of money to individuals for the development of new ideas and I suppose, possibly, to organizations as well. I would like to know if maybe that couldn't be co-ordinated with your department and when we have people that may want to go into programs on their own as individuals in their own farming operations, to try new systems, whether it be a solar home or a methane gas plant in their livestock operation, that maybe that way, through your department, they could realize some funds and do some of this experimental process in that area at the farm level and let the individual farm people benefit from it, and set an example, set a trend. I agree, Mr. Minister, with the Member for Morse, wholeheartedly, when he says you have got to take a look at this problem — quit sitting here in the province and waiting to see what Mr. Whelan in Ottawa is going to do, because I quite frankly think if you are going to wait on Mr. Whelan in Ottawa for anything, you are going to be waiting a long time.

Let's resolve our own problems right here in the province and let's put that pressure on the Federal Government where it is required.

I was disappointed, Mr. Minister, in the area of oceanic import of beef. I felt that you could have applied more pressure to the Federal Minister of Agriculture in that area. People out there, the farm people in the various constituencies are waiting for you to stand up and take a solid stand on their behalf. Make a statement — say something, do something. And, Mr. Minister, you have the staff, you have the ability yourself, and I give you credit for that, to take the bull by the horns in this province and let's get a hold of this Brahma of agriculture; let's get our production up; let's not look at programs to stabilize and keep a steady flow of income for all people. Let's get production on the move, and that is what I have against marketing concepts as you perceive them. They tend to stabilize, and I would like to see you take the other approach where you are going to encourage production and start things moving.

It goes without saying, Mr. Minister, that the nuclear balance of power among nations in this world, and now the energy balance of power among nations of the world, are the dominant factors. But I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, and I am sure you will not disagree, that given 10, 15, 20 years, I don't know how long, but not too long, food energy and I say again, Mr. Minister, in your control to put that ability in the hands of individual people of Saskatchewan to provide that much needed energy to mankind throughout the world. And I just say again, Mr. Minister, please, you have it right now — go ahead with it.

MR. KAEDING: Well, Mr. Chairman, that was a lengthy speech on energy and resources and I don't know exactly where that fits into the agricultural scene. I do believe that there is certainly some need on the part of our department to look at alternate sources of energy and what we might do in the case of energy shortages, but I think you are far afield when you think that that is an area where agriculture should be deeply involved in. I think we have other research projects which we should be looking at.

I was rather interested when you talked about our total control of agriculture. Again, I keep wondering where some people get some of these ideas they have about this Government trying to take total control of agriculture. In all of our programming, we try to avoid as much as possible, Government control in the agricultural field. It was rather interesting yesterday, when you asked the question in the House, why did I not do something about the chicken marketing board. He talks about me wanting to get control of everybody and have everybody by the throat, and it is rather interesting when he asked me to interfere with the Chicken Marketing Board. We say that we have these marketing boards. The job of those marketing boards is to operate to the best advantage of their producers and we do that and we let them do that. And we don't attempt to interfere. Now he was suggesting yesterday, I should interfere.

He talks about control of land ownership and I am sure he was talking there about the Land Bank Program and the fact that we are attempting to control farmers, tell them what to do and where. And I think if he would look at and examine the Land Bank Program, he would find that we do not tell the people on Land Bank what kind of crops they should grow. We don't tell them how much to grow or when to grow it. We simply give them a lease on a piece of land, and it is up to them to go from there, and so we do not exercise control over what farmers do on Land Bank land.

With regard to the marketing boards, he again took the attack that we were trying to shove marketing boards down someone's throat. I think if he would have listened carefully this winter, he would have noted in all the conversations I had with agricultural organizations and in the meetings that I had out in the country, that I was very careful to say that I think it is up to the producer to make up his mind what he wants to do about marketing beef, and to this point they haven't given me a clear direction of what they want to do. Certainly, we are going to be listening to them, and so I challenge him to tell me one time when I tried to ram a marketing board down someone's throat.

With regard to oceanic beef and again, he says that we did not take strong action to try to prevent the importation of oceanic beef. I think he knows, as well as anyone else, that that is a federal issue. We did on a number of occasions, wire and write to the Minister of Agriculture on this particular problem and again I say it is an over-reaction on the people in the beef industry because oceanic beef in my opinion, did not have as much effect on prices last year as many people think, because we imported as much product as we exported, so if you are going to say that you are not going to allow imports, then we should not be very critical if we can't export as well.

I think that is all the reply I want to make to that Member. Are there other questions?

MR. BIRKBECK: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, I won't even answer to the statement that you feel I am far afield when I talk of energy and that you don't know how that relates to agriculture. I don't know of any tractor that doesn't run on fuel. You know that. I don't know why you would even say that. It is absurd. Surely it has to be a statement that is going to take away from you, Mr. Minister, and not add to your credibility.

With reference to chicken marketing boards, at the risk of a great outburst in the Legislature, I would only say that on the one hand you say that you are not going to interfere with this particular marketing board, when I tried to say, and I think I am right in that, unless you can correct me, that the idea of a marketing board is to stabilize and to keep this under-cutting, under-selling if you like, which depresses prices. You argue bringing feed grains under the marketing, under the Wheat Board, under the Canadian Wheat Board because you don't like the idea of a farmer taking his grain and selling it to his neighbor maybe because he needs the dollars right away and he maybe sells it cheaper. You don't like that idea. But when it comes to this as far as the Chicken Marketing Board is concerned, where you are selling to the outfits in this province for 87 cents and turning around and selling to groups of over 500 for 53 cents, you will find that and you will divorce yourself from that problem, and you say, "Oh that's going to interfere. You are not going to interfere." If you are not going to interfere, Mr. Minister, then why don't you take every piece of legislation pertaining to agriculture which has in it, "the Minister may by Order in Council . . ." take that out of there if you are not going to interfere. Now you can't argue that. Either you are going to have that control and you are going to interfere or not. You can't be here and there both, and that's where you are. Just to very simply answer that question — chicken marketing boards — you have stepped out of that, because you know that there are some questions to be answered there and you haven't

attempted to and that is fine. As far as the marketing board as it pertains to beef is concerned, in the province, you say that the beef producers have not given you a clear direction as to which way they want to go. If you want to have a clear direction as to which way they want to go, hold a vote. That is the way you are going to get it.

It is very interesting, the Members from that side of the House have meetings and they are talking about groups that come out discussing marketing boards and the vote was unanimously in favor of marketing boards. I got a meeting and I got 200 and some odd out, 250 to a Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association meeting and only 10 out of over 250 were in favor of it. And I say that the only way that you are going to get a clear idea is to hold a vote.

MR. W. H. STODALKA: (Maple Creek) Just a few questions to the Minister of Agriculture. I want to summarize what I think is your position on grazing leases. The position that you have on grazing leases, I believe, is that a number of years ago in the case of a ranch, if the owner had deeded land, let's say four, five or six quarters, and then had grazing leases to the extent of let's say two or three sections of land, he used to be able to approach your department and the arrangement would be made whereby the grazing lease was transferred along with the deeded land to keep together what you might call the economic ranching unit. Is this not correct? Was that not the policy?

MR. KAEDING: The policy on leases right now has been changed, and the new assignment policy says that the only automatic assignment that takes place is from a father to a son. The previous arrangement used to be that a lease could be passed on with the farm. It could be assigned with the farm under certain circumstances. That is no longer possible.

MR. STODALKA: Then the policy is right now. Let's say the same individual that has the deeded land, the small portion of deeded land complemented by a number of sections of grazing land to form the one unit, when the person or the individual was to sell to someone other than a direct descendant, he then now no longer can guarantee that that package of grazing lease is going to be transferred with the existing deeded land, is that not correct?

MR. KAEDING: As a direct descendent he would be able to make that transfer provided he met all of the criteria which is in the assignment lease as he always had to do. In a direct descendent transfer that's possible.

MR. STODALKA: Not in the case of someone that is not a direct descendent.

MR. KAEDING: Right.

MR. STODALKA: Would the Minister not feel that this would have an impact on the land that the individual has. I imagine the reason for the change is the feeling by your department that they were really getting inflated prices for the unit and they were selling

land that belonged to the Crown. That's probably the reason for the change. But there's also the other impact now. What happens now and the danger that we see in this particular proposal is this. The individual that has the five quarters of land, particularly if it's grazing land and if he doesn't have a parcel of land to guarantee to make a viable economic unit, then that five quarters of his own land becomes possibly worth less than the market value because it's really of no value to an individual unless the whole other grazing surrounding is there to make a unit. Would the Minister not agree that this is a serious situation?

MR. KAEDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are some complications there but I think you have to recognize really what is taking place and you put your finger on it. It's a fact that because a farmer with his deeded land had a certain amount of lease land around him he was able to command a substantially higher price for that parcel of land simply because he could guarantee that he had this extra leased package. If he's got a piece of farm land it should be worth what it's worth, not what it's worth in addition to the other land which he can attract with it. You know around these parcels of land there are many young farmers who wish to lease land have not been able to lease land because it has been tied up with someone else. Now you're suggesting that we should let someone come in maybe from 25, 30 or 50 or 100 miles away, come in and get that total package, again deny those young farmers around there an opportunity to bid on that land. This new farmer coming in will have the opportunity to bid on that land the same as anyone else. And if he can qualify certainly he has as much right to get it as anyone else, but we don't think that we should guarantee him that right.

MR. STODALKA: The final question on this. But don't you agree though that there is a possibility particularly in the case of grazing land that the original homestead of the individual is going to be worth less in market value because of the fact that it's too limited, it's too small and therefore does not become something that is really desirable.

MR. KAEDING: Well, certainly I can agree that it might be worth less than he could get otherwise. But again why should we, why should the department or the Crown let's say, why should they guarantee him some kind of situation where he could get a better price for his land, or even a good price for his land? We don't guarantee that to anyone else anywhere else in the province.

MR. STODALKA: I have the feeling that here you have a number of viable units that are presently operating and that the policy that you have adopted can destroy those viable units, the individual ranching units that are established. It's got to have all of these quarter sections of land in order to make something that's profitable for the individual. And here now you're going to break it up. There's a possibility of the five quarters, or say whatever it is of the deeded land going one place and the leased land, its four or five sections going and being split up amongst four or five or six or seven neighbors depending I suppose on however you list it.

MR. KAEDING: Well, again, you may be

handicapping this one particular person. But you may also be setting up viable units which couldn't be set up before simply because that was denied them. I think it works both ways.

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Chairman, if I've heard a cock and bull lousy policy come out of this Government this is one of them. This is one of them and I'm sure that that policy did not come from your support staff within the Department of Agriculture. That kind of a policy could have only come from the backward philosophy of your Treasury Benches and NDP Government. I have never seen anything as ridiculous as this. What the Member for Maple Creek is saying is certainly true. What you're doing is you are placing the land and the buildings of the person who owns deeded land as being worthless. Certainly a man may own a section of deeded land and he may lease 2 sections of Crown land but in order to make that unit function he may have spent anywhere from \$50,000 to \$150,000 in buildings on that deeded land to supplement his operation. It could be cattle; it could be hogs, it could be dairy or whatever. You say now to that individual, "look we're not going to allow you to sell that package to another young farmer coming in. We are going to be saying, look, we're going to give those 2 sections of deeded land to someone who may not be interested in purchasing that deeded land." So what happens? We're not talking about the 4 quarters or the 1 section of deeded land. We're talking about \$150,000 worth of assets that that farmer has stuck into buildings on that particular property which now are worthless. No one's going to come along and spend that kind of money, that kind of money to buy that property if he doesn't have an opportunity to obtain the deeded land that goes along with it or the leased land that goes along with it.

You're breaking up a complete unit. And why do I say that's fuzzy NDP philosophy? I say what you're doing is you're saying to that guy who owns that 1 section of deeded land and those buildings, we're saying, "Look there's no buyer that's going to come along and take it." He's going to want to sell it so he's going to sell it to the only guy that's going to come along and pay any kind of money for it. Who's that going to be? That's going to be the Land Bank. The Land Bank is going to come along and say look, we'll offer you maybe 10, 15, 20, 30 per cent less than that land is worth because you have to dispose of it. The Land Bank is going to say, look, those buildings are worthless to us. You know they're worthless to us. We can't go out and lease that 1 section of land to someone else. He's not going to pay the 6 per cent lease fee or whatever it is on the value of those buildings to operate a farm. You're putting people who own deeded land and complimentary leased land in this province at a very, very great disadvantage. Mr. Minister I cannot for the life of me see the reasoning behind this kind of a policy. It's just not feasible and it's just not fair. If anybody is being discriminated against it's the small land holder that owns a small amount of deed land and you're taking his future and his livelihood and his retirement away from him. I think it's the worst program that this Government has ever implemented and I'm sorry that we have to say that we've got a Government in this province that would implement that kind of a policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. KATZMAN: (Rosthern) I would like to take another line here — the Market

Development Fund and the Agriculture Department. What amount of money have you planned for that area this year? Grants to people like Saskatchewan Livestock, Agribition and so forth, what's the amount in those, Farmers' Union and so forth?

MR. KAEDING: Are you talking about the Market Development Fund or the Assistance to Agriculture Interests?

MR. KATZMAN: Market Development Fund.

MR. KAEDING: Mr. Chairman, there is a long list of projects which come under this Market Development Fund. I can read you a few of them and you'll have an idea of what . . . you want a copy of them. Okay, we'll just send you a copy.

MR. BIRKBECK: If I might just take the discussion back to leased land just briefly. In the event where the Government through the Lands Branch has leased lands being taken over by a co-operative organization as directive bodies, who would have sole jurisdiction over those lands? These are leased lands for grazing, primarily. Is that co-operative organization going to have the decision-making power as to who will be able to lease the land when there's new land under that co-operative organization available or is it still going to be the jurisdiction of the Lands Branch?

MR. KAEDING: You're asking about co-op pastures, are you? With regard to co-op pastures — clarify that a little bit so I know what you're talking about.

MR. BIRKBECK: I'm just basically talking about leased land for grazing which is leased from the Lands Branch, rather than by individuals. It may be a case where there were a number of leased lands in a particular area. If you like I can give you a good example. The Haunted Hills Grazing Co-operative would be a good example. Now does that particular co-operative organization have the sole jurisdiction over those leased lands or does the Government through the Lands Branch Department?

MR. KAEDING: There is a policy which outlines the qualifications of a person who can qualify and to go into a co-op pasture, and that policy is there when the pasture is incorporated. Each of the Members must qualify on the basis of their need. Now once the pasture has been incorporated, they continue to operate it and they simply lease the land from the Lands Branch. They operate it generally speaking as they wish. However, they are required to stay within certain regulations of the Lands Branch.

MR. BIRKBECK: Mr. Chairman, then I would be right then in assuming in this particular instance that once that is done that co-operative organization has the control of that particular land.

MR. KAEDING: Well, yes they do for grazing purposes. There are only one or two restrictions, the one restriction is that no member of that co-operative can put more than 50 head of cattle into the pasture, some of those kinds of things so that you

would prevent it from falling into the hands of one or two people in that co-operative and have different members drop out of the Co-op. They have to continue to get new members to maintain a viable operation.

MR. BIRKBECK: In fact, Mr. Minister they don't. They don't have to at all. I think that particular co-operative organization is one in particular where given a few years or maybe within the next 10 years it could be one family that owns all that leased land, or not owns it but have the control of it through that particular co-operative organization. If they don't want a particular member in that organization for any particular reason all they have to do is the majority of the members vote him out. That is Mr. Minister, if you'll check that, that's the way that particular organization sets itself up.

MR. KAEDING: Yes, that may be true but no member can graze more than 50 head of cattle in the pasture. And so what advantage would it be for two or three guys to own a big pasture if they could only put 50 head of cattle into it. So they have to go back and get new memberships in order to make that a viable pasture.

MR. ANDERSON: I think if you will go back into the history of the south-west where I'm from you'll find that units which sound large on your books got to be that size for a very good reason. It's a very dry area. We homesteaded in 1909, 1910, up to 1920 at one-quarter to one-half section per person. And in that area it's too dry for what we'd call allowable grain farming. Our herds in the past varied from 35 cows a month to 25 cows a month which is basically on a 5 month period, 7 cows and calves to 4 cows and calves per quarter, which is 20 per section. Now these units if you break them back down and start dividing them to 1 of these units you have to develop hay land irrigation. We have large tracts where it was used for sheep for years because there's basically no put up of feed. You've got units to be viable to size to carry a family and they sound large, I know, 10 or 20 sections. But go back to that 4 cows for 5 months per quarter and they are not large units.

In this area services are a long way, I go 60 miles to hospital from where I live and I'm not at the far end of it. We go 40 miles for parts. We have the longest school bus route in North America, 50-55 miles one way to school. It isn't easy to get people. It sounds easy here in Regina to say we're going to put young people to work on this. It doesn't work that way. You can't come in there on that land and take it unless you have irrigated land. You also know as well as I do that if a ranch unit is up for sale that your department will evaluate the deeded land and they will put a price upon it, then they will evaluate the improvements on the lease. This has been done for years. And if the price of that unit is beyond what you feel is fair for the improvements for the deeded land plus the improvements on lease, you will not okay a lands transfer. But what you're doing now is you're taking a unit and you're not going to get a buyer in. A young fellow trying to start has to buy the irrigation improvements and the building improvements, but you won't give him a guarantee. You know it takes a lot for legal fees; it takes a lot of doing to raise the money. And he just can't raise the money.

You still have the control of looking at that if the price is beyond what the deeded land is worth, beyond what the improvements in irrigation and buildings are worth and the improvements to your lease. You can stop or okay a sale. You have the power.

And I do know that every time they advertise a lease you get a lot of applications but those applications in my area are applications that have been taken up and have been dropped within a year to five years. We face a very difficult problem in building a viable ranch unit. Once it's built if you start splitting it away we go back to when they homesteaded this. We were homesteaders as I say of a quarter and half section when I was a kid in the '30s. We started off by the droves and if we go back to that small type of farming in my area or ranching we can set them up but they won't last. They just can't. We're just too dry; it's just too arid an area.

I wish you would reconsider the policy looking at the facts. You check your departments. You do have the power of controlling. No one can control all of it. You cannot sell your deed land for what's more than market price; you can't sell leased land. That's been a policy for years. Your department has a very good point system of deciding who should have leased land. When a young fellow comes in to take over an outgoing person has to have the assurance that it fall within the lines which can be guidelines checked out before the sale. And what can happen is larger units which do want the irrigated land can pick this out and pay a price for it, but a young fellow can't come in and buy the unit. And I think you'll find if you check into this what you're doing to help the young fellow is doing exactly the opposite. You're preventing a young fellow from coming in and buying a viable unit and putting a family back in that area.

I do wish, Mr. Minister, you would talk to your officials and reconsider. I understand your reasoning and your argument entirely but in my area I do believe that unless you've lived in the area that you don't quite understand the importance of transferring these units as a working unit. You have the hay land, you have the winter grazing with it as a unit. If you take any person out of the way the unit becomes not viable. I wish, Mr. Minister that you would reconsider, check with the Lands Branch. You have the control. I think your whole system worked quite well. Any unit that was considered too large was broken up before this, but any unit which was a family unit, would be transferred to get the guarantee so they could get the loans. I hope you understand what I am trying to say.

