

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

March 21, 1978.

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

MOTIONS

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON RULES AND PROCEDURES

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North):— I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Wiebe, the hon. member for Morse:

That the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):— Mr. Speaker, in the east gallery we have today, and I introduce them to you and to other members, a number of students from Douglas Park School with Don Taylor, one of their teachers. We have in addition, a number of students from California, about 40 students, Mr. Speaker, on an exchange with Saskatchewan. Some of our students, from the constituency that I am fortunate enough to represent, will be visiting California. I think as all members, particularly members opposite should know, the United States is our largest supplier and our best customer and in my view one of our best international friends. I am sure that you and all members will join with me in welcoming Douglas Park School and our American guests to the Assembly today.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the member for Wascana in welcoming these students from Bakersfield, California to the Legislature today. Since Saturday they have no doubt been touring Regina and participating in cultural and educational activities which the people of Saskatchewan enjoy. I am sure they will have interesting stories to tell their friends and families when they return to Bakersfield, perhaps particularly about their prowess in ball hockey, which, I understand is a game which is played there and here as well. I know that their friends from the Douglas Park School are looking forward to visiting Bakersfield next week and I wish the students from Douglas Park an enjoyable and memorable visit.

I share with the member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) the fond feelings for our neighbor the United States. Since the founding of both of our nations, the United States and Canada, have been with a few notable but short exceptions, friends. And throughout the many decades of our friendship we have exchanged our wealth and our ideas and our support. We have the much publicized, longest undefended border in the world. On behalf of the government of Saskatchewan and all the members of the Assembly I will take an opportunity to present to the students from Bakersfield, a copy of a book, "Between Friends" — "Entre Amis", in this case. This book celebrates the peace and friendship which our countries enjoy and I hope that through its many beautiful

photographs and quotations the students will come to recall their visit to Saskatchewan. I have inscribed it, "With best wishes from your many friends in Saskatchewan, Allan E. Blakeney, Premier".

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.H. LANGE (Bengough-Milestone):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a group of students from Radville, Saskatchewan. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery, 22 in number and in Grade Eight. For those members of the Legislative Assembly and for those students from California, for the information of those people, Radville is situated about 40 miles from the American border and straight south of Regina and is the heart of the Bengough-Milestone constituency. It is well-known as an agricultural centre and a social and cultural centre in the south with a great deal of bilingual background. There are a lot of French Canadian people in Radville. This group of students is accompanied by Mr. Ed Borsa, who is their teacher and also a very good friend, I might add of Mr. John Kowalchuk, the member for Melfort. As well as being the geographic centre of Bengough-Milestone, I think Radville has some significance in terms of the last three years of debate in this House since it was where potash was first discovered in Saskatchewan in 1942. I wish to welcome the students to the Legislative Assembly and I look forward to meeting with them later on.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to join with the Premier and the member for Regina Wascana welcoming on behalf of the Conservative caucus the guests from California. I note the very kind words some of the students made on the news last night when they were interviewed. The response they gave to the fine hospitality they have received from the Regina students and their desire to give the same type of hospitality when the Regina students go to California next week. We thank you for your kind words and I know that you will give the same type of hospitality you have received. Our thanks to the students from Regina for making them feel welcome when they arrived in Regina.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SGEA STRIKE

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):— Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of the Public Service Commission. I note, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members as well that the SGEA strike continues apparently without the concern of the government and I ask the minister what you are doing to resolve this matter and end the problems, particularly the problems in the administration of justice, Land Titles, the courts? What positive steps is the government taking to resolve what is developing into a very serious problem?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance):— Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the first question about what the government is doing to try to resolve the dispute, as the hon. member will have no doubt heard in the news media, a mediator has been appointed who is mutually acceptable to both parties. He is currently involved in mediation and my hope is that we will be able to resolve the differences with the aid of the mediator within a short period of time.

In the case of the problems that do arise because of picket lines, this is part of the price that you pay for the free collective bargaining in which this government believes. There are naturally some inconveniences but I think, by and large the inconveniences to the public have been minimal and the union members have been quite co-operative, but as I say there has been the odd inconvenience.