MR. KAEDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand what the Member is trying to say. I don't want to pretend that the policy that we have now is the end-all of Land's Branch policy. We have changed it and we can change it again. But certainly one of the reasons it was changed was because of the fact that we have evidence in many cases where land values were double to what their true market value was simply because they had an attached piece to them. That doesn't appear to be totally reasonable either. But certainly I will say that we will be examining this policy from time to time as we have done. If we find this one not working we will not be dogmatic about it. We will certainly look at it again to see whether other changes are needed.

MR. ANDERSON: You always had the authority. You could not sell deeded

land that had lease land with it for double its value, because if that came up your department would evaluate the deeded land of that unit plus the improvements on that deeded land, plus the improvements on the lease land. You would not transfer the lease land. That has been a policy for as long as I can remember. You then would stop the sale and say we will not allow that lease to be transferred because you are selling it.

MR. WIEBE: I should like to re-emphasize the problems which the Member for Shaunavon has talked about today. I hope that the Minister will seriously look at revamping this particular policy, not in the future but right now. I think that in terms of the southwest especially, it may not apply to such a large extent in other parts of the province, but as the southwest is concerned, this particular policy is very detrimental to the future and the development of that southwest part of the province. To emphasize my point, let me say that it is just not ranchers and farmers in the southwest who are concerned about this particular new policy, but also local governments.

The city of Swift Current, for example, the Council of the city of Swift Current last Monday, unanimously passed a resolution urging your Government to change this policy, to change it back to what it was. The city of Swift Current which is the hub of the retail business in the southwest part of the province realizes how detrimental that policy is to even its existence as a city. Let me remind the Minister that the City Council in Swift Current is comprised of members from all political faiths, whether they be Liberal, NDP or Conservative. They are saying to you and to this Government, look, it is a bad policy as far as we are concerned. It is a bad policy as far as the southwest part of the province is concerned. What they are asking you and what I and the Member for Maple Creek and the Member for Shaunavon are asking you today is to change that policy, not allow that policy to take effect in the southwest part of the province. It is going to hurt the agricultural sector and it is certainly going to hurt the economic and business sector of that area as well.

I hope that you will reconsider and again I say that it is difficult for me to believe that this kind of a policy would come from your officials. I think the change and direction of that policy is going to be on your shoulders to convince your Cabinet colleagues of the fact that the policy in the southwest part of the province should be changed. I hope that you take on that responsibility on behalf of the farmers and ranchers and the businessmen and the people in the city of Swift Current and those in the southwest part of the province to urge your Cabinet colleagues to change that policy. Make it more realistic and make it a policy that will apply to the particular situation that does exist in the southwest part of the province. I hope, Mr. Minister, that you can stand up and say that you will take a very serious look at the representation not only by the three MLAs that represent that part of the province but also the representation which has been made to you by the local elected officials of the city of Swift Current. Take a second look and let's not implement that policy in terms of the southwest part of the province.

MR. STODALKA: I would just like to indicate that this last Saturday I went into Calgary and I saw an idea that I would like to give to the Minister of Agriculture concerning 4-H clubs.

Last Saturday in the Province of Alberta, all the provincial highways were flooded with young people picking up debris out of the ditches along the highway. The Alberta Government decided to give each 4-H club \$8 per mile for picking the debris out of the ditches. They gave each club a section of 10 miles of highway. The strip I happened to travel on was from Medicine Hat to Calgary and I assure the Minister the amount of debris that came out of those ditches was absolutely amazing. There were bags piled every 200 to 300 feet along the highway. I think this not only teaches children not to pollute and not to throw their wastes into ditches and public places but it also had the effect of cleaning up the highways in the Province of Alberta. I don't think it is a very costly proposition when you are planning some of your 4-H programs for next year.

MR. BIRKBECK: Just in order to speed things up if I may I just want to ask a series of questions and ask the Minister to reply.

First I should like to know what the plans of your department are, what the Government plans are to deal with the problem of foreign investment of land in our province. That is the first question.

The second one is how much land has the Land Bank rented out to non-residents of Saskatchewan, if any? If so, what other provinces are these leases from, or the United States? How much land in east central Saskatchewan — around the Yorkton area — or another example, maybe you could answer them both, in the Yorkton area and the Indian Head area?

MR. KAEDING: With regard to what we are planning on doing with non-resident ownership of land, I think you would know that I have said on a number of occasions that we have had substantial pressure from people in many organizations asking us to be more restrictive with regard to ownership of land by foreigners. We will be examining that and seeing what we can do with that in another session. Certainly we recognize it as a serious problem.

As far as the Land Bank land is concerned, you asked me how much land was leased to people who are non-residents of the province. I can say there is none leased to non-residents of Saskatchewan.

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Chairman, I think possibly under Agricultural Estimates if we could deal with the whole agricultural budget under Item 1 then we can whip through all the other items fairly quickly, if that is agreeable.

I should like to turn now for a moment to community pastures and another new policy which appears to be emanating from the Provincial Department of Agriculture, that is the allocation of livestock that is being permitted to patrons of the community pastures. To a point I agree with some of the policy which they have implemented. Yet to other points I must disagree.

What you are doing is putting many young farmers who do have anywhere from 10 to 30 head of cattle at a very serious disadvantage if they happen to reside a number of miles away from that particular community pasture. I am talking in particular of some community pastures that effect my particular constituency. As you know community pastures are not that prevalent in

this province. It was disappointing for me to see when we look at this budget that there is a further cutback by your department in money being allocated to the expansion and development of community pastures in this province. Yet on top of that you are coming out with a new policy in regard to community pastures, that effective January 1, 1978, is going to drastically cut back on the number of cattle that these young farmers are going to be able to place within those community pastures. What your point system says, I believe, is that the further distance that you are away from a particular community pasture the fewer points you get and the less eligibility you have to put animals within that community pasture. But let's look at the situation of that particular young farmer. Where does he go? Where does he go if he is completely cut out of putting cattle in that community pasture because of distance? There isn't any community pasture anywhere close to him for him to transfer to and even if there was the other patrons that were in there — and the waiting list is so long, they would have priority over that particular applicant. I received many letters as I am sure you have in regard to this particular policy. I would like the Minister to hopefully explain to us today the reasoning why the drastic change in policy exists and why does he feel it is necessary in many instances to discriminate if you might say against young people between the ages of 18 and 30 who will be affected by these community pastures.

I can see someone who is established that is maybe 50 or 55 or 60 years old being phased out of the community pasture picture. But for heaven's sake let's not phase out our young farmers, because they are going to be put in an extremely difficult position. They have had a tough time in regard to livestock in this province over the last couple of years. When 1978 rolls around they are going to have a further reduction in their cattle, they don't have the land base at home in order to look after those cattle, so the only result, if they are cut back by eight head is they are going to sell them. Many are cut back with that eight head or 10 head. This means that their total herd is no longer economical for them to spend the time looking after them and they will dispose of the entire herd and instead try to find a job in the winter time working in the city or some other area. The policy could have the effect of taking some of these younger people right out of the livestock business and putting them into a further demand on the job sector within this province.

MR. KAEDING: Mr. Chairman, there are only so many head of cattle that we can graze in the community pastures. There is just a limited amount of land there and you can only have so many cattle and what we are attempting to do with this policy is to provide for younger farmers the opportunity to get into community pastures. There is a formula here which would attempt to sort out some of those people whose need is not as great over a period of time. I think that most people going into a community pasture should recognize that at some point in time they should be providing some of their own. What the community pasture program might do is to try to provide pasture for some of these young farmers until they are able to get themselves into that position. I don't think we should assume that a community pasture once you have an allotment to it, that you should have a lifetime allotment there. I think it should be considered to be a stop-gap between the time when you are starting up and when you can develop your own. I know that some cases may require at a certain point in time, if you don't have your own set-up for

for forage or pasture, that you may have to cut back according to this policy.

The proximity factor which is in here gives you maximum points up to 30 miles, to within 30 miles of a pasture. So the proximity doesn't start to taper off until you are beyond that distance. Generally speaking, I think you will agree, that most people close to a pasture seem to feel that they should have a little bit of priority because they are close to the pasture. I know that it is difficult for those that are farther away, but we can't provide pasture for everybody.

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Minister, I agree with that policy for new applicants for community pastures. I think it is the only fair and just one. But what about those who presently do have animals within that community pasture? I am thinking now of one of my constituents for example who lives at Neidpath, Saskatchewan. His closest community pasture I imagine would be the PFRA pasture located at Webb, and yet he has been allocated for the last two years, 20 head of cattle in the Grainland Community Pasture which is way up in Central Butte. That is a considerable distance away. It is about 80 to 90 miles away from this particular farmer. The only other closest one would be the one at the Matador, which is across the river. He has no opportunity whatsoever of ever having any hope of qualifying to put those 20 head of cattle in the Matador or to put those 20 head of cattle in the Webb pasture. He has been taking 20 head of cattle up to the Grainland Community Pasture, each and every year I understand, for the last two years. This young lad is 19 years old. The letter he received on March 9, said:

You have been allocated a quota of 20 head of adult cattle plus sucking calves in the above pasture for 1977.

The same as he had last year and the year before. At the bottom of the letter it says:

The new allocation policy requires that allocations be reduced to that allowed by score. Based on your present score your 1978 allocation will be 14 adult head. A further reduction may be required as outlined in the allocation policy.

So what this young fellow says when he receives this letter is, look I have got 20 head of cattle there this year, next year I am going to be cut down by six. I am going to be cut down by 30 per cent of my basic herd. For me to concentrate on 14 head of cattle, I am better off to sell them. I am better off to sell them and try and get a job in the city of Swift Current in 1978. Where does this put this fellow? I say what happens to those other six that he had? Who is going to get those six cattle that he had this year, that he won't have next year? And what further reductions will there be?

Here is a young chap who is just starting out. This is going to be an extreme hardship for him. Where is he going to go? He can't get into the Webb pasture. He can't get into the Matador. He managed to get into the Grainland Pasture a couple of years ago and now he is going to be cut back to the point where it is not going to be an economic unit. What does he do? The only alternative is to sell. Maybe we should be directing policies to encourage this young guy to stay in there,

to keep that 20 head in that community pasture, maybe apply in Webb. Maybe the Government should be using its funds and its efforts to develop a community pasture close to Hodgeville or close to Neidpath to allow that young guy to take his cattle out of Grainland Pasture two years down the road and put that same 20 head in a new community pasture located closer to his home, but don't cut them out of that until you develop something new. Don't cut your budget back for community pastures until you have set up the mechanics to look after individuals such as this. It is going to be an extreme hardship and I certainly hope that you will take another look at this particular policy because this young fellow no doubt by 1978, unless things change will be forced out of the cattle business.

MR. KAEDING: Mr. Chairman, it is pretty hard to identify a specific case and take that one and show it as a typical case. I don't know, this fellow may have resources at home. His parents may have resources which he can draw on, which had been taken into consideration in the scoring. Simply to pick out one case would be pretty difficult for us to assess. I do think you will agree though that what we are attempting to do here is correct. We are attempting to get the pasture into the hands of those people who need it the worst, whose potential is the greatest. Again, he may have resources which you haven't mentioned that you may not know about, but our people, probably in their allocation process discovered that he had other resources which he would use.

MR. WIEBE: He doesn't have resources. I went out and interviewed him on it. I have another one here that says:

You have been allocated 25 head. Next year you will be cut down to 17.

It's a similar situation. I can provide you with a dozen if not more representations which I have received from people within my constituency who have been affected by the Matador as well as the Grainland Pasture. The point I am making, though, is what is happening to those six head. Who is going to be replacing; what individual is going to qualify for this six head? Are you going to be bringing in another farmer to put six head of cattle into that particular community pasture while you cut back on this young farmer over here? He doesn't have the resources. That is why I say if he had the resources it wouldn't be necessary for him to be considering now, the selling of his 14 head in 1978. If he had the resources he could say, okay, I will use them at home, but he doesn't have them. I think that the fact that these questions are being brought to me and to you indicates that there is a problem in this regard and that possibly your point system or the look that your department officials have had at this particular application and other applications, is possibly not the right system to be using.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 6 agreed.

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering whether it might be easier on your voice, and as I understand it is under strain, to just read the item number and not the figures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that I will read the item number plus the figure.

MR. BIRKBECK: I would just like to ask the Minister what benefits have been derived from this fund of money that has been allocated to statistics?

MR. KAEDING: What this department does, it undertakes surveys together with the Federal Department — Statistics Canada, and provides records of shipments of cattle and by the classes, the number of cattle, where they are shipped to and where they come from, and forecasts in agriculture as regards to production potential and so on. That is the purpose of that particular branch.

MR. BIRKBECK: Would I be right then in saying that basically the money allotted to statistics is primarily for you and your department to rather have a view of the direction that agriculture is going so that you may develop policies accordingly.

MR. KAEDING: Certainly, that is one of the purposes. These statistics are also available for any other farm organization that wants to have them. If they want to get statistics, they simply phone over to our Statistics Branch and they can get that information.

Item 7 agreed.

Items 8 to 13 agreed.

ITEM 14

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Chairman, just one brief question. Back in 1975/76 this Item was \$600,000. Last year it dropped to \$350,000. Now we are back up to \$550,000. Why the fluctuation? It is my understanding that this item is shareable with the Federal Government and I am just wondering what portion of this is federal money and why the fluctuation?

MR. KAEDING: Mr. Chairman, we could rather assume that there would be a tapering off of the request for farm sewer and water projects, I think, probably because of the fact that there was a little more money in the country than had been up to 1972/73, and a lot of farmers were again looking at improving their farmsteads. Some of them were taking up grants which had appeared to be tapering off and our budget this year reflects the higher level of activity. We would assume that over a very short period of time most farmers would have used their farm sewer and water grant and it should taper off, but it hasn't up to this point. We are budgeting a little higher amount.

MR. WIEBE: So in other words, you are not planning on any new and innovative programs in regard to farm sewer and water and making farmers that may have had a grant 10 years ago, and may be eligible for another grant this year, to help remodel and update some

of their sewer and water systems.

MR. KAEDING: No, we don't have any projects of that kind in mind, and I suspect that it will be rather difficult because then the people in the city would say, "you know our sewer system is 30 years old too. We want another grant too."

MR. LARTER: Just one question to the Minister. Why is it that small towns or towns still have to go through this Family Farm Improvement Branch for water facilities? Aren't there two or three sources for them? Now why are they still associated with this one?

MR. KAEDING: Well, they don't have to go through the Family Farm Improvement Branch, but it is much cheaper for them to do so, and that is why they do it.

MR. LARTER: Well, why don't they just have it then, Mr. Minister, where they just go through this branch then, instead of some of the other channels?

MR. KAEDING: Well the . . . says that any town under 250 population can come under the Family Farm Improvement Branch. That is simply because that is about the maximum size that we can handle through the plastic systems and that is the kind of system that we operate under. If you want to go to a more expensive system then we don't handle that through the Family Farm Improvement Branch, but you have to do it through the normal procedure.

Item 14 agreed.

ITEM 15

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Chairman, I have two questions on this. First of all, last year the amount was the same — \$195,000. It is my understanding that these grants are for new livestock operations only. My first question would be — how much of the \$195,000, if any was used last year? And my second question is — don't you feel that it might be to the advantage of public relations in terms of agriculture and intensified livestock operations in the province, that possibly the criteria for this particular grant be changed to allow individuals who presently do have livestock operations and who may be causing a bit of a pollution or smell problem to neighbors or towns where they are located, to be able to qualify for a grant under this program as well to remodel and update their pollution-handling facilities for that particular, or the manure-handling facilities for that particular operation?

MR. KAEDING: Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of this grant is for relocation of intensive units, not new ones, but existing ones which have been creating problems in and around urban areas and where there is a concentration of people. So the grants are not for individual new operations. A new operation now must get a permit from the Branch before they can set up an intensive livestock operation and there is no grant for that. You simply have to meet certain criteria before you can set up an intensive livestock operation. The grants are for relocation of existing

units if they are creating problems.

MR. WIEBE: My second question is – how much of the \$195,000 was used last year, and isn't there some program by the Department of Agriculture — it is my understanding that there is one – that besides the permit, that you also qualified for some small grant if you followed the guidelines of the department in the proper controls that were necessary for pollution?

MR. KAEDING: No, there is no grant in that particular case where a person is setting up a new unit. We spent only \$18,700 out of that last year, because we were in a state of flux. Our policy was not working well and we were trying to re-adjust the policy. We now have a policy which is in operation and which will be used this year.

MR. BERNTSON: How much did you spend last year?

MR. KAEDING: \$18,700.

MR. BERNTSON: And that was with no policy. We have been without a policy for a year and a couple of months.

MR. KAEDING: It was carried on.

Item 15 agreed.

ANNOUNCEMENT

BY-ELECTION IN PELLY

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could interrupt and make a brief statement. I am asking the indulgence of the House to make a statement that I will be making outside the House and I thought that Members would want to know first. The Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan today has been asked to sign an Order in Council which will lead to the calling of a by-election in the constituency of Pelly on Wednesday, June 8th.

The Order in Council directs the province's Chief Electoral Officer to issue a Writ of Election for the constituency of Pelly as required under Section 4 of The Elections Act. The seat of Pelly was held by the late Leonard Larson for the New Democratic Party. He was a popular, effective Member of this Chamber, and I am confident that the people of Pelly will want Mr. Larson's friend Mr. Norm Lusney to carry on Leonard's good work to the end of this full term.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: I will have much more to say outside the House, but I thought that this announcement should be made in the House.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to welcome the news of the Premier and I hope that as soon as you 39 Members are prorogued that you get up to Pelly and fight for your lives because you are in for the fight of your life.

MR. J. G. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) On behalf of the Conservative caucus, we certainly welcome the announcement of the Premier today. We look forward to, again re-asserting our new-found capabilities of winning by-elections. We do note the previous commitment of the Premier not to call a by-election, I believe, when farmers were seeding. However, I am sure that that particular commitment will be forgotten in the heat of battle. We welcome the opportunity to join battle again with the Government Members opposite, and we certainly welcome the Premier's announcement and look forward to it.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (cont'd)

ITEM 16

MR. BIRKBECK: Mr. Minister, it would be my understanding that this is just to co-operative seed cleaning plant.

MR. KAEDING: That's right.

MR. BIRKBECK: Just one other question, Mr. Minister, in this case what is the criteria — in other words, are a number of farmers that are in a close proximity of a present seed cleaning plant which is a privately-owned one, may they form a co-operative organization with a half-dozen in number and be qualified for a grant under this program?

MR. KAEDING: No, I don't think so. I think the policy is here, and you can get a copy of the policy is you wish, and the policy requires a certain number of people and a certain acreage and so on.

Item 16 agreed.

Items 17 to 25 agreed.

ITEM 26

MR. BIRKBECK: How many people are employed at the Institute?

MR. KAEDING: Pardon me?

MR. BIRKBECK: How many people are employed at the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Testing Institute at Humboldt?

MR. KAEDING: Forty-nine people.

MR. BIRKBECK: And what is their average salary?

MR. KAEDING: The range is between \$13,000 and \$18,000.

MR. BIRKBECK: Mr. Minister how many of those employees are female?

MR. KAEDING: We don't know we have just the names here — we don't

know what their sex is.

MR. BIRKBECK: Mr. Chairman, just one more question in that area. Are these people local people that are employed here? Are they all local residents that are employed at that Institute and if not, what numbers are not?

MR. KAEDING: Well, most of these people work at Humboldt in the Humboldt Plant and I assume most of them live in Humboldt.

MR. BIRKBECK: But that is just an assumption. Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a question and he should be able to provide the answer for it. We haven't really put that much pressure on his staff to answer any detailed questions today, and I just really would like to know how many of those 49 people were formerly residents of that Humboldt area, and if they were not all, what number were from other parts of the province that came in to be employed at that Institute?

MR. KAEDING: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I wouldn't have that kind of information, but you can be reasonably sure that many of them have come in to that area because a lot of these are technical people, engineers and so on, and you don't have those sitting around Humboldt waiting for a job. I would expect that a fair number of the local people, the secretarial kinds of people, would probably be hired locally, but the engineering staff certainly would not have been from Humboldt.

MR. BIRKBECK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister then, as he doesn't have that information right at his disposal, if he would mind getting that information forwarded to me.

MR. KAEDING: Well, we will try to get it. I don't know whether we can isolate it in the kind of form that you want; we can try.

MR. LARTER: Just one question on the Agriculture Machinery Institute. Is the Institute getting full co-operation from the farm machinery companies and are you working full-tilt now? Are you testing just about everything that is asked to be tested?

MR. KAEDING: Yes, the Humboldt plant is in full operation. We just opened up the Portage la Prairie plant last week and it will be prepared and ready to go into full-scale operation, I think, very shortly and there are a lot of projects already under way.

As far as co-operation is concerned, I can say that at both of the openings we had people there from the industry and they expressed a great deal of satisfaction in the fact that we had opened up such a plant and they felt that they could work very well with the plant.

Item 26 agreed.

Items 27 to 34 agreed.

ITEM 35

MR. BERNTSON: Where is this training farm?

MR. KAEDING: It's the Le Brett training farm.

MR. BERNTSON: How many native people have we trained there? I know there are 43 there at any given time. But how many have come out of the farm fully trained?

MR. KAEDING: There is a turnover of people moving in and out. Basically the farm is not acting now as a training centre in the true sense of the word. The people who are there continue to stay there until they move away and another couple will move in.

MR. BERNTSON: Is there any follow-up as to the number of people turned over in the training process as to how many are actively engaged in farming elsewhere now?

MR. KAEDING: There are not very many and we have to say that we haven't been happy with the way the people have been carrying on after they have left the training farm. They certainly haven't shown themselves to have been very good farmers or being attracted to the farming industry.

MR. BIRKBECK: Mr. Chairman, I guess I have to ask this question under this Item, regarding the grants to milk producers, the construction or improvement of facilities for the production of manufacturing milk. I see that you have no funds allocated in that '77-78 year. Could you tell me why?

MR. KAEDING: We simply feel that the FarmStart program has taken over that activity and that any grants that they want they can receive through the FarmStart program.

Item 35 agreed.

Vote 1 agreed.

Capital Expenditure on Agriculture — Vote 2

Items 1 to 7 agreed.

MR. BIRKBECK: Mr. Chairman, before concluding I should like to thank the Minister of Agriculture and his staff for answering the great variety of questions that we have had today. We just hope that the Minister can, in the next year or two, through his Government work more efficiently and bring more funds into this department and advance agriculture to meet the needs of the world today.

Vote 2 agreed.

LOANS, ADVANCES, INVESTMENTS — VOTE 42

Items 1 to 2 agreed.

Vote 42 agreed.

FARMSTART — VOTE 43

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 43 agreed.

SASKATCHEWAN LAND BANK COMMISSION — VOTE 50

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 50 agreed.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

Item 1 agreed.

Supplementary Estimates agreed.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE — VOTE 19

HON. N. VICKAR: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to introduce my staff this afternoon. To my right is Mr. Jim Hutch, the Deputy Minister; to my left front is Derek Ireland the Executive Director of Planning. To my right front is Herb Scot, Director of Finance and Administration. Behind me I have Ron Hamson, Charlie Webster, Peter Carl, Harvey Switzer, Lyle Peterson, Ken Rockel, Managers and Associate Deputy Minister in their respective right.

ITEM 1

MR. R. E. NELSON: (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) Mr. Chairman, I would like to welcome the representatives from Industry and Commerce. I should like to make a few brief remarks. The Government should be trying to create a climate and an atmosphere that would encourage domestic and foreign investment in our province. The NDP Government's attitude on foreign investment as well as resource policy of this Government has hurt development not only in Saskatchewan but certainly in all of Canada. We should be supporting a responsible private enterprise system. We should be doing all in our power to encourage individual initiative.

The Government of Saskatchewan should be endeavoring to obtain Canadian investment in our industries and our resources first. However, if Canadian capital is not available the Government should welcome outside investment. This Government, while frowning on outside investment has rushed to New York, to London and anywhere to borrow millions of dollars to buy potash mines in our province. The citizens of our province have watched with disbelief seeing this Government dip into the Energy Fund to spend millions of dollars buying potash mines, yet with the spending of all this money have not created any new jobs.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, a government with any vision whatsoever would be encouraging new industry into our province and creating jobs for our citizens. While the Minister has put out

press releases to the media expounding the new revamping of his department, we have seen very few changes.

For over a year the department had full knowledge of the problems for the markets for sodium sulphate, and the possible closing of the Bishopric plant. These 20 odd jobs are here now. They don't cost anyone any capital to create. Why hasn't the Department of Industry and Commerce done more market research to assist in looking after present industries in this province? If you go over the list and see what the problems have been in the many industries that have gotten into financial difficulties in our province, in most cases certainly there were no markets for the product that was being produced. Common sense planning must be utilized much more than the department has been doing in the past.

There was a run of alfalfa mills not long ago without stop ping to check the markets. Over production put the entire industry in jeopardy. The same thing happened in the North with the sawmills. There is presently far more capacity in sawmills than we have product to harvest. In creating these sawmills in forest products the Government cut the rug out from under the private enterprises in the area. Proper planning too often has escaped the Minister in that department. Too much attention seems to be focused on getting press out on official openings, rather than the development of sound business.

A good example of this is certainly in the Aiaz Jewellery Limited that was closed two months before the annual report was even printed. And yet we find the department boasting about the creating of 20 jobs in that venture in the booklet.

In my closing remarks I would ask the Minister to apologize to this Assembly for the contempt he has shown for the Legislature last week. He refused to answer a direct question on more than one occasion. Then he stepped out in the corridors and stood in front of a TV camera and gave information that he refused to give in this Assembly.

MR. D. HAM: (Swift Current) Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make. I should like to begin by extending my welcome to the Minister's assistants.

Mr. Minister I am not being facetious when I am extremely happy to see that you were appointed to the position that you are in. I believe with some prejudice that your background will be an asset to your department. However, it is unfortunate that you are somewhat ham-strung in many ways by the climate that is created by your party's philosophy. Any reasonable investor nearly requires bribing to invest in Saskatchewan today. Even then the fear of expropriation hangs over their business places.

Those that moan and groan may be interested to know that some months ago before the defeat of the NDP Government in British Columbia there was talk of some NDP Members of expropriating Dairy Queens in British Columbia, of all things. Little wonder that capital investment looks elsewhere in Saskatchewan or outside of Saskatchewan.

There are two areas of concern, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to comment on. I might qualify by saying that I have been some what indirectly involved with respect to industry and market development. From comments of those who have been involved with

your officials these have been extremely complimentary; they have been extremely helpful.

But I have for sometime questioned the Business Service and Business Assistance Branch. I don't know of any businessman; maybe you know of some. I see you have listed 600 that have had advice or so-called expertise from the department to assist them. Perhaps the Minister in a few moments could tell me how many of these 600 are still presently in business or how many have gone bankrupt.

My second area of concern, Mr. Chairman, is the controversial SEDCO. Any amendment to Bill 54 gave the Minister total power to act for any other purpose considered advisable by the Minister to assist business enterprise. This ignores the Government's programs, and problems and failures in assisting small business in the past five years. SEDCO, upon inspection, has had more connection with interference than assistance. SEDCO, as a whole, has proved to be anything but a profitable corporation, with a total deficit of \$322,000 odd in its first year of operation. Over-done publicity and insufficient investment make SEDCO a venture that the Government has admitted will not be solvent for at least five years.

In 1975, SEDCO received only 7.2 per cent return on its investment of \$22.2 million in various companies in the province. Out of the \$22 million, the profit on the investment was only \$1.7 million.

The previous Minister said SEDCO wrote off a little over \$400,000 from the total of eight companies in 1975. However, in 1975 eight other companies went into bankruptcy or receivership. There are well-known SEDCO-sponsored failures like the bankrupt Meadow Lake Industries Ltd., Sportsmen's Campers and Trailers Manufacturing.

In Crown Corporations studies of SEDCO . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, I wonder if you could confine your remarks to the Estimates that are under review here — Industry and Commerce. SEDCO is a separate vote on page 96. There is a separate vote on that and we are not dealing with that at this time. I wonder if you could just do with Industry and Commerce.

MR. HAM: If you want me to conclude I can wrap it up now and we will pass through that Vote after.

MR. MERCHANT: I certainly hope to have the opportunity and don't think it inappropriate to say a few things about SEDCO. I think that people clearly know that Industry and Commerce and SEDCO . . .

MR. ROMANOW: I said I'd give you some flexibility on that Vote.

MR. MERCHANT: . . . work together, and I was just going to suggest that I think the House Leader is correct, that if the rule is imposed that one is to be departmentalized from the other, the result would be we would be moving very slow, very slow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, it seems that every body is agreed that we talk about SEDCO under this item. If nobody objects,- I guess we may as well do that.

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, just on this point if I can. I think that what I am agreeing to as one Member of the House is that we don't review SEDCO all over again, because we have done it in Crown Corporations Committee. But, what I am agreeing to is that there is an element of perhaps Industry-SEDCO discussion, the calibre, the atmosphere, the whole thing, but if the Minister is going to be asked about annual reports and have to explain them — I don't think he's got any SEDCO people here, in case you are going to ask him on detailed operations. But I think to make political speeches about SEDCO and that kind of stuff we are used to the Opposition making — let them go. I mean, everybody's heard it already.

MR. HAM: In the Crown Corporations study of SEDCO's 1975 report, the previous Minister read a list of companies which had been expanded in Saskatchewan, thus bringing new jobs. However, he wouldn't say which of these companies had prospered as a result of SEDCO's so-called assistance. He, at the time, refused to give the names of two companies of which SEDCO lost \$600,000 in 1975, and said that releasing their names might jeopardize further relations between the two companies and SEDCO.

Financial loss seems to balance, even out-weigh, financial gain. Yet the Government is free to continue making shaky investments with taxpayers money through SEDCO and then replying to the Opposition's probing that any pertinent or revealing information is not in the public interest. The Government has repeatedly over a lengthy period of time fielded Opposition queries by refusing to supply information regarding SEDCO's dealings with private companies. It is obvious that the Government is shielding itself under the guise of protecting the best interests of SEDCO assisted businesses. Bad investments and many have proved to be, or good and these have been few, the Minister in charge of SEDCO makes the move on what is to be assisted and how. The people of Saskatchewan with what information the Opposition has been able to provide to them are aware of the results in the operations of SEDCO.

MR. VICKAR: To answer the first question first, we are not aware of any situation where a business has failed as a result of the counselling of our small business administration branch.

With a further answer to some of the questions on SEDCO, first I'd like to emphasize that while SEDCO and Industry and Commerce are both under one Minister, they both have very different responsibilities and the two agencies do work very closely together in specific projects in formulating their long term plans and strategies. We do not have all the answers at this time on SEDCO that you may be referring to.

MR. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) Mr. Chairman, I have a very, very lengthy list of the debentures filed by SEDCO under The Corporations Securities Registration Act. Would the Minister be prepared to forward to me a list of all of the companies that are set out on The Corporations Securities Registration, indicating the companies'

offices, that SEDCO has the security registered and list for me those companies that have obtained, that are on that list, that have obtained counselling from the Department of Industry and Commerce?

MR. VICKAR: I don't think there will be any problem with that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LANE: I would be quite prepared to give you my list and save you, at the company's office, having to go through and pull that back. They've done it once already and I would be quite prepared to supply you with a photocopy of the list if you'll give me the undertaking that you'll go through the list and advise me which ones obtained counselling and which have not.

MR. VICKAR: Thank you very much. That might expedite the thing for the boys at SEDCO.

MR. MERCHANT: The new director and the new General Manager of SEDCO, is that the same Frederick J. Flynn who was operating Agriplast in Alberta?

MR. VICKAR: I don't think so. We have no information that he was.

MR. MERCHANT: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's amazing. You people really are amazing. I'll tell you the whole story, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure you'll be interested. You just light up a cigarette.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can tell me that privately.

MR. MERCHANT: Well I'd like to tell some other people too.

There is a Frederick J. Flynn. He's now the Managing Director of SEDCO. This company called Agriplast went to the Alberta Opportunities Company for financing, the Alberta Opportunities Company comparable to SEDCO in this province. They sent that company, Agriplast to the Agricultural Development Corporation in Camrose, Alberta. Indeed Agriplast operates in that area. The Agricultural Development Corporation encouraged and improperly perhaps, advanced quite a bit of money to Agriplast. Agriplast now owes the Agricultural Development Corporation \$309,000 and Agriplast is in receivership. Agriplast went to a large number of farmers in the area of Camrose and encouraged those farmers to grow a high uric acid rapeseed and as Members may know the high uric acid rapeseed is of advantage in the production of plastics, but is not particularly valuable for use in terms of consumption. Indeed the lower the uric acid content the better and the Government was considering getting some bonuses at one point for a low uric acid rapeseed. The farmers signed contracts which agreed to pay them far more money than they would ordinarily have received through the sale of rapeseed. Then Agriplast went under, leaving the farmers to some small extent holding the bag, because they've still got the rapeseed which they can sell, but they can't sell it for the inflated price and indeed they have difficulty unloading it for consumptive purposes, because it's really grown for making plastic.

So the farmers have suffered and the Agricultural Development Corporation is left holding the bag for \$309,000. It has some assets and may recover them. Now all of that came out in the Alberta Legislature, because of the work of one NDP Member. And you are not going to suggest to me that when you then hire the man who was managing Agriplast at the time that you are not aware of the fact that that's one and the same man.

This Frederick J. Flynn was also handling Halgard Venture Analysis. He's a director of Halgard Venture Analysis and he's also a director of H.V. Analysis. It's all one and the same person. The director of H.V. Analysis is a Fred J. Flynn. His address on the company documents, Province of Alberta, is 909 Bank of Montreal Building. The Frederick J. Flynn, who was the director of Agriplast, his address with the company's office in Alberta is 909 Bank of Montreal Building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a coincidence.

MR. MERCHANT: Yes, coincidence. I agree with the Chairman, it's a coincidence. When the same Fred J. Flynn signed on with Halgard Investments, which is the same as H.V. Analysis, it's just a different corporate vehicle of the same group of people.

Now the thing that I find so amazing is that the Premier, who was asked questions about this this afternoon, said, after I'd asked him whether this was one and the same person, read the run down on the man and said that he was the Halgard Investments man. He didn't bother to mention that that's one and the same person as Agriplast. Now the Minister who's had three and a half hours notice and clearly would have checked into the matter and knows now, I assume, that it's one and the same person, comes in and says we have no knowledge of that. We don't know whether it's one and the same matter or not.

The amazing thing is that the cover-up is worse than the fact, because everything that I can discover from talking to the development people, the Agricultural Development people in Alberta and talking to the Alberta Opportunities Company, would seem to indicate that Mr. Flynn came in, wasn't responsible for conning the Agricultural Development Corporation out of this money, could almost be described as someone brought in to fix the problem, wasn't really the cause of the problem. And that's the reason when I raised it in Question Period, I didn't raise it as saying, look, you've got on your hands this guy that ripped off the Agricultural Development Corporation for \$309,000. I don't suggest that. That would be an unfair way to put it and I don't put it in that perspective whatsoever.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, what you have is a guy, with whatever expertise he has, trying to solve the Agriplast problem, and then the Government by denying that that's one and the same person, inspires me and other Members of the Opposition and no doubt the press, to think they've got something to hide. There is something wrong there. Why are they hiding that? Now I say to the Minister, surely to God you are aware of the fact that it's one and the same person, after these three hours, although I say to the Minister, not with much respect, that in response from what I've seen with your responses to other questions that have been directed to you in this House, since you've become a Minister, I have every good reason to believe you may not know.

I say also to the Minister, that I find it a little hard to believe that you earned a million dollars in the car business and didn't learn a little something about business. I find it a little hard to believe that you were that successful as a Mayor of a community, did as well as you did, have the high respect that you have in your area, to do as well as you did to get elected and you haven't been able to get any grasp of what's going on in your department. You don't seem to have any control of what's going on over there. You were given a very significant department. You were given a significant department because you are supposed to be one of the people on that side of the House who has some affinity for dealing with business. You and two or three others are supposed to be able to feel your way around the business community, have some inkling of what an annual report looks like. Now maybe you've got something going for you that doesn't demonstrate itself to Members of the House and doesn't demonstrate itself to the press, but to us you look like you are just floating; you look like you haven't got any conception of what's going on with your department.

I don't know how long we would be expected to wait before starting to say those kinds of things, but I say to you, Mr. Minister, and say to Members of this Committee that over an incident like the hiring of a manager who may well turn out to be an excellent manager, good heavens, at least you can come before this Committee and be candid about it. I'm not suggesting that the Agriplast thing is so awful, but I do suggest that there's no prize for trying to hide it. It almost makes it look worse.

MR. NELSON: I was hoping to hear a response from the Minister, but as usual he's not giving too many answers. Now the Minister in Crown Corporations, when asked about the decision to take the \$15 million and the \$1.8 million into equity, pleaded ignorance. He said he didn't know how or why or when the decision was made. His only answer came at a later date and that was only the date of approval of the 20 per cent equity base which was made in February, 1977. Now the Minister either didn't know or again refused to tell the committee that the study had been taken on the situation. Now, I ask the Minister to explain his position at that time and I also ask him to table that report that was taken on SEDCO on which the equity decision was based.

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Chairman, the question that the last speaker asked with regard to the equity base on SEDCO, the answers were given to you very vividly during the Crown Corporations and I had told you at that time that the decision was made back in 1975, although it took that time to be enacted. I have no files or documents to table at this time and I would like to reply to the Member, if the specific Member would ask a question, then I might be able to answer it. I'm not here to reply to any statements, in particular the statements that are being made by the Member for Wascana.

With regard to the appointment of Mr. Flynn, I don't want to bring any characters into the discussion this afternoon and if there are any questions that you would like to ask, if we can, we'd be glad to answer them.

MR. NELSON: Is the Minister saying that

there was no report taken in regard to SEDCO? Is the Minister saying there was no report taken on which the equity decision was based?

MR. VICKAR: You have the financial statement of SEDCO and it was in the Financial statement.

MR. NELSON: There was no report in the financial statement of SEDCO and the Minister knows right well there wasn't. Are you aware or have you read any report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I think I allowed a fair latitude here in terms of bringing in SEDCO and that kind of thing but I think the questions that could be specifically asked in Crown Corporations Committee should likely be asked in relation to SEDCO. I don't want to limit the Member other than the rule.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, the date the decision was made in February 1977 and you know and the Minister knows we couldn't discuss that particular subject or item in Crown Corporations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Well, you'll have to ask it next year in Crown Corporations, then I guess. Is Item 1 agreed?

MR. NELSON: Are you saying the Minister will not and does not know of any report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not saying anything. I'm saying you're out of order. That's all.

MR. NELSON: On what basis?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, on the basis that you're asking specific questions about SEDCO that can be asked in the Crown Corporations Committee. We're dealing with Industry and Commerce Estimates here.

MR. NELSON: It can't be asked in Crown Corporations for over a year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm not going to get into an argument. I say that the Member is out of order here. Is Item 1 agreed?

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Chairman, you know I'd like to know how in heaven's name are we ever going to be able to ask questions on SEDCO.

MR. ROMANOW: He doesn't mean to challenge it?

MR. WIEBE: Yes, I mean the word challenge, that particular ruling. You know and let the House decide whether we are going to have an opportunity to discuss SEDCO within these Chambers or whether we are not and I think it is utterly important that

we as Members do have that opportunity to question the operations of SEDCO. Everyone is aware of the limitations of questioning SEDCO within Crown Corporations. We are getting the same answer each and every time when we ask a question in the House from 2:00 until 2:30, "Take it up in Crown Corporations", we go to Crown Corporations and we ask the same question they say, "Ask it in the House when you get into Estimates." When are we going to ask it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has been challenged and I can't make a ruling. We will have to call the Speaker into the House I guess to rule on the challenge to the Chair.

MR. ROMANOW: Well, before the Hon. Member continues perhaps I might just say one word and he might reconsider his remarks. I say to the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg as well, I recall specifically a very lengthy debate on this particular point during consideration of Department of Finance Estimates culminating in a motion during the Minister of Finance's Estimates that the report be tabled. I recall that very specifically and we went through all of this hassle in the Department of Finance because it was a question of the Treasury Board and I recall the guys were yelling that we were bailing out the Minister of Finance and all of that stuff came in Department of Finance Estimates. It was, as you recall, something to do with Treasury Board. I say, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Hon. Member for Morse will reconsider: this is not an Industry matter. If anything it is a Department of Finance matter. It was recognized so by your colleagues who took an hour or hour and a half debate on it. It is not our fault that the rules of the Crown Corporations Committee say that it is a one year drag on the operation. Maybe we should change the Crown Corporations Committee. That's another issue and yet we had ample opportunity in Estimates two weeks ago with Mr. Smishek to go around that route, over and over and over again. And I recall all of the detail on that because I was involved in it. We came back after supper. So I am saying Mr. Chairman that so we didn't table the documents and that's a decision of the Department of the Minister of Finance and the House.

MR. NELSON: He said he didn't know about them.

MR. ROMANOW: He didn't say he didn't know about them. He did not say he did not know about them. I don't know what his answer was in the matter. I don't think he had a chance to make an answer because the Chairman was making a ruling. But I do say to the Hon. Member for Morse and the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, if you are fair, you will recognize the fact that this thing has been aired, rightly or wrongly, during the Department of Finance. There is no way that there is even a modicum of a chance of having the ruling changed otherwise because it is clearly a SEDCO operation. Your best bet to have had it in order was when Department of Finance Estimates were up and you seized that and you debated it under the Minister of Finance's Estimates, which was proper, because it was a Treasury Board involvement, and it was decided not to come into a SEDCO issue at this stage of the game. It's totally wrong. So please Members, make any kind of speech you want on the thing. I don't care if we hear the whole thing over again but I am simply saying don't challenge the Chairman because he hasn't had a chance

to be here on this thing.

MR. MERCHANT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a couple of comments to you on the Point of Order and the evidence to what is challenging your position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I just ask if I have been challenged. Has the Chair been challenged?

MR. WIEBE: Not yet.

MR. MERCHANT: Mr. Chairman, what situation would we be left in if we took for instance the advice of the Hon. Attorney General. This is one of the nice times. Sometimes he gets up and shouts at us and sometimes he gets up and pleads with us. This is one of the nice times and on this nice time he says, well, what we have done is we have transferred \$15 million and \$1.8 million into equity from a loan situation. We've fixed the books in SEDCO a little. We just cleaned up the books in SEDCO because SEDCO is going to look pretty rotten and now SEDCO doesn't look quite as rotten and now rather than just being able to just see the problem we are able to talk about something confusing. Well, our equity has gone up and loan ratio has gone down. Our long-term funded data is reduced or whatever. The whole machinations are designed to make it more confusing for people to understand the process. So we then say to you, Mr. Chairman, we want to question the Minister about this, the Minister in charge of the very powerful Industry and Commerce Department, in charge of SEDCO. Is that the kind of practice we can expect? Is that the sort of thing that we are going to see in the future? Does it mean that whenever SEDCO gets into trouble you will just do an equity transfer? Those are the kinds of questions we would have been asking but we are told, Mr. Chairman, by your ruling that we can't ask those kinds of specific questions and we say that improperly limits our ability in dealing with this Minister to deal with his area which is SEDCO.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks you have now come closer than you were a moment or so ago and we challenge the ruling of the Chair.

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN: (Regina Rosemont) Mr. Speaker, I ruled in Committee of Finance that a specific discussion of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation should be dealt with in Crown Corporations Committee and not during Department of Industry and Commerce Estimates. My ruling was challenged.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

Ruling of Chair sustained on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 26

Blakeney
Pepper
Romanow
Snyder
Byers
Kramer

Matsalla
Robbins
MacMurchy
Mostoway
Whelan
Kaeding

Feschuk
Faris
Cowley
Tchorzewski
Vickar
Skoberg

Baker
Lange
Kowalchuk

Kwasnica
Dyck
MacAuley

Nelson (Yorkton)
Koskie

NAYS — 6

Stodalka
Wiebe

Merchant
MacDonald

Nelson (Assiniboia)
Gravelbourg)
Anderson

The Assembly recessed from 5:00 o'clock until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

MR. W. J.G. ALLEN: (Regina Rosemont) moved, seconded by Mr. M.J. Koskie (Quill Lakes) **That the Second Report of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers be now concurred in.**

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Indian Head-Wolseley) Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask on a Point of Order. I rose to speak on the original motion on Bill 51. Can we speak on it after this? What is the procedure?

MR. SPEAKER: You can speak on the Committee Report.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I only want to say a very few words. In the Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers Bill 51 has been adequately debated on both sides and both points of view. I do want to express in the Legislature for those Members who are not a part of the Law Amendments Committee my disappointment at the withdrawal of Bill 51.

First of all the withdrawal of Bill 51 does not adjust itself to the problem that has been pointed out to us by the Minister of Health, the medical profession. And as I indicated in the Committee there are two specific concerns or problems. Number one, the medical profession indicates that by the year 1980 many Saskatchewan graduates out of the Saskatchewan School of Medicine will be unable to find employment in the Province of Saskatchewan because of the influx of doctors from outside the country. Secondly, because of the fact that only Newfoundland and Saskatchewan do not require that the Canadian exam be taken by physicians from outside the country, that Saskatchewan will become a funnel for all alien doctors or doctors from outside of Canada who wish to locate in other parts of Canada. It is also interesting, Mr. Speaker, that I received a letter written on May 2, 1977 from Dr. Allen White Thompson, registered to Dr. Allen White Thompson, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Saskatoon. It is from the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States and it indicates now that all practitioners coming to the United States must pass a new set of examinations as of January 10th. In other words, every state across the United States, in the past it was only 45 states, now every state of the United States any doctor from outside and they refer to them as all alien physicians expecting to remain in this country, will be required to take and pass the exam called

the VQE. This means, Mr. Speaker, that there is an average implication to the withdrawal of this Bill. That means now that Saskatchewan and Newfoundland will be the only ports in North America where doctors from outside of Canada will be able to come to locate anywhere in North America. We will now see an increase, not a decrease of doctors coming in from outside of Canada and coming to the Province of Saskatchewan and remaining here for a short period of time and then locating in other parts of Canada. It could have very serious implications not only on the employment opportunities of the Saskatchewan students but also on the quality of medicine throughout the Dominion of Canada.

So I merely point this out and I would like to suggest to Members that this is a very disappointing day in the House. I would like to see all Members of the Legislature have the opportunity of addressing themselves to the problem and standing up and voting and expressing their approval or disapproval of Bill 51.

I also want to mention one other point. This Bill was introduced by a Cabinet Minister. It went through the Cabinet and the Government. It passed caucus. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it has the approval of the NDP Government and the NDP caucus. Then because of some outside pressure, political pressure . . .

MR. CAMERON: A little inside pressure too.

MR. MacDONALD: . . . and a little inside pressure, perhaps, from the odd MLA. I don't dispute any MLA expressing his opinion or his independent point of view. I think that's his right, but because of pressure the Government folded like a pancake, for one reason, that they are timid and they don't want any controversial issue in this Session and they are trying to get out of it as quickly as they can. They used the method of withdrawing the Bill as an escape, an escape from reality. They refused to address themselves to the problem and it certainly is a vote of non-confidence in the Minister of Health.

I want to say that I will vote against the motion of the chairman of the Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE — VOTE 19 (Cont'd)

MR. NELSON: (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) Mr. Chairman, I think it was made abundantly clear at 5:00 o'clock just what's going on as far as this particular Minister is concerned. He doesn't answer questions in this House. He makes statements outside the House after being given direct questions and refusing to answer. He takes questions under advisement when he should have answers at his finger tips. Crown Corporations was a tragedy. He didn't refuse to answer. He just didn't know any of the answers. The Attorney General has played goal for this Minister since he's been in his portfolio, and when he doesn't the Chairman of this Assembly has. The entire exercise in trying to question this Minister is an exercise in futility. The Minister is making a farce out of the democratic system and I think we are wasting our time even trying to get an

answer out of him.

MR. J. G. LANE: Would the Minister be prepared to supply me with the list of those companies that have received industry incentive loans?

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Chairman, we no longer make the industry incentive loans.

MR. LANE: Were there any loans for given in the last year of the operation of that program and if so, can I have that list of percentage of forgiveness.

MR. VICKAR: Yes, yes under that circumstance we can.

MR. LANE: Can you advise me of those companies that were referred to the Foreign Investment Review Agency in the last year, whether any were rejected or if any were opposed by the Government or the Government's position on each one of the ones that came before the Review Agents?

MR. VICKAR: My people tell me that they would give you that information on a confidential basis.

MR. LANE: Can you advise me of the status of the Porcupine Plains Alfalfa Dehydrated Company and also the Hewing Plant? I believe they are one and the same and advise me of the status?

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Chairman, from the information I've received it is that we as Industry and Commerce are not directly involved in the Porcupine Plains plant.

MR. LANE: Did your department give any advice to the Porcupine Plains? Any assistance?

MR. VICKAR: The department could have been involved in a minor way at the outset.

MR. LANE: Well, would you outline for me the minor way in which it was involved stating what the position of the department was?

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Chairman, I am told that the business representative in the area was involved if at all in that plant.

MR. LANE: Well, would you undertake to advise me to what activities the business representative and I would particularly like to know if the business representative recommended that grants or incentives be given to that particular . . . you know I don't think it's fair for the Minister to say that the department is not involved when in fact it may very well have been the catalyst

that started the ball rolling, in which case the department is involved and I think that's fair comment.

Would you advise me on the Agent Generals office in London? What were the circumstances on Mr. Beaudin's resignation or retirement or whether any lump sum payments were made to Mr. Beaudin on his termination?

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Beaudin was on a three year contract and he was at retirement age and he just retired. He wasn't let out or anything. He is still working with the department.

MR. LANE: Well, what's his position with the department now and if he was at retirement age, why hasn't he retired?

MR. VICKAR: Our department just took him on as a specialist in his particular area on a temporary basis.

MR. LANE: What is that?

MR. VICKAR: Special Assistant to the Deputy Minister.

MR. LANE: Was there any decrease in salary for Mr. Beaudin when he took this new position?

MR. VICKAR: Yes, there was Mr. Chairman.

MR. LANE: An increase in salary?

MR. VICKAR: Decrease.

MR. LANE: Decrease, how much?

MR. VICKAR: Approximately \$1,000 per year.

MR. LANE: Did the department receive any management memos or audit memos with regard to the Agent Generals office from either the Provincial Controller or the Provincial Auditor?

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Chairman, No we did not.

MR. LANE: Have you received applications for that particular official agent, but secondly I believe there are assistants in that and I forget what they are, trade assistants or whatever. Are those positions all filled and if so name the individuals?

MR. VICKAR: One of the people returned to the Federal Government Services and the other one came back to Regina and is working in the Industry and Market Development Program.

MR. LANE: Those positions

MR. VICKAR: Those positions have been deleted over in London.

MR. LANE: Well, can you advise why there was a bit of a to do as the department announced the major new drive in the expansion of the Agent General's office with the appointment of Mr. Beaudin. It seems to have been a temporary abhorration and the department is now backing off its European activities.

MR. VICKAR: If I may read a statement that I have here on that. You may remember that the London office was expanded in 1973 on the experimental basis for three years, and after the three years were up we reviewed the results and concluded that some of its duties especially related to Trade and Industrial Development, were better performed out of Regina. As well, fuller use would be made of the Federal Governments Trade offices in Europe. This was made possible by the closer working relationship that Industry and Commerce developed with the relevant federal departments. Still the London office will continue to be a strong agency working on behalf of the department and the people of Saskatchewan.

MR. LANE: The Government went out and made a major purchase of a new property office premises and Agent Generals residence two years ago. Yes Government Services did, or were they just leased on long term leases. Why now would you embark on the long term leases if you are just going to have a short term program?

MR. VICKAR: We leased the office, the office was leased on a seven year basis. We bought the residence. We still have a staff over there and we intend to have an Agent General there.

MR. LANE: I think it is a second example that the Government went off half cocked about two or three years ago when it decided that it was going to expand around the world. We had the announcements of a big office going into Japan and Mr. King was designated to take over that office, and in fact, we have seen a pretty severe entrenchment by the Government by its overseas operations and really a failure in the pacific rim to even get started. We adapt to the Saskatchewan Trading Corporation which is really proved to be you know a bomb if there ever was one, and a bust. You know surely the Minister has got an answer for the total failure of the Government to promote Saskatchewan products overseas and in fact is seemingly abandoning his position that there should even be any work done overseas.

MR. VICKAR: We are not abandoning our policies and use of the overseas office. We feel that we can make better use of the people from Regina by utilizing the federal programs in conjunction with ours and we will continue to move forward with them in an office.

MR. LANE: Well, you know I can't believe that the Government would embark on potash nationalization just to give Mr. King a job after everything else had fallen down around his ears. However, my next question, has the department been involved in any way, minor or otherwise, with the establishment of the Heninger and Maulden plant in the Biggar area, and if so what was the involvement?

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Chairman, our department provided information particularly with respect to Government programs when the thing was getting going.

MR. LANE: Did the principals of the Heninger company approach then the department that you supplied the information or how did the request for information come or did you seek out Heninger?

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Chairman, my people tell me that the project was started prior to 1973 and they don't have any information. However, they will try and get you some of that information if that's possible within the department.

MR. LANE: Okay, when was the project started then prior to 1973?

MR. VICKAR: It was in 1973.

MR. LANE: That's when the department got involved or that's when the project started.

MR. VICKAR: To our knowledge that's the first record we have in the department that there was anything doing there.

MR. LANE: You didn't answer my earlier questions. Was the approach to the principals, Heninger made by the department or did they approach you first.

MR. VICKAR: Yes, I am sorry that is the information we are going to have to get to you because these people were not sure at that time.

MR. LANE: Okay, would you give me the date of the approach whether which way or whatever way it came. I would like to know and I am not satisfied with the answer, you know, supply them information as to Government programs. I would submit that the department you know went further than that and gave some active encouragement as to programs or assisted on programs or assisted on applications, made contracts on programs. I assume it would do that in a matter of course. I would like to know then which programs the department recommended and which ones it gave assistance on to comply with the regulations in the Act, and when each of these applications were made.

MR. VICKAR: Yes, my officials tell me that we provided no financial assistance but the advice could have been down the road and we will get you that information.

MR. LANE: Was the department involved in any way in Westank Industries?

MR. VICKAR: Mr. Chairman, not since 1971

has our department been directly involved with Westank. Prior to 1971 however, the department was involved, I am told. We were involved and still are to a very minor degree at intervals only from conversation back and forth with people at Westank.

MR. LANE: I referred you and perhaps to save — because your department can't have the information — the list that I referred to earlier that I obtained from the company's office on the Corporations Security Registration Registrar. Would you go through the list. The amounts are set out and I am prepared to accept the figures off the list. When your department is getting the information that I had requested earlier would it also advise on whether it is given information or advice or been involved in and the extent of the involvement on the advice or whatever or capital grants or grants of any kind, of say everyone over \$200,000 which will eliminate I would think the majority of them but probably about a third would be over \$200,000.

MR. VICKAR: My department will provide that for you.

MR. LANE: I could go through and I could ask you these questions until you got the information. If you are prepared to supply it to me that is satisfactory. I will get this photo copied now and submit it to you.

MR. WIPF: Mr. Chairman, does your department have anything to do with the green houses that were built north of Prince Albert? I believe it was at the experimental farm, not the Parr Industries, but the other green house facilities that were built.

MR. VICKAR: No, we are not involved in the other ones.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 9 agreed.

Vote 19 agreed.

THE SASKATCHEWAN RESEARCH COUNCIL — VOTE 35

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 35 agreed.

SASKATCHEWAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION — VOTE 48

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 48 agreed.

DEPARTMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL — VOTE 3

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) Before we start I should like to introduce my staff. To my right the acting Deputy Attorney General, Hugh Ketcheson; behind him our Director of Administration, Harvey Murchison; directly behind me is the Director of Criminal Justice, Mr. Del Paris. At the back assisting us from Mr. Murchison's staff in Administration Mr. Bachelu and from time to time we may have some other officials come in as the questions or the vote may require.

MR. H. LANE: (Saskatoon Sutherland) Mr. Chairman, a question to the Attorney General. On November 15, 1976 a Mr. Huggett, Director of Court Services issued a memo, I think you are familiar with the memo. It was to all offices of the sheriff, the local registrar, court reporters etc., in which memo — if you have a copy of it and I am sure you do — it contains what really must be seen only in one way and that is an indictment of the way your department was running.

Shortly after that I take it that you had disagreed with what was said because I have before me a Leader-Post article dated December 2, 1976, in which you say that the situation is not serious, you are quoted by the press as saying the situation was not serious and there really were no problems. I would ask the Attorney General then if he thinks that the memo by Mr. Huggett overstates the problems that were prevalent in the department at that time.

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, we dealt with this quite some time ago and of course we can deal with it again. I am trying to get a document in my possession which I may not be able to do from Huggett. That memorandum which was circulated was erroneous in two or three key areas. The document was worded from the point of view of trying to state as dramatically as he could state the need to be careful with respect to budget and control of budget. But in fact, he was erroneous as to what the actual expenditure areas were. I don't have a copy of the memorandum here in front of me. I thought we would have it but we don't have it, the memorandum from Huggett when this matter came to the attention of the House, which explained the situation in some detail. All I can say is what I said at that time in very general terms, in the absence of locating this memorandum that the situation was overstated.

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, I have several questions in that regard if I might. You are quoted by the Leader-Post in the December 2, 1976 article as saying:

I just don't believe one bit of what the Member says (Mr. J.G. Lane) about the quality of court services in Saskatchewan. I think it is at an all time high and I am prepared to back my record, etc, . . .

Now, in terms of what you just said, I take it that you do believe that Huggett overstated the situation, I don't know whether Huggett is still with your department or not, and that the situation was not as serious as he purported to let on that it was. Yet, sometime early in this January or February you got a special warrant for somewhere in the neighborhood of a million dollars. Now, I believe it was a special warrant for about \$900,000, early in this year, perhaps you could tell us whether you did take a special warrant at the beginning of this year in January or February.

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, again I am not sure that I fully understand the point of the questioning because if the Member is saying on the one hand that the Huggett memorandum shows that due to a lack of funds there was a serious situation with respect to court services and then on the other hand says that there was

\$900,000 for a special warrant presumably to make up what was needed in order to do the job, it seems to me it is contradictory. The answer is that there was a special warrant I think in the amount of \$650,000 used partly for court services, \$170,000 for court services, \$100,600 for Land Titles and \$251,900 for Magistrates' Courts. All that I am saying is that those are the three totals for the supplementaries and of the amount that was related to the problem named in the Huggett memorandum, \$170,000 which was subsequently covered as the end of the year showed on a requirement for additional funds in order to meet overtime and other requirements. My point is and has been throughout the piece, and by the way Mr. Huggett is with me still, he is the Director of Court Services, I think he is an excellent man. I believe the memorandum was designed to do what it did, namely to state the case as dramatically as it could.

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, if I might refer to the article again, I think the Hon. Attorney General missed the point that I was getting at namely that there was some criticism as I interpret the memo of planning in your department and in particular you are quoted as saying that court services are at an all time high. I haven't been here that long and I don't understand what the special warrant business is about, but I take it that special warrants are to cover unforeseen situations and situations that arose which were not predictable. If the situation in court services was at an all time high, then surely you are contradicting yourself by asking for special warrants for more money. What I am getting at is, where do you perceive the problems in your department are in terms of the fact that your department was under budgeted and have you managed to correct the situation so that the same kind of situation doesn't develop in the future?

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member will know, although, as he says this is his first year of experience in Estimates, that there are what they call supplementary Estimates. We deal with them for almost every department. I would simply invite you to take a look at your supplementaries and you will see that there is almost every department listed. In the list I have here is Agriculture, Attorney General, the three segments that I have mentioned, Consumer Affairs, you can go down the line. What happens is that the budget is struck as it is struck here, we are debating today by the Blue book. It is a budget that we try and live within. During the course of the year there may be insufficient funds in order to accomplish the objectives, an example being in the Land Titles area. We have no way of judging with precision how much land title work will be required; there may be the necessity for overtime, things of that nature. In the court services area, coming back to the Huggett memorandum, at year's end it may also so prove that you need to expend more money in order to cover the functions. All the supplementary does, and I think I have had supplementaries every year since I have been Attorney General for six years, supplementaries cover those funds which are needed as it turns out at the end of the year which are short to do the job. There is nothing inconsistent with that. My position still remains that in terms of dollars and in terms of positions the amount of money which is spent on court services. If that is a yardstick and I don't think it's the only yardstick, it's probably an all time high. Some will say to me, is it good enough. I would

like to see more money, more staff and more emphasis on court services. The point that I am making is that there is nothing inconsistent with saying (a) court services are at an all time high, using that yardstick, which is true, and (b) the supplementaries are necessary to meet all wages in order to do the job.

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, the point that I was getting at is I am not sure what exactly is the yardstick the Attorney General is using when he says that his department has during the past year been at an all time high. I am forced of course, Mr. Attorney General to judge it. Other people who are involved with the judicial system are forced to judge it by whether they can get the job done, whether they get cases through court, whether they get a case through court, they get a judgment and then they can in fact enforce that judgment. The situation — and I am not aware of what has been happening in the past few weeks or months but upon my departure to come down to the Legislature, we had arrived at the sorry point — I have showed you the memoranda before in the House, I believe they were tabled — where once you have an order of the court ordering a writ of execution to attach goods and lands you get back correspondence from the Sheriff saying, I am sorry we can't do this right now, we're tied up, we can't serve process. The situation had come to the point where it was simply ludicrous, once you had a judgment, an order of the court, you were in the position where you may as well throw it in the garbage can because it wasn't any good to you. Surely that is not a system which bespeaks of an all time high.

I would like to ask you this question. Did you get any outside help, legal advice in the Canadian Industrial Gas and Oil case, and if so, which firms and at what cost to date?

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, first of all a word with respect to court services. I don't know what the Hon. Member's personal experience is or isn't. I practised law and I had difficulty as well in that execution area. All that I can say is looking at the facts, one sees the following. In 1970-71 the last year of the Liberal budget for example, a total part of the budget that related to court services was \$808,000. In 1977-78 the budget amount is \$2,295,000 that's an increase of 175 per cent in five years. You can say it's not enough, maybe it isn't, but I think that 20 or 25 per cent a year that's pretty good, for any budget, for any government for any department.

In 1970-71 for court services we had 101 people, today we have budgeted 130, that's a 29 per cent increase in one year from the year budgeted. Again, what is good enough? I don't know what is good enough. I am saying that in terms of the total of the functions, we have made some very good strides in this area of court services and court facilities and the job that is being done.

Now the questions with respect to CIGOL I am not sure that I can provide that. Maybe I can. Mr. Chairman, we have two basic law firms involved in this matter. One is the firm of Ward, Davies and Beke from Toronto, who as of yet have not tendered a bill which has been paid by the department. There is another law firm, Goldenberg, Taylor of Saskatoon who have billed the department, the billing periods for February 20, 1974

to May 15, 1974, \$4,003.10; May 15 to October 30, 1974, \$19,040.90; November 1, 1974 to August 9, 1975, \$11,329.37; December 19, 1975 to March 12, 1976, \$1,853.89; April 10, 1976 to October 12, 1976, \$2,312.35; and December 14, 1976 to February 7, 1977, \$12,672.90.

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. LANE: If I might continue this line of questioning for a few minutes Mr. Chairman.

That's a fairly substantial bill, there may have been substantial work involved too, I assume that there was the question I am asking about, has the other firm not sent any statements of account at all? I am wondering if your department is looking at another bill the same size from the firm in Toronto.

I have another question in that area that you might answer at the same time. Did the former Deputy Attorney General Ken Lysyk, I believe his name was, attend as counsel before the Supreme Court of Canada on the hearing of CIGOL appeal or on any other matter since he has resigned?

MR. ROMANOW: The answer to the latter questions is Yes, he did. I guess I must have overlooked that. We'll see if he tendered a bill on that, and I can give you that as well.

Yes, on the Goldenberg Taylor firm, it is a substantial bill for a substantial amount of litigation, probably one of the most important cases in resource law in the division of federal-provincial powers that has come down the pike and has gone right to the Supreme Court of Canada. Mr. Lysyk appeared as well, I don't know if he tendered a bill or not, yes, \$5,530.99.

On the Ward, Davies and Beke there is no bill which has been paid out, let's put it that way, and I am dealing strictly from the paid out operations. I don't know, he may have submitted something to the department. I am only giving you the up-to-date figures on it. In any event, I am not sure that Ward, Davies and Beke are strictly on the CIGOL law case, they were involved in other deliberations from time to time.

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, then there were actually three billed, . . . Mr. Chairman, if I might continue this line of questioning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand quite well but I also have to make sure that all Members have an opportunity to question, I will allow one more question, then I will acknowledge another Member.

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General indicated previously that there were in fact two outside people being used, and now I believe it is three including the Lysyk matter. I am wondering whether that is a final bill from Lysyk. I am wondering also, whether Lysyk did any arguing at the actual hearing of the appeal, or whether the argument was addressed by one of the other firms. If he did no arguing, why then was he sent to the Supreme Court of Canada in this particular matter. I would also like to ask if in fact . . . perhaps I'll let you answer those

questions first.

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, I can't say whether or not that's the final bill as far as Dean Lysyk is concerned.

With respect to the question of argument and appearances before the Supreme Court, he appeared and submitted a half day's argument.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I acknowledge the Member for Regina South.

MR. S.J. CAMERON: (Regina South) Mr. Chairman, there are, of course, a whole variety of areas here of administration which one might get into, areas that we have dealt with from time to time with the Attorney General, areas such as court amalgamation, the family court in respect to which we are still awaiting some announcement. Those questions are with respect to the access to the courts which we continue from time to time to debate, questions about statute revision and why we haven't had them, questions about the central registry system, a whole area in my view of law reform which we ought to undertake, and respect to a continuing practice that is exposing people to prison terms when fines would do in respect of offences of a less serious kind. There is a whole area there that one might get into and debate at great length.

Last year at this date, I was a bit disappointed that the Attorney General's Estimates came on so late, in the Session so that we couldn't have a lengthy period of time in which to deal with them and have a full debate in respect to them.

There is, of course, the whole area of the Hall Report in 1973, there is some progress in respect to that, but some areas still need attention. Over the course of time in respect to the session, we do get more time than what I had at that time thought to debate some of these questions. I still wish we had more time to get into them.

I want to get into one particular area with the Attorney General, in a very serious way, to see whether there isn't something in this respect that we could do in some pretty constructive way. Here I refer in a narrow sense to my own community and the city of Regina, which the Attorney General I am sure is aware is in the midst of a growing trend, towards violence and crime. If one looks at figures over the course of the last four or five years, not picking them in isolation, but looking at the trend, there is there a very distressing trend in this city.

Just to underline that point a little bit, I want to draw to his attention some statistics to give you the statistical story. For example in 1975 and this is the last police report that is available to me. Murder for example was up 60 per cent in 1975 or 1974. Attempted murders grew from 2 in 1971 to 18 in 1975, attempted murders up in 1975 by 80 per cent. Wounding with intent, another crime of violence, went from 11 incidents in 1971 to 32 in 1975, again a 45.5 per cent increase in 1975 over 1974. Rapes, another area of violent crime, occurred about 12 to 15 times a year over the course of the last five years; five years ago there were three rapes. Robberies, we had over 150 robberies regularly in Regina occurring yearly in the last

five years. Breaking and entering up 5 per cent in 1975 and in the last five years, have averaged about 3,000 a year or 60 a week or 8 or 9 a day. Theft over \$200 is up in 1975 over 1974 by 49.6 per cent, 700 or 800 cases a year of that variety. Over 1,000 cars were stolen in Regina in each of the last three years. On and on it goes in respect of what I say is a clear trend in the city of Regina towards violence and crime.

Prostitution convictions up from 6 in 1971 and 1972 to 33 last year. Frauds running at over 1,000 per year, that's only part of the story and that's only the statistical story. Where of course the real story lies, as we all know, is the citizenry over the course of the last seven or eight years who are now reluctant to set foot for example in Victoria Park after dark. That's a fact we face now in this city.

Other ways in which the really sad side of this reflects itself is in parents sending children downtown in the evening to attend movies, for example, which they don't now do generally, because they are afraid of the downtown area. Taxi drivers who went through another year of tremendous difficulty and fear because some among them were mugged and knifed and indeed killed. They too today, and it is no exaggeration to say are living in some fear.

The corner grocery store in my own constituency was the subject of an armed robbery last year, as was our corner bank in my seat. Again, example upon example which one needn't continue to give of a city of 150,000 or 160,000 which has now on its hands in my view, a major crime problem and a major trend toward violence in the city. Anyone familiar with the city knows that there is an area downtown where one is not safe as a matter of fact after dark, the alleys and the streets in that portion of the city are simply not safe for people. Crime is, I wouldn't want to say rampant, but it is clearly there in a very large scale way.

What troubles me a little bit in two respects with this situation is one that I am not sure there is full enough realization of the trend that's occurring in this city. And secondly that almost inevitability of attitude about it. I know there is concern expressed from time to time in the city and perhaps some concern expressed from time to time in government, but up to this point in time, no real serious willingness to come to grips in some way with the problem and particularly with the growing problem in the future.

If we had more time what I would like to do is to put before the House a resolution to be debated at greater length. I am going to put the suggestion to the Attorney General without a resolution and that is, that we should find a mechanism to challenge this community to take a look at the problem, its dimensions and its fundamental causes and its solutions over a course of time and develop a real willingness in this city to do something about that problem. Now that kind of leadership is not coming from the city and the leadership is not currently coming from the Government. I don't think it is a time to quibble about jurisdiction in respect to it. What I would like to see us do, in conjunction with the city is to establish a commission of some variety made up of various representatives of the community experienced in the area, the police and the social workers and the judges and the courts and prosecutors and others, and attempt in some thorough fundamental way to look at, as I

say, the dimension of the problem and particularly where it is going in the future to take a look at the root causes of the crime of the city, and to take a look at the solutions that may be there.

The question is, do we need more police? I don't know. We have, I guess, in Regina 256 policemen and policewomen covering a population of 150,000 to 160,000. I rather suspect but I don't know it to be a fact, but I rather suspect that isn't enough. I rather suspect that we are not giving them as a government and as a community sufficient financial and other kinds of support. The court situation in the city I will concede to the Attorney General has been the subject of some improvement in the last year and a half. Whether it has got to the stage though where it ought to be, I am by no means certain, I think indeed there is an area there for improvement. That is not to say that the people there functioning, the judges and the prosecutors and the police and indeed the support staff are not doing a very good job because indeed they are and the city of Regina is fortunate in that respect.

I wonder too, whether there isn't an area there that we ought to be examining into particularly with their sentencing practices, and whether those sentencing practices are serving the ends and aims that we want them ultimately to serve.

One wonders whether the schools indeed couldn't be challenged to place some greater role here too, and perhaps there is another area there. Are there additional social programs of some variety that we ought to be conceiving to come to grips with the underlying causes of this kind of wave of violence that is growing in the city.

I don't know what the answers are and I don't think anybody at this stage knows what the answers are. Indeed there is a certain, almost a kind of paralysis of thought and action in respect of it, an unwillingness somehow to really take a good fundamental look at it involving the whole of the community and see what we can do with it, because if it continues as it has surely gone in the last five years, by the year 1982 or 1983 Regina is going to be in a sordid state in respect of the violence in this city. There is no question. Now it is a community which is represented here by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek), by the Premier (Mr. Blakeney), by myself, the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant), the Legislative Secretary to the Premier, the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Whelan). I don't see why we as a Government here, involving the city and involving the communities can't come to grips as I say in fundamental ways with what is causing it and how we go about solving it. And I don't think we have had that kind of leadership in the city up until now.

I am not going to move a resolution in respect of it. If we had more time I would because I would like to invite a wide scale debate in respect of it, but I am going to put it to the Attorney General as a suggestion for something that we may consider in the course of the next year and I think, certainly we lose nothing in the process and if we can by one means or another stem the tide in the city, make the community more understanding about the problem and the way in which we solve the problem then I think there is indeed a chance there to do a lot of good. So I leave that with you as a suggestion for your consideration in the course of the two or three or four months ahead of us and

when we come back again I will raise the question with you again at that time.

There is a second area that I had raised a little earlier in the Session and that was with respect to some reform in the area of this Limitation of Civil Rights Act and The Land Contract Actions Act. I described to you the particular problem that some citizens are there experiencing and the injustice that is currently being caused to some people under those two statutes. I think, Mr. Chairman, I drew from the Attorney General an assurance to submit those two statutes together with the related Act, The Queen's Bench Act, and The Land Titles Act and others to the Law Reform Commission with a view to having them give us their opinion on what we might hear and do to better secure the rights of vendors and mortgagees who are individuals as distinct from corporations.

And if I may I should like in conclusion to seek your response generally to my suggestion that we should show some leadership in conjunction with the city of Regina with respect to its growing and very real problem for this community, and in the second respect to tie down your assurances that the questions I raise with you about The Limitations of Civil Rights Act and related statutes will indeed be given over to the Law Reform Commission.

The other area is a quick question that I want to deal with you about is the court amalgamation and where that now stands. The family court where that stands and various sorts of odds and ends of administration. But the major question that I raise with you is the question about my own community and the secondary question about the questions of law areas with you.

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, I can give the Member and I will so undertake again that this matter of The Land Contract Actions Act and the Limitations, etc., will be referred to the Law Reform Commission. I think I may have done that already, maybe not because of the Legislative Session but I will do so the moment that I have a couple of days to get things together.

I would like to just say a few words with respect to the Member's concerns and his, I would agree, positive suggestion to come to grips with the concern that he articulates. And I want to respond and say right from the beginning that I feel that I am in kind of an awkward position in responding because what I say here may be viewed by some as kind of a defensive posture with respect to the crime rate in the city of Regina. I think that without sounding too maudlin about the whole thing crime at any level, even if it is committed just on a one person basis, is something which has to be fought by all people. And I want to agree with the Member that there is a problem on crime rates I think, not only for Regina but for Saskatchewan, indeed it seems to be for the country.

Having said that I would like to just point out one or two matters with respect to the statistics. First of all, I am not one who puts all that much emphasis on crime statistics because, I think the Member opposite will agree with me, that these are very difficult to interpret. They depend on so many factors, such as the reporting procedures, number of police involved, so forth. To state the ludicrous and the obvious if there were no policemen on duty no one would be apprehended and the crime rate would be zero and one could argue in a perverted kind of

way that the city of Regina or the Province of Saskatchewan has an excellent crime rate because nobody had been arrested. So statistics can be very misleading. But the figures that I have respecting Regina are the 1976 crime rate statistics, and I refer Hon. Members and indeed I am going to forward a copy of this to the Members, or at least to the Member for Regina South, this is a statistics book that has been prepared for me with respect to the Regina crime statistics for the year ended 1976 so it is fairly current. In the year 1976 Regina concluded the investigation of 19,557 reported criminal code offences. According to the Regina Police this was an increase of 2.6 per cent in the year 1976 over the year 1975. So if there is anything that can be taken as encouraging out of that one could argue that the 2.6 per cent increase in the year 1976 over 1975 is certainly not great. It would be nice to have no increase and in fact a substantial reduction but at 2.6 it is quite significantly below the national average and suggests we are holding the line over.

I think there is one other important factor to take into consideration in the year 1976. They have what they call a major crime category or trends in major crimes. There are 13 major offences. In these 13 offences there were a total of 11,961 major crimes reported in the year ended 1976. The thing about that figure is it represents an actual reduction of the year ended 1975, 13 major crime category offences a reduction of .12 per cent may not be in some eyes a world beater of a figure I think that is quite an impressive situation to actually try and have a reverse in that regard. Now obviously, I won't take more time in the House I will just forward the figures to the Member in due course and he can examine them at a later time. But I want to simply say before I close off on the statistical story that there are problem areas. According to the last report we continue to have a serious criminal code driving area. In Regina there is a 15.9 per cent increase in the criminal code, there is a 6.6 per cent increase on reportable motor vehicle accidents, and so forth. There is a growing and continuing serious juvenile delinquency problem in Regina. I think that it is not only Regina but that seems to be the case everywhere.

My point being Mr. Chairman, that having prefaced my remarks the way I do, I don't want to be viewed as being defensive or viewed by anybody as saying that things are all roses we don't need to be worried about it. My point is that the year 1976 has shown on balance with some notable exceptions and pretty significant hold the line and in the 13 major crime categories, an actual reduction of the crime rate. And I say that the police in Regina are doing a terrific job. I know that the Member for Regina South is not suggesting otherwise but I am simply saying that it is a very difficult job being on Number 1 Trans-Canada Highway and it is a going city with all kinds of other problems which are tied into it which I don't need to elaborate to the Members opposite. I think they are doing a very good job, and therefore I am saying that we should be careful before we base our concerns or possible actions not to base them solely on the statistical data.

Two other points before I sit down, now speaking directly to the Member's suggestion. I want to be candid with him. I can neither accept nor reject it tonight because I obviously would want to discuss it with the Chief of Police and the Police Commission which I shall do. I should like to discuss it with

my own department officials and the Saskatchewan Police Commission. I would simply ask the Members to keep in mind that in Regina, the Regina City Police force is really doing a very admirable job in what I call community prevention type programs. They really have an extensive list of community watch, block parent programs, mobile family service, welfare service, mental health counselling, drug abuse, lost and missing persons, domestic situations, I suppose that is not specialized, community field officer which while not particularly novel is certainly a very commendable thing and in Saskatchewan terms maybe a pioneering thing. The community field officer service places police constables on foot patrols in key areas, high crime rate areas, business areas at individual times and so my point being that here is an example of actual efforts through community co-ordination and community contact by the police force which may have some long-term impact as opposed to say, as thorough going study into the operation.

The second point I should like to make is that there are two other agencies which I think will do a usefully improved job in this area. One is the Criminal Justice Co-ordinating Committee on which the city of Regina is represented and they are just only now beginning to work and the other is the Saskatchewan Police Commission, which I know is concerned about the need to get a study and not only a study but one of their proposals which I think will be forthcoming in this next budget year, kind of an aware type of publicity program about respecting the law and respecting police officers and respecting legal institutions and the like. I think one has to be careful about the nature and the format of that but that is the Saskatchewan Police Commissions embryonic proposal which I can reveal and tell the Members of the House is certainly gaining some favor with me. So my point is that none of this that I have said should be viewed as saying that I am throwing cold water on (a) the seriousness of the problem which I readily admit or (b) the need to take action even in the way that the Member suggests, which I shall pursue further. But there are two or three factors which I must also consider, namely the statistics which I have recited that are rather better in this year and we will see what 1977 produces and last that there are some community organizations and community operations at the Regina Police level which are doing an excellent job which we must continue to encourage and support. Maybe these are the programs which are now being felt in the year 1976 and there are these two bodies, the Criminal Justice Co-ordinating Committee and the Saskatchewan Police Commission which must have input in this kind of an analysis.

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Chairman, I say firstly I am encouraged at least with the willingness of the Attorney General to acknowledge the problem, at least, in some dimension. Not quite in the dimension as I see it and secondly with his willingness to at least consider and within his own department to consult with the Police Commission and perhaps the City of Regina to see whether suggestions of the variety I have made don't have some merit in them and to challenge the community in a sustained way, to do something in the several respects that I have mentioned. One can only take exception with one thing that you have said and that is that, you may recall when I was putting to you the mention of the problem, I said I want to look first at the statistics, although the statistical story is not the story. What the statistics tell you, and one can look at 1975 as compared to 1976, I don't have the 1976 figures except in broad

terms, I understand that 1976 was a slight increase over 1975. But that isn't the point at all. The point is that what the statistics tell you is that from 1971 or from 1970 — and it is not a political question — is that there has been a growing discernible trend in this city. The statistics tell you that clearly. The second thing is that anyone who has lived in this community ten years or the past seven or eight years can tell you by instinct and by observation and by knowledge and the way in which they themselves conduct themselves in downtown Regina and the way in which they caution their children, that the community has a growing problem and in that respect that the real story is there.

What I say I hope we can do and as I say I can appreciate your willingness to take a look at it, is to get serious about finding a way to challenge every aspect of the community to come to grips with the problem on every front. If the police need additional support from us in terms of assistance from the community in terms of funding from us we ought to give it to them. If we put our finger on problems in the court system we ought to be prepared to deal with that. If we find that the schools can do additional things we then would want to do that as well. There is no question, I agree with you the Regina Police force has done an excellent job in trying to develop the community and seriously to come to grips with the problems. What I come back to though that I feel has been lacking is a sense first of immediacy about the problem, the urgency that the citizenry knows is there and yet a kind of administrative level doesn't, it is an overstatement to say it doesn't see it. It is kind of as though they don't have the willingness that they ought to have to find out what really is going on and then to find out if there isn't some better way to correct it. So with these remarks in response, I look forward to your keeping me informed over the course of the next three and four months about your discussion with the Regina Police force, your own department and the city in respect of the suggestion that I made to you.

MR. LANE: (Saskatoon Sutherland) Mr. Chairman, if I could get back to the line of questioning that I was on before, I should like to ask the Attorney General if in respect to the law firm, the Toronto law firm which he had referred to, he indicated that there was billing and I believe no interim billing to this point in time from that firm. Did the Government place that firm on retainer and if so what was the retainer?

MR. ROMANOW: No, we did not place it on retainer, they will be billing, sending the bills to us in due course. I think I made an error, when I answered that Ward, Davies and Beke were on the CIGOL case they really weren't on the CIGOL case, they have been advising us on other matters which one could loosely describe as related to CIGOL. We have made no payments to date, so I am advised, to them on that matter.

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Attorney General could advise the House the length of time prior to the hearing of the CIGOL case in terms of days or weeks or months approximately. You received the resignation of your former, he then was the Deputy Attorney General, Ken Lysyk, prior to the argument in the CIGOL case in the Supreme Court of Canada?

MR. ROMANOW: I can't give you the exact date but I think Mr. Lysyk was through on or about August 1, 1976, it may have been September 1, 1976, yes, August-September of 1976 that will be, I think, accurate enough for your purposes. The CIGOL case was argued in November of 1976, late November of 1976.

MR. BAILEY: Before we get off Item 1 I just have a couple of questions for the Attorney General. I am sure that he is used to being questioned from this side of the House by those who are trained in law. The other day in the House I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs a question pertaining to the situation at the municipal government level here in the city of Regina, and I recognize the Attorney General's position in that no one from the City Council nor the Chief Administrator has asked for an inquiry from the Attorney General's Department into the present situation with the Regina City Council. The fact still remains, as I understand it, the power is vested in municipal laws, powers which are really vested from the Legislature, and the situation which the Member for Regina South has mentioned in regard to some of the problems facing the city of Regina, so it seems to me that when the City Council took steps to reduce the salary of the Mayor to something in the neighborhood of eight cents a month or a dollar a year they are really belittling the position. Now I know it was an attempt to embarrass the present Mayor, but the situation as far as the general city is concerned and the citizens of the city, they feel very uncomfortable about the situation. If those who have their powers delegated by this Legislature through The Municipal Act, if they in themselves use these powers in a manner which is not a manner that will benefit the city, does that not, Mr. Attorney General, give your department some grounds upon which to move to reach an amiable solution, which is certainly a plague for the city at this particular time?

MR. ROMANOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any legislative or legal basis upon which I could act to bring a solution to the situation that exists in Regina. All that I know is that I was asked, as the Member knows, by the members on the Regina City Council to determine whether or not some form of an inquiry should be set up to inquire into certain statements made by various members of council. I had the material and evidence before me and concluded that I would not so direct. I do not know of any legal basis upon which I could act. I'm not sure that my good offices, or I personally, would have any goodwill to try and mediate that situation even if I were so inclined. I don't know what else I can say to the Member, other than that.

Item 1 agreed.

ITEM 2

MR. LANE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Attorney General, and this came up during Question Period a short time ago in respect of the proposed correctional centre for the city of Saskatoon, I had asked at that time whether any additional security measures would be taken, and the Attorney General of course indicated that this is simply a scare tactic on my part and that there was nothing to worry about. I believe he started to say something else and cut it off. I would like the Attorney General, if he would, to be very candid and indicate what sort of look you have had at the security measures at the proposed correctional

institute in the city of Saskatoon. What I want you to tell the Members of this Assembly, if you would, in light of the escape record that's been prevalent in the Province of Saskatchewan . . . Incidentally on the same date I heard a press release by the Hon. Attorney General stating that the Government's escape record was very successful, and I think he is right. All those who tried to escape did successfully, and I am wondering what, in terms of the correctional institute in Saskatoon, if the proposed site would be done any differently. I would ask the Attorney General to deal with it in a candid fashion and tell the Members of this Assembly what is planned and what, if anything, will be done differently to prevent escapes?

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, I would remind the Member that this is not a matter of the Attorney General's Estimates, this is a Social Services Corrections Estimate, and Corrections are not my responsibility. I have not had an opportunity to see the plans. I don't even know if the plans are fully drawn yet on the new proposed correctional centre, and as to what the safety features are, Therefore, I am not able to make any kind of a comment.

MR. LANE: If I might ask the Attorney General, the Legal Aid staff that is housed in the Melfort area, is there a lease signed up with any Member of your Government or Cabinet with respect to ownership, or any person who would be shareholder of a company that owned property?

MR. ROMANOW: Not that I know of. In any event, this is a matter which is dealt with by the local Legal Aid Board, who would enter into that arrangement, if there was such an arrangement, on its own. The local Legal Aid Board interfaces with the Provincial Legal Aid Commission, not with the Provincial Department of the Attorney General, and it is purposely structured that way so that there is an adequate bumper between the local board and the Provincial Attorney General through the Saskatchewan Legal Aid Commission in the centre. So if that indeed is the fact it would have to have gone through those two other channels.

MR. LANE: Well Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept that there is some division in terms of line of staff, the line of authority, but would the Attorney General not agree that if the building which housed a segment of your department was owned by a Member of your Cabinet, or a Member of your Government and rented back to the Government, that wouldn't you now suggest at least a conflict of interest situation. What I would ask the Attorney General to do is first of all comment on that. Secondly, I would ask him to undertake to find out and provide us with the information.

MR. ROMANOW: No, I do not agree that the Legal Aid Commission of Saskatchewan is part of my department. In fact it is not a part of my department. The whole purpose of the Legal Aid Commission as set, as recommended by the Carter Report, is to give it independence, and I am sure that the Member would be the first one to be objecting if I viewed the legal aid lawyers to be my lawyers. The whole argument is the independence of the Bar and the independence of the whole board. As far as I am concerned whatever the local board does and decides to do, this is their business.

If the area doesn't like the local board's decision let them get a new local board or a new lease.

MR. LANE: That's an interesting subject, and I would like to ask the Attorney General very briefly . . . I understand that in the city of Saskatoon the Legal Aid Society has launched a lawsuit against the Provincial Auditor in terms of obtaining a court declaration preventing the Provincial Auditor from looking at some of the records of the Legal Aid Society there. I think in particular it has to do with the trust account, if I am not mistaken. Now, what I am wondering, since the funding of course comes through your department, that there is a relationship between you and the Legal Aid Society in Saskatoon, or any other Legal Aid Society, and I am wondering, in terms of any of these societies taking it upon themselves to launch legal action or to get involved in litigation, will they then be responsible for retaining their own counsel, or do you then provide them if they take it upon themselves to instigate litigation to provide them with counsel and the money to get the counsel?

MR. ROMANOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. Member's facts are not correct and again I want to be careful how much I say because it is before the courts. But in a nutshell, the issue concerns itself with an interpretation of a particular section of the relevant statute. I think it is Section 8. Again, and perhaps I am overstepping the bounds because it is sub judice, but the Provincial Auditor takes the position, or has taken the position, that he has a right as the overall guardian of the public purse to audit the trust accounts of the local boards. The local board lawyers are taking the position that their trust accounts are to be audited by the Law Society, as if — like in your case, that they are not subject to the provincial kind of control. It's an important thing for the local boards and for the local Legal Aid Commission and for the provincial Legal Aid Commission, because they want to be viewed as being on the side of the non-governmental bar. They want to say 'we are subject to the Law Society, we are subject to the whole operation.' I am getting a little bit off the field. The Provincial Auditor, I recognize, is also trying to do his job, quite properly and quite authoritatively.

Now the section is not clear. This is not a matter of the local body launching an action to prevent the Auditor from doing the auditing. This is, as I understand it, that this is a mutual reference (or as close as there can be mutual reference) to determine what the section says. And we will see what the court decides and I am sure that both parties will deal with it. Now as to the facts, the local body hires their own lawyers and they are responsible for it, the Provincial Auditor has his lawyer and whoever pays the Provincial Auditor out of his budget is responsible for it, and it is being argued it doesn't relate to the Department of the Attorney General at all.

MR. LANE: The last part is what I was particularly interested in. I understand, I may be wrong, that in fact the lawyer who was retained is another person who is funded through your department. Now I may be wrong, you can check that out, but what I was getting at was not the merits of that particular case. What I was getting at was the broad principle or if any of the branches of the Legal Aid Society (they are equipped with lawyers) decide to get

involved with litigation, don't you think this sets kind of a precedent, or did you in this instance screen the case and give them the go-ahead and say 'well we'll provide you with the lawyer, but come to us on a case by case basis'. Or is it sort of wide open, that every time you know, it's a possibility that some person in some legal aid clinic decided to launch a lawsuit, or a half a dozen lawsuits. Now do you screen that through your department, or will you provide them with counsel in each case?

MR. ROMANOW: Well, Mr. Chairman I am subject to correction because I say this is the local Legal Aid Commission's problem and not the Department of the Attorney General's problem. But I am advised that the lawyer who acts for them is a non-Attorney General lawyer. He is either on a fee for service or a friend of the Commission, or of the local legal aid body. The Auditor's lawyer I think is one Mr. Gordon Neill who is a respected practitioner from Regina. So far as I know we don't provide the lawyer. I stand to be corrected, and in any event, it would depend on the individual case. We may, in some circumstances and may not in some circumstances provide a Department of the Attorney General lawyer to do the advising. In this case I am advised that it is not so.

Item 2 agreed.

ITEM 3

MR. LANE: In respect of the problem in the Court Services Branch, I am going to try to be as unpolitical as I can, but there are difficulties, and I am sure the Attorney General, if he is in contact with fellow practitioners from the Bar, will appreciate that there are difficulties. The first is getting your case through court because of difficulties that developed; the second, once you do have your case through the court and you have a judgment, of enforcing that judgment. Now you have indicated to the Members of this Assembly that you have spent a great deal more money, you have increased the budget, and I can appreciate that there are certain difficulties. What I am wondering about is, do you perceive that there is some difficulty in your own department with perhaps the lack of morale because you have seen the stuff that has been tabled over the period of weeks and months that we have been here, and we are referred to the department memo from Mr. Huggett which we talked about earlier in this discussion. We get correspondence from sheriffs saying that they are not able to serve court process any more. They don't have the staff to investigate seizure. A letter I received very recently indicated that investigation with the view to seizure couldn't be carried on for a matter of a number of months because of short staffing in that particular local registrar and sheriff's office.

Now what I would like you to deal with, Mr. Attorney General, and in candid fashion, is why does the money not appear to be solving the situation? You are putting a lot of money into it. Do you perceive any problems within your own department that are preventing the proper functioning and the efficient functioning of the Court Services Branch?

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, the question is predicated on an assumption

of fact which I must say candidly I cannot accept. The assumption of fact is that on the basis of the Huggett memorandum that the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) tabled some months ago, and on the basis of the Reg Stevens memorandum which came by the way at a very tough time. In the case of Mr. Stevens the sheriff's officer had quit without giving any kind of notice, he was left in the lurch on his own, and there was the fact that he was going into hospital in January awaiting surgery.

MR. LANE: We've got evidence.

MR. ROMANOW: No, no, well let's see your documentation. You say you have evidence, I am saying to you show your documentation. No, the only thing that you have tabled is the Reg Stevens letter which I am trying to explain, and the Gary Lane-Huggett memorandum which I tried to explain, rightly or wrongly. That's all. I am not trying to say that it is perfect. I am acknowledging to you that it is far from perfect. I am acknowledging to you that there are delays in sheriff executions. I am acknowledging to you that we need more money, we need more staff.

What I am saying though is that on the basis of the budgeting, the increases in numbers and in percentages of the budgets are, in my judgment, very generous from the Treasury Board. Now whether they will solve the problem, I don't know. All I am saying is that a lot of Ministers can't get up like I can get up and say that I've got a 42 per cent increase in the Court Services Branch budget this year over last. It may not be enough. How much is enough? That's all I am saying to you.

In terms of morale, my belief in the morale of the department is that so far as I can detect I think the morale is good. There was a period of indecision, and I might say that the Acting Deputy Hugh Ketcheson did a terrific job as Acting Deputy and is doing so until the new deputy lands here, which is going to be July 1. I have been Attorney General for six years and I think that I haven't seen a department which is as hard-working and as dedicated to the whole overall operation.

Undoubtedly you may find some personnel somewhere who say we are overworked or whatever, but I think on balance it is quite good.

My only answer to the Member is I don't know what else I can say. We have more money than we have had in past years by a long shot. We have got more personnel by a long shot. We have cut down the delays. There still are problems in delays, but the whole situation, I think, is on balance quite good.

MR. LANE: I did not say that you do not have a hard-working department. Certainly I know by the new Director of Criminal Prosecutions that it was a real blow to lose him as a prosecutor to Saskatoon, he was a real workhorse and did a very effective job. I am sure that if I knew the other members of the department I would have the same thing to say. But what I am getting at is this. You are copping out. You are not coming right to the problem. You keep saying that you are spending a lot of money. I agree, you are spending a lot of money. What I am getting at is: do you see any difficulties, or have you done any studies that would indicate to you that there are some difficulties which can be solved? I would ask you to deal with it very candidly. What kinds of problems are you having?

MR. ROMANOW: Well Mr. Chairman, the only problems that I think I can say is that I would love to have more personnel. I think that would ease the load.

Items 3 to 14 agreed.

ITEM 15

MR. J. G. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) Is the Attorney General considering any change to the Human Rights Commission at the present time, and if so, the names.

MR. ROMANOW: Mr. Chairman, the answer is No and this time the Commission has a five year mandate which does not run out until November of 1977, and I quite frankly will tell you I have not turned my mind to what to do when it comes in November.

Item 15 agreed.

Items 16 to 19 agreed.

Vote 3 agreed.

Supplementary Estimates agreed.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RIGHTS BOARD — VOTE 31

Item 1 agreed.

SURFACE RIGHTS ARBITRATION BOARD — VOTE 37

Item 1 agreed.

PROVINCIAL SECRETARY — VOTE 30

ITEM 1

MR. E. COWLEY: (Provincial Secretary) I would like to introduce Leo Beaudry.

MR. CAMERON: A question I have and perhaps I can leave that to Item 3, but in the meantime the Minister might get some information in respect of it and that's why is the Protocol Office tripling in budget and what's the reason for that?

MR. COWLEY: The basic reason for the increase in the vote is that the funds for providing Government banquets, I believe were formerly in Tourism and Renewable Resources and would not be transferred to the Protocol Office. That's the largest sum.

MR. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) What is the difference between the executive administration when the administration in most other branches is straight administration. What's the distinction and can you advise the employees under executive administration?

MR. COWLEY: Well, the executive administration is the staff in my

office and the administration staff is all the rest of the staff in the Provincial Secretary's Office. Mr. Beaudry is in administration, The Companies Act, The Real Estate Brokers Act, all of those other Acts, the Investigators, etc., all of the clerical staff outside of my office are in administration.

MR. LANE: Are you saying your executive assistant is under executive administration?

MR. COWLEY: That's correct.

MR. LANE: What other staff? Would you list the staff that is under executive administration?

MR. COWLEY: There is a Research Officer I, which is vacant, an executive assistant Mr. Ross Eden which is filled, my secretary, Mrs. Pat Porter, a clerk steno IV and a Clerk Steno II which are both filled.

MR. LANE: Well really what we are doing is we are paying your political staff under the Potash Corporation under the Provincial Secretary is practically what we're doing for all practical purposes. If a Cabinet post is warranted, and I put the emphasis on the 'if', you should be a Minister without portfolio responsible for the Potash Corporation. In fact what you are doing is you are burying your political staff of the Potash Corporation under the Provincial secretary and that's the real reason for the distinction.

MR. COWLEY: Well I beg to inform the Member if he has ever and I emphasize the 'ever', and I suggest it's unlikely one in Saskatchewan would not want to be a Minister without portfolio because if one reads the rules and regulations, a Minister without portfolio receives no salary and therefore it is somewhat of a handicap in recruiting people for the position.

MR. LANE: You have done absolutely nothing to refute my argument if the potash record is any indication. Can you tell me what original research the department is doing, and I phrase it that way in distinction to the fact that for example on The Companies Act, The New Corporation Act that we have is basically verbatim from the Government of Canada. Now I happen to think that the Federal Act is an excellent Act and long overdue. I don't object to necessarily taking the verbatim from another jurisdiction but it should be justified. I do recall a year ago and I forget the particular Act where the Minister got up and announced the tabling of new proposals in Saskatchewan, and lo and behold it was word for word from another jurisdiction after he had taken credit for all his great research and the new legislation in the province and I think the Minister well recalls the situation. Now I would like to know what areas of pure research, original research the department is doing on legislation that we may be looking at in the relatively immediate future?

MR. COWLEY: Well I want to say first with respect to The Company

Act, I indicated at the time that it was part of an attempt to bring about some uniformity in companies law across Canada. The department had a committee which reviewed the Act, basically found it sound and we introduced it. We only have one research officer, Mr. Doug King, and the department is doing what the Member might call original research. The department went through the Act and found it basically satisfactory, obviously there were some changes required just because you're moving from one jurisdiction to another and there obviously were some changes made both before the Act was introduced into this House and during the course of the consideration of the Committee of the Whole. Also in The New Companies Act, we've also introduced some other amendments to other Acts under our jurisdiction. At this Session we are currently looking at a re-write of the Act dealing with the Real Estate Brokers, what may or may not come forward at the next session. The department's role is primarily a regulatory one, that's primarily what we are doing in the case of The Companies Act. The Federal Government had invested some sizeable sums of money into the research of The New Companies Act, I believe they have taken five years and it seemed to us that it wasn't prudent to duplicate that effort. We did go to the Law Society and to other groups which we thought would be interested in The Companies Act, have them review it, we engaged outside counsel which we thought was particularly competent in the Saskatchewan sense, with The Companies Act in this province, and with various private companies, to reveal it, and by and large I think we have a good Companies Act, obviously there are two or three clauses then which some Members have some disagreement with.

MR. LANE: I preface my remarks as the Minister is well aware by saying that I happen to think that the Federal Companies Act is a welcome change in the law. Now who is drafting the proposed new personal property securities legislation?

MR. COWLEY: We haven't done any work on that!

MR. LANE: So we can assume that that is a long way down the road, not an immediate proposal notwithstanding that there has been some indication that there was going to be in the near future.

MR. COWLEY: Only in terms of this department.

MR. LANE: Are there other departments doing it that you can advise us of?

MR. COWLEY: I have no knowledge of that, there may be.

MR. LANE: Can you advise us what outside law firms were used and for what purposes by the department. I particularly would like to know the expertise of the law firm you used, the expertise that justifies pretty well taking a verbatim transcript or verbatim copy of the Federal Act and The Companies Act.

MR. COWLEY: The White Paper was introduced after review by the

department following that the lawyer we used in terms of reviewing it and giving us comments was Mr. Harold MacKay.

MR. LANE: Was there any other outside counsel used by the department?

MR. COWLEY: Mr. Beaudry says not that we paid for.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 and 3 agreed.

Vote 30 agreed.

Supplementary Estimates, Item 24 and Item 31 agreed.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICE — VOTE 65

Vote 65 agreed.

SASKATCHEWAN POWER CORPORATION — VOTE 52

Vote 52 agreed.

PROVINCIAL AUDITOR — VOTE 28

HON. W. E. SMISHEK: (Minister of Finance) Right next to me is Mr. Lutz, the Provincial Auditor, and Mr. Bucknall.

ITEM 1

MR. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister. There was a verbal and political dispute between the Progressive Conservative Party and the Government opposite over a document filed in Public Accounts last year. Now I'm quite prepared if the Minister wants to continue that dispute as to whether 27 agencies or boards have audit reports or not. What disturbs me more than anything, however, is a press article and I refer to one in particular, of Tuesday, March 1, 1977. It was dealing with the political dispute between ourselves and the Government opposite. But they are quoting one, Mr. Lawson, a political appointment, a political worker out of the Premier's office. In that press statement, it is the Cabinet Press Secretary, Bruce Lawson whom they are referring to. Mr. Lawson is quoted as saying:

The Auditor (referring to the Provincial Auditor) was disturbed by the news reports over the audit reports and declined to accept telephone calls from reporters late Monday.

My first question of the Provincial Auditor is, did you decline to accept telephone calls at the request of Mr. Lawson, the Cabinet Press Officer of the Premier's office?

MR. SMISHEK: I am advised that the Provincial Auditor has never declined to take phone calls from the press or anyone.

MR. LANE: Was the Provincial Auditor

requested by Mr. Lawson or anyone from the Premier's office, instructed or requested not to accept telephone calls from the press around the time of this dispute?

MR. SMISHEK: The answer is No.

MR. LANE: I wonder if the Minister then could perhaps tell us how the Star-Phoenix reporter would be told by Mr. Lawson that the Provincial Auditor was disturbed by news reports and declined to accept calls? I'm wondering if the press would take it as notice that the Provincial Auditor has stated tonight that he does not decline to take calls from the press and I think that's the proper position for him to take, and that if in the future the Cabinet Press Secretary or anyone of that stature tells the press that the Provincial Auditor is disturbed by news reports and declines to accept telephone calls, that that individual is not telling the truth.

MR. SMISHEK: I don't know the question.

MR. LANE: My next series of questions deals with the staff. I think that had to go on record. I think that that statement by the Cabinet Press Secretary, as everyone knows is an abuse of the parliamentary process to say the least. But I ask my next questions. I notice that the Provincial Auditor had indicated in past Public Accounts there there was a shortage of staff, that he was running into competition from other departments. There was an indication that perhaps the Provincial Auditor was short between, I believe, 11 or 14 auditors, that would bring him up to full complement. We see an increase of only four permanent positions. How many auditors will the Provincial Auditor be short of, what he believes to be full complement, after the passage of the Estimates?

MR. SMISHEK: Mr. Chairman, if we are able to fill all the positions, 58 that we're proposing, staffing will be adequate and as things stand right now all but three positions are filled.

MR. LANE: I'm assuming those are the words of the Provincial Auditor that that staff will, or are they the words of the Minister, which?

MR. ROMANOW: . . . answers the questions.

MR. LANE: I just asked him, Mr. Attorney General, and you heard the question. Are those the words of the Provincial Auditor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think perhaps if you direct your question to the Chair please.

MR. LANE: I would ask, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister of Finance, was that answer his answer or that of the Provincial Auditor?

MR. SMISHEK: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member knows very well that he can't question in this House, the officials, whether it's the Provincial Auditor or whether it be any other department. There

was every opportunity during the Public Accounts Committee to direct questions to the auditors and I'm sure that the Members of the Opposition had a chance to discuss these kinds of matters, but in the House, as he is very well aware, it's the Minister who does the answering and I gave the answer.

MR. LANE: I'll ask the questions. Is it the Government's intention or does the Government have any proposals to add to the Provincial Auditor a position similar to that recommended in Ottawa of a Chief Financial Officer or a Comptroller General of the Province of Saskatchewan?

MR. SMISHEK: Obviously the Hon. Member doesn't know the function of the Government because we do have a comptroller's office. We had that position a long time ago, long before Ottawa even considered it. Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member, in raising questions about the staffing, I might inform the House that since this Government took office we have increased the staffing by 35 per cent to the Provincial Auditor and the funding by 332 per cent.

MR. LANE: Very, very interesting that the Minister would bring up those particular figures, that when in fact, since he became the Government, the Budget has more than tripled. I would venture to guess that the size of the civil service has more than doubled, that in fact, the Government programs have increased more than double and in fact, the Provincial Auditor is not getting the support of your office, Mr. Minister, and the Government opposite and is in fact, falling behind what would be a fair and reasonable level for this Assembly to be able to review the financial affairs of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 28 agreed.

Supplementary Estimates agreed.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION — VOTE 17 — CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

MR. G. N. WIPF: (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) Mr. Chairman, I had requested some information, I was wondering if it's available tonight?

HON. E. KRAMER: (Minister of Highways and Transportation) That was the gravel pit. You've given me some more detail, and we'll see that you get them shortly, Mr. Wipf. Now he has a question regarding the ownership of certain pits and I said we would provide it and we will provide it. When we rose, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) was asking a question about the exact amount that we were underspent in capital budget. I see he is not in his seat. I have the answer here. The funds voted in the blue book were \$71,456,000, actual expenditures, \$66,464,688. The difference on rural surface was \$4,991,312. on the urban surfacing section in capital, \$8,813,000 and the actual expenditures were \$8,189,986. The difference underspent, \$623,014. Air transportation was \$4,496,000 in the blue book, actual expenditures, \$2,967,389,

difference underspent, \$528,611. The actual underspent in capital then, total amounts to \$6,142,937. Now the reasons for the underspending was in that budget last year, the \$4,300,000 allocated for the Cluff Lake road. There was also a large amount of money for the ring road around Regina which was delayed because of the objections of people over on the north east section and those totals take up the main bulk of the underspending. I hope that would answer the questions of the Member. I undertake here to send Mr. Thatcher the Member for Thunder Creek the details of it and I hope that that will satisfy him.

MR. WIEBE: Just one other short question. I had asked a couple of questions during the Estimates a bit earlier, regarding the sign policy of the department and some of the concerns which some of my constituents had in that regard. I was just wondering if the Minister had anything to add on that.

MR. KRAMER: I have a letter ready for signature for you, Mr. Wiebe, which indicates that there probably was some misunderstanding as to how this should be done. The sign in Kincaid I understand has been there for 20 years. The reason for that has been the 300 series as opposed to the higher series. But if it is more convenient for the public, I believe we are prepared to sign the Hodgeville road even though there may be some argument as to whether it is within policy or out of policy. It was a little difficult I think for the staff to interpret what the policy should be. The letter will explain it in any case and I hope that if you are not satisfied, please get in touch with me.

MR. WIEBE: Mr. Minister, if that is the case on behalf of the citizens of Hodgeville let me extend my thank you for your consideration.

MR. WIPF: Last time you were on Estimates we were talking about the Air Tanker base in Prince Albert and I imagine your people have had time to look over the design there. I am wondering what access have they come up with for aircraft, small aircraft to get from Athabasca hanger out to the grass strip that is going to be built. I understand that in looking at some of the plans that the only access will be over a road which is going to be built out to the tanker station. Have there been any changes on that? I believe that road is going to be fenced also.

MR. KRAMER: The latest information is that as I told you earlier the official of the city council of the city of Prince Albert had approved and signed the approval. The city has now, apparently after discussions, also given approval. I am sure they wouldn't give approval if there are going to be any problems in traffic either way. I haven't got the detailed information here, but the fact there has been unanimous agreement between the federal people, the city and ourselves ought to indicate that everything now has been straightened out to everyone's satisfaction.

MR. WIPF: Just one more thing. I have talked to the Minister of DNS the other day, and he hadn't looked at that plan from that site. I just wonder if your engineers will somewhere down the

road get together and find out what access they have out to that north-south runway.

MR. KRAMER: I think we can give you an up-to-date report on it because it is in the area of our responsibility.

Vote 17 agreed.

Supplementary Estimates

Item 12 agreed.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION — VOTE 33

HON. G. T. SNYDER: (Minister in charge of Public Service Commission) Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the remaining Members of the Committee the gentleman to my left is Mr. Ray Purdy, Chairman of the Public Service Commission and on his left in the Premier's seat, Mr. Dan Cunningham, the Director of Administration.

Item 1 agreed.

ITEM 2

MR. WIEBE: Just one comment, Mr. Chairman. The Minister in his introduction noticed for the remaining Members of the Committee, I want it noted that the benches on that side of the House are just as sparse as the benches on this side of the House.

Item 2 agreed.

Items 3 to 6 agreed.

Supplementary Estimates

Items 1 to 6 agreed.

Vote 33 agreed.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION BOARD — VOTE 34

Items 1 to 8 agreed.

Vote 34 agreed.

Supplementary Estimates

Supplementary Estimates agreed.

SASKATCHEWAN WATER SUPPLY BOARD — VOTE 59

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 59 agreed.

Supplementaries — agreed.

SASKATCHEWAN DEVELOPMENT FUND CORPORATION

Supplementaries — agreed.

May 10, 1977

OFFICE OF THE RENTALSMAN — VOTE 68

Items 1 and 2 agreed.

Vote 68 agreed.

Supplementaries — agreed.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

APPROPRIATION BILL

By leave of the Assembly, and under Rule 48, the Hon. Mr. Smishek moved that Bill No. 111 — **An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Years ending respectively the Thirty-first day of March, 1977 and the Thirty-first day of March, 1978** — be now read a second and third time.

He said: Before presenting the motion for second and third reading of The Appropriation Bill I wish to make a few remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the consideration of the province's Budget and the Government's spending plans for the coming year, is or ought to be, one of the most important responsibilities of this Assembly.

In the Budget debate and in the clause by clause examination of the department Estimates in Committee of Finance, the Opposition has an unparalleled opportunity to question the Budget, and to scrutinize the Estimates. Mr. Speaker, not only do they have an opportunity to make their scrutiny, they have an obligation to scrutinize the Estimates. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that the performance of both Opposition parties in this respect has been shocking experience in the last few days.

Not only did they fail in their obligations as Members of the opposition, they displayed a real unwillingness to talk about the Budget or to discuss the Estimates in an intelligent fashion.

What did the Liberal financial critic have to say? Well, he thundered on in his usual incoherent fashion about the new federal-provincial financial arrangements. He wept copious tears on behalf of the disadvantaged group, Mr. Speaker, the smokers, if you may recall. He patted himself on the back because we as a Government agreed to eliminate the Succession Duties and Gift Taxes.

But did he talk about the Estimates, Mr. Speaker? Certainly not, it was the farthest thing from his mind. He didn't want to talk about the increases in grants to schools, nor did he talk about the 50 per cent increase for police protection that we are providing in this Budget, about the increase in assistance to local governments nor did they talk about the innovative new social and health programs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how about the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald)? Well, seeing that their official critic is not here and has not been around for several days I thought I would sort of refer to the past critic. Well you know he was a bit late getting into the debate. It seems he was on a vacation or something like that, but when he did arrive, all full of vim and vigour, what did he pull out of the hat?

He took a look at the money coming into the Energy and Resources Development Fund and he said, "If you don't spend any of this money, if you just keep it in the fund, in seven years you can double your money, and in 14 years it will have perhaps quadrupled and so on." That is what he said Mr. Speaker. Well Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dispute his arithmetic, but I will dispute his logic. After all, there is not that much difference between government budgeting and individual budgeting, so suppose that an individual was to say, "I am not going to take a vacation this year. Instead I will put my money in the bank." Then after a period of seven years he would have saved a lot of money, and in 14 years would save a mint.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he may be right, but, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this much, it surely wouldn't do much for the economy of the province or the country and it would put a lot of travel agents out of business.

And then Mr. Speaker, there was the Leader of the Conservatives, the Member of Nipawin (Mr. Collver). Last year all he wanted to talk about was that there wasn't enough money in the budget for salaries. You may recall that. He made extravagant predictions about a shortfall of anywhere up to \$100 million. Remember those allegations he made last year. He was noticeably vague about the size of the shortfall or where it was going to occur. But that's not really unusual for the Member for Nipawin. He talks about spending cuts, but he is vague on the question of which programs he would eliminate. He talks about cutting taxes, but he is vague on how he would finance the business of the Government if he eliminated major tax revenues.

He talks about problems, but like his federal counterparts, he is vague on the subject of solutions. Well, this year he forgot all about his predictions of last year. It was very noticeable, Mr. Speaker, it was very convenient for him to omit that, because if it had not been for the beef industry assistance program and the money provided to victims of last summer's disastrous windstorm, there would have been no shortfall, there would have been no deficit at all, Mr. Speaker.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, and I should like the Opposition parties and the press to take note, although our accounts are not finally closed for 1976-77, it now seems certain that the actual deficit will be substantially less than we estimated on March 10th, in fact I think it is safe to say that it will be less than the cost of the Beef Assistance Program alone, Mr. Speaker.

Now I would have thought that the Member for Nipawin, that advocate of truth and moral rectitude would have wanted to apologize for the inaccuracy of his predictions, or at least he would have congratulated the Government on its sound financial management. But did he apologize, Mr. Speaker? Certainly not. Did he offer congratulations, Mr. Speaker, you know that he did not? He was completely silent on this issue, when only last year it was such a great big issue to him. I wonder why he was so silent about it this year? Was it because he opposes government assistance to the beef industry in Saskatchewan? If so, then surely he should speak out and say that the Conservative Party is opposed to any assistance to the beef producers of this province. Or was it because he opposes government assistance to victims of disasters over which they have no control? If so,

Mr. Speaker, then surely he should speak out to the people of Moose Jaw and Lumsden and Estevan and Davidson and Watrous and say under a Conservative government there would be no disaster assistance in this province; there would be no aid for persons who lose their homes, their belongings and their livelihood because of floods, tornadoes or other disasters.

Mr. Speaker, since the Leader of the Conservative Party did not talk about any of these things that he might have been expected to talk about, what did he have to say? Well, Mr. Speaker, he got out his home-made calculator, he consulted his little book on accounting made easy for beginners and he proceeded to cry kiting and juggling. Remember those two words, he repeated them over and over again. Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the Hon. Member got his training in accounting, his so called financial expertise. But I do know that the Provincial Auditor is a qualified Chartered Accountant and his report makes no mention of kiting and juggling.

And then the Member for Nipawin said he would demonstrate that there was something strange about the Government accounting, that he would demonstrate examples of this kiting and juggling that he had talked about. So he put on an interesting demonstration. He demonstrated his total ignorance of the fundamental principles of budgeting and accounting. He demonstrated that he can't distinguish between an asset and a liability or between revenues and expenditures. He demonstrated that he doesn't understand balance sheets or financial statements. He demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a complete and total tragedy if he should ever be entrusted with the responsibility to manage the finances of this province. But perhaps most damning to both Opposition parties, Mr. Speaker, were the revelations made in this debate by Liberal and Conservative spokesmen in respect of the health care issue.

What could the people of Saskatchewan expect if a Liberal Government were elected? In the light of what they have said, the picture is beginning to unfold itself as to where the Liberals stand on the health question. Liberals would reintroduce health care premiums. How much, they do not say. Is it going to be \$300 or \$500 a year? Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know. Liberals during this debate said that they would introduce deterrent fees if they had a chance. How high would they be? Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party has an obligation to tell the people how much the deterrent fees would be in respect of medical care in hospitals.

The Liberals say that they would eliminate the 'frills'. What do they include in their category of 'frills', Mr. Speaker? Well, Mr. Speaker, in the health area they say that dental care for children is a frill, they say that the hearing aid plan for the old people is a frill, they say that the prescription drug plan is a frill, that is what they say, Mr. Speaker. That is what the Liberals are saying that if they had a chance every health program that was introduced since 1971 would be done away with, Mr. Speaker. That is what the Liberals have said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I know all Members will want an opportunity to clinch all of the wonderful arguments that are made during Estimates and it is a pity that they can't be heard when they are clinching those arguments and I know I want to get it from both sides of the House and I should like a little order so that I can hear them.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: Mr. Speaker, and what about the Conservatives? Well, at least two Tories support deterrent fees. One proposed a \$10 daily hospital charge. Perhaps the most revealing was the shocking Tory grandstand play on the so-called 'filthy' hospitals. What a shameful display, Mr. Speaker, here was the Leader of the Conservative Party levelling charges against every hospital board, every hospital administrator, every hospital employee in the province. And when his one specific charge was proved false, did he apologize? Did he clear the air Mr. Speaker? No, he responded with bluster, promising more charges, and proof. Well Mr. Speaker, this Legislature has been waiting. We have been waiting since April 14 for the Conservatives to come and present the proof. We have waited for almost four solid weeks almost four solid weeks. Where is the proof, Mr. Speaker? We're still waiting. Where are those filthy hospitals, Mr. Speaker? The fact is that Saskatchewan's health care programs are the envy of North America. Their standards are as high as any on this continent, and those standards are being maintained and improved upon.

What more can I say about this Budget Mr. Speaker, that has not already been said in the Budget Speech or by colleagues during the Budget Debate? It is a confident Budget and a realistic financial plan for the year ahead. It is realistic because it recognizes that we face some levelling off in growth in the year ahead. It is realistic because it recognizes that we are not immune to the uncertainty of performance of the Canadian economy. It is realistic because it deals with the partial withdrawal of federal funding for cost-sharing programs. It is a confident Budget because in the face of those realities, it does not look backwards.

This confidence is reflected in our determination to maintain and improve high standards of health care, education and social programs and in our commitment to increase the supply of housing, to increase assistance to municipalities and to help to build new recreational and cultural facilities, and also to introduce a very important new program Safety '77, which I believe will save lives and will save money for the people of Saskatchewan.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, by leave of this Assembly and in accordance with Rule 48, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move second and third reading of this Appropriation Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse) Mr. Speaker, one cannot allow the prorogation of this House to occur before making some comments on the fantastic speech of the Minister of Finance. I think we have to be charitable to the Minister of Finance. One can realize certainly from listening to that particular speech that the Minister of Finance expected the House to adjourn tomorrow. That is very evident because basically he had no time to prepare that speech or to adequately look at it and to deal more specifically with it.

The Minister of Finance accused the Opposition of not talking about the Budget, about not taking a positive position on the aspects of the Budget, or to provide positive alternatives

to the Budget which we have before us. Let me say that the Minister of Finance is half right. I can certainly say that the Progressive Conservatives certainly never provided any conversation or positive alternatives to the Budget as presented. But, Mr. Speaker, the official Opposition certainly talked about the Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: The official Opposition, Mr. Speaker certainly talked about the low priority which Treasury Benches placed on agriculture and that we dealt with today. We talked about the low priority and the contempt which this Government and Treasury Benches has for our greatest resource, which is agriculture, and its people that provide the incentive to make that resource grow.

Mr. Speaker, the official Opposition talked about Government's inability to funnel needed funds into future development and future diversity, stabilization that this agricultural industry in the province needs so badly. We talked about the inability of this Government to funnel funds away from that bureaucracy; a Government which is prepared to spend 67 per cent of its agricultural budget on the housing of civil servants and the hiring of more civil servants.

Mr. Speaker, we presented positive alternatives, we presented sound alternatives, we presented our policy, and all that this province needs is a government in this province to have the guts and the courage to implement something that is going to develop this province for the future.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt from my comments that I will not be supporting the Appropriation Bill.

MR. R. H. BAILEY: (Rosetown-Elrose) Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that the Minister of Finance would have taken the opportunity to read his speech over before coming to the House. He did have some difficulty with it because someone else wrote it and though you may be pressed for time, Mr. Minister, I noted your own colleagues didn't do that good a job of paying attention to what you had to say.

Mr. Minister, criticism levelled at the Conservatives in the House was rather a weak attempt to discredit the positions we have taken. Weak indeed in that when you criticized the Leader of the Conservative party for statements which he had made . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: . . . you say . . .

MR. BAILEY: I will get to that too. I'm glad you mentioned that. I'll get to that.

The fact is that during the year, Mr. Minister, you did juggle the funds and pull some \$65 million from the Liquor Board, some \$35 million out of the Energy Fund. These are but two examples in which \$100 million was taken out of one fund and placed in the other. You can't deny that, Mr. Minister. Without doing that, without doing just those two items alone, you well would have had a deficit. Make no mistake about it, and

you certainly cannot refute that at this particular time.

It is very interesting when the Minister of Finance mentions the Disaster Fund, the windstorm which swept through. What happened to the Government when they were faced with their first disaster? Immediately the Government pulled out of it and your television ads say that there will be no more Disaster Fund. Shame on you Mr. Minister for even bringing that to the attention of the House.

You know Mr. Minister, last year in the heat of the debate during Finance, the Minister stood up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and he said, "There were two Conservatives and they tried to bribe me and they were trying to get information from me". At that particular time we asked the Minister to name them and so on and you know, Mr. Minister, over a year has gone by and I wonder if the Minister, with the closing of the Session, I wonder if the Minister could inform the press and tell everybody in the Assembly who was here at that time, just who those Members were? I wonder if at this particular time if he would be prepared to do that?

Mr. Minister, you mentioned a statement which I made in the House and you deliberately tried to take a statement which I made during the debate and the Estimates on Health, you deliberately took this statement and tried to inform this Assembly this evening that I had said that the hospital fee should be \$10 a day. Now, Mr. Minister, I challenge you this evening to get hold of the Hansard and you will see what I said. I said this, and I want to make it abundantly clear. This holier than thou 'art holy Government will take anything, anything at all . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I wonder if we can have some order. I would like to hear what the gentleman's comments are. Proceed.

MR. BAILEY: The Minister of Health, Mr. Finance Minister, will tell you that I had said during the time of inability of people to get into the hospitals, and the long waiting lists and I said that people at that particular time would have gladly paid \$10 a day to get into the hospital. That is exactly what I said, and any other comment which you try to build up, Mr. Minister, is absolutely and completely out of order.

Mr. Minister, I am surprised that you had mentioned during your deliberations about the state of the Government. We have seen in this Assembly, since March 7 to come back to dealing with the affairs in financing, all kinds of mismanagement, and you know it.

The Minister who sits next to you (Mr. Bowerman), in his department alone, it is well known to be in an unholy mess of mismanagement. There is no other way, and you can yell all you like from your benches over there, you know that is true.

We listened tonight, and have previously in Question Period and taken a look at the portfolio of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, particularly SEDCO. The whole operation for which Opposition Members have very little ability to get any information whatsoever is a terror to the people of this province and to the Government benches opposite. There is a great deal of mismanagement. Today it was brought up, the possible conflict of interests. We have also seen Ministers, Cabinet Ministers,

particularly the Minister of Health, undermined in presenting Bill 51, undermined by the fact that the Premier and his aides let the Bill die on the Order Paper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in summing up I should like to say just a few words. I think that the Government would be well advised to make every attempt in the Third Session of this Legislature to try not to delay the opening of the Session so that it runs into this time of the year. We have seen on both sides of this House a goodly number of empty seats. If you take the late start of the Legislature, couple that with the early spring, and of course another particular incident which is going on at the present time, the Pelly by-election, you will find that indeed a lot of the attention that should have been focused in this House is being focused outside the House.

Mr. Speaker, you will also find that the Session wasn't without a little humor. I think to me the most humorous incident of all was the new Minister and Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) trying to dig up an old cliché or an old attachment you might say of the Ku Klux Klan. I found in visiting the Arm River constituency, Mr. Speaker, that his own colleagues and his own people just think that is one of the most hilarious things that they have heard mentioned for years, most hilarious. Mr. Speaker, needless to say with the way in which the Government has bungled around the affairs of Industry and Commerce, conflict of interest, the reports of the Auditor stating very clearly that many reports were not audited, the fact that the Government has pulled money from two or three sources to make the Budget look good and balanced out right we cannot support this Bill.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD: (Indian Head-Wolsely) Mr. Speaker, on this last night of this Session, on the 56th day, I believe, the Attorney General told me today, I cannot refrain from making a few comments.

First of all I must say in all honesty that in the 16 or 17 sessions that I have been here, this is the dullest and most boring Session that I have ever participated in. The reason is that perhaps I might describe this Session and the participation of each of the three parties with three words — the NDP were cautious; the Tories were confused, and the Liberals were constructive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, let me explain those three words. Those fellows opposite are supposed to be the people with the great leap forward. Mr. Speaker, never did a government come in with a more timorous approach, with a more tired approach. In only five years of government, those people over there are bankrupt of ideas and just examine the Order Paper to see if this is not true.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I talk about the NDP being cautious. First of all they never dared bring in any controversial legislation. First, they brought in one Bill that received a little opposition — Bill No. 51 and they ran with every means at their disposal and left the Minister of Health hanging and with a complete vote of lack of confidence on his

behalf. It was a shameful performance. They didn't dare bring in no fault insurance. This Session might be characterized in another way as the SEDCO rift, or the SEDCO strip. They stripped it of \$16 million, Mr. Speaker. The only bills that they brought in this Session were housekeeping bills.

Let me talk about some of the other things. It will also be remembered as the year that the Minister of Labour introduced retroactively the withdrawal of a telephone call. It will also be remembered as the Session where the Attorney General stood on his feet and once tried to pretend he had some common sense. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only Member on the other side of the House who kept you out of trouble was the Member for Milestone (Mr. Lange).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, we also heard that there is a new rumor that there is going to be an additional Cabinet Minister, and this Cabinet Minister may be a Minister without portfolio, and he may not even be paid, and it may be a position for Henry Baker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Speaker, let me now talk a little bit about the confusion of the Tories. And I say confusion, Mr. Speaker. First of all when we start talking about the Tory confusion in the seat belt legislation they didn't know what to do. They didn't want to take a stand, they turned around and they said, let's have a plebiscite. We don't want to make that decision, we are not elected to do that. Let's let somebody else do it, let's transfer it back to the people.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, we sat here and one of the fundamental democratic rights of democracy came up and they sat on their hands because Dickie was in Pelly and they couldn't decide.

I could go on Mr. Speaker and talk about some of the things that they have done and with the absolute confusion. In most cases they refused to participate in the debate; in most cases they refused to participate in the House, because after all the Tories didn't know where to go, they were afraid to take a position and, therefore, they demonstrated their confusion day in and day out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: Let me now talk about the constructive approach of the Liberal Party.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Members of the Government that the only Bills that were worthwhile in this House were Bills that my colleagues here introduced. I can enumerate some of them for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: The Information Act, The Marriage Act, The True Cost of Government Act . . . I could go on with all the amendments

that were accepted by the Government. Never before, Mr. Speaker, in the history of my experience in this House, has a Government been forced to accept so many amendments by the Opposition to rectify the mistakes that they made in their own legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: No, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that this has been a very, very strange Session of the Legislature. As I say, the caution of the Government was because they were going into a by-election and they got kicked in the trousers on two by-elections . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: Oh, they got kicked very hard, and now when they are entering the third they don't dare do anything that anybody might construe as a new idea, a controversial idea and they are walking forward on tip toe . . . the tip toeing through the tulips . . . one day they stand on this foot and the next day they are on this foot. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I don't ever recall in all sincerity, all joking aside, a session as non-productive, a session which means less for the people of Saskatchewan, a session that has produced less Bills that will make an impact on the social and economic problems of the Province of Saskatchewan than this Session, and why? Because the NDP is afraid to go out in Saskatchewan and take a bold new look and the Tories are so danged confused that they are scared too in case they will be accused of taking a stand on something which might lose them a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for the Appropriation Bill.

MR. R. A. LARTER: (Estevan) Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I have enjoyed being with these wonderful Members through this Session.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK: I was interested in some of the remarks of the previous three speakers, particularly the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley. When he talked about confusion, it was interesting to note when he talked about the Conservatives being confused, and I concur with him, but he should have also included the Liberals in that massive confusion.

Remember The Consumers' Warranty Bill, Mr. Speaker, and the Liberals said that they were all for the Bill, and then when the Bill came up for the vote, what did the Liberals do? They voted against it. Now this is an example of leadership that is so obvious and so evident in the Liberal caucus these days.

I was also interested in the remarks about the Hon. Member making reference to the two by-elections. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there'll be another one in a few more days that will be able to test how the popularity of the Liberals is and how the popularity of the Conservatives is, because in the New Democratic Party feel pretty confident that with the kinds of programs that we have been introducing, the kind of budget that we have had, the kind of legislation which is here, that the voters of Pelly are going to ensure that an NDP Member is returned to this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: Mr. Speaker, reference has been made that the Liberals presented alternatives, Mr. Speaker, it has been 56 days and we waited, I would like to hear those alternatives. The only alternatives that the Liberals have to present is to reduce the taxes, cut in the public service and somehow at the same time increase expenditures for various programs. We have heard Liberals say that you need more money for agriculture, you need more money for police protection, need more money for education, need more money for road construction, need more for hospital care, practically in every program they say that there is more money needed yet at the same time you have got to reduce taxes which reduces services to the people. Mr. Speaker, if you are going to introduce programs you have to provide for the people to run those programs.

We in our Government believe that our public servants are doing a good job for the people of Saskatchewan and we do not regret the public service that we have.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elrose made reference to the revenues that we are getting from the liquor profits and from the Energy and Resource Development Fund. I don't know where the Member has been all these years, but if you take any interest in government and in politics, he would have noticed that certainly during the entire period that I have been a Member of the Legislature, since 1964 that every government derives a certain amount of its revenue from the Liquor Board profits. We make no apologies for taking \$35 million from the Energy and Resource Development Fund to finance the health programs and other programs. We have said to the people, that we will use funds from the resources, resource development for developing programs for the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, we make no apologies.

When it comes down to the question of the management of this Government, management of programs that we operate, people from all across Canada, other administrations, come to examine our administrative procedures. Mr. Speaker, this Government can take pride in giving leadership to public administration. We make no apologies for the expenditures that we make on various public programs in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second and third time.

ROYAL ASSENT AND PROROGATION

At 10:27 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Administrator having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

His Honour, the Administrator was then pleased to deliver the following speech:

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at the Legislative Assembly. In doing so I wish to thank you and

congratulate you on the work you have done.

You have taken steps to improve conditions for working people by making overtime after 44 hours voluntary and by more clearly defining the rights and responsibilities of workers to participate in occupational health and safety committees at their place of work.

You have increased pensions for disabled workers and their dependants.

To protect and conserve our natural gas resources, you have granted new powers and duties to the Natural Gas Development and Conservation Board.

You have provided capital financial assistance for communities constructing cultural and recreational facilities.

You have enacted legislation to regulate the practice of denturists and ophthalmic dispensers.

In the face of the rising toll of traffic deaths and injuries, you have provided funds for a wide range of safety programs and passed laws to make the use of seat belts mandatory and to establish a Traffic Safety Court.

You have taken steps to provide closed circuit television service for Saskatchewan people.

You have established a new pension plan for the province's public servants and provided additional sums for persons already superannuated.

To give further protection to Saskatchewan consumers, you have passed legislation setting out basic statutory warranties and reasonable standards of product durability, quality and safety. This is the first products warranties legislation in Canada.

You have amended The Snowmobile Act to clarify the liability of landowners to snowmobilers.

You have completed a major revision of the law affecting business corporations.

I thank you for the provision you have made to meet the further requirements of the Public Service, and I assure you that this sum of money will be used economically, prudently and in the public interest.

In taking leave of you, I thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the Session and wish you the full blessing of Providence.

The Hon. Mr. Cowley, Provincial Secretary, then said:

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Administrator that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it pleases His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

His Honour then retired from the Chamber at 10:35 o'clock p.m.