MR. MERCHANT:— Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I did note the appointment of an active New Democrat and former deputy minister and I ask the minister whether that mediator has specific instructions regarding your insistence on a two-year contract. I ask whether the insistence on a two-year contract is the principle stumbling block to settlement and I ask whether it is not true that a big part of the motivation in stonewalling for a two-year contract is that the government wants to avoid the political problems you fear in having labor negotiations next year, during a provincial election?

MR. SMISHEK:— Mr. Speaker, we have indicated a desire for a two-year elective bargaining agreement. The hon. member may have noted that quite a number of unions in the public sector area have been settling for two-year collective bargaining agreements. The mediator is free to mediate. I hope that he will be able to resolve the dispute, or assist the parties to resolve the dispute. He has not been given any specific instructions. He is a free mediator.

FARM COST PRODUCTION

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):— I would like to direct a question through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, as you are aware, through the question period yesterday, the Alberta government has allowed a discount of eight cents a gallon and effective April 1st, that will be increased to 12 cents a gallon. I want to know, Mr. Minister, will you now consider a re-introduction of the farm cost reduction program and, with some modification designed along the lines of Alberta's program where there is far less administrative red tape and is going to result in a far more efficient type of system where there is no limit on the amount of fuel purchased. Mr. Minister, I just want to know, will now you reconsider the re-introduction of the farm cost reduction program.

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):— No, Mr. Speaker, we are not anticipating such a move.

MR. BIRKBECK:— Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Very simply, Mr. Minister. Are you telling this Assembly, and in fact through this Assembly the farmers of this province, that in these times of low net returns, you are not about to do anything, Mr. Minister? By your own admission, you have said that you cannot do anything about the prices that farmers are paid for their products except through your notorious marketing board concept and, by your own admission again, you admit that the farmers are not prepared to accept that proposal. This is one area in which you can do something — you can reduce those costs to the farmers.

SMDC PROPOSAL

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition):— A question to the minister in charge of SMDC. Yesterday's Leader Post carried a story on its financial page that Inexco Canada, one of the government's or the SMDC's partner in the Key Lake development, has decided to sell its assets, subject to some conditions, to Denison

Mines Limited of Canada, the purchase price being some 158.5 million dollars. Presumably, the purchase price also refers to Alberta property this government would not have an interest in. My question to the minister, and I think this is a matter of some public concern, does SMDC have, at this time, an option to match the offer of Denison or right of first refusal to purchase the assets of Inexco Canada Limited, both within the province and without the province. If there is such a right of first refusal can the minister indicate to me whether the government has determined whether or not it will exercise that right?

MR. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):— Mr. Speaker, as I understand the proposal that Denison has made to Inexco, it is for the purchase of properties solely within the province of Saskatchewan. In answer to the member's second question pertaining to whether or not SMDC has a right of first refusal, the answer to that is, yes. We have 60 days to exercise that right of first refusal. I believe that one of the most important options in the Denison proposal relates to the outcome of the Bayda Inquiry, and ultimately, the decision of the government in regard to uranium mining in Northern Saskatchewan. I don't believe that we will be undertaking to give consideration to our right of first refusal until Bayda has had the opportunity to report, and the government has had an opportunity to consider what its position will be pertaining to uranium mining at that time.

MR. MALONE:— Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The story does indicate Alberta properties, I thank the minister for the information that it is strictly Saskatchewan we are concerned with at this time. A twofold question, Mr. Speaker. It is apparent that if Bayda does not come down within 60 days with his report that the government is going to be put in an awkward position, to say the least, with the 60 day first right of refusal period.

A secondary question as well — the story also refers to government permission for this transaction to take place and it is plural, presumably federal and provincial. Should the government decide not to exercise the right of first refusal that it has, can the minister tell me what the government's position will be as to whether or not you will give them permission to allow Inexco to sell its assets to Denison?

MR. MESSER:— Mr. Speaker, I can recognize the observations made by the Leader of the Liberal Party that perhaps the 60 day option and its relation to the Bayda Report coming down may present some problems. I don't believe that it would be credible for this government to undertake to endorse, in any way, either for or against the proposal that Denison has made to Inexco until we have the opportunity to look at the report that we expect shortly from Bayda and as a government to come to a decision in relation to whether or not there is going to be uranium mining in northern Saskatchewan. To do anything else, I think, is not really conclusive with regard to the proposal that Denison has made to Inexco. We first have to have the benefit of the Bayda Report. We, secondly, have to be able to have the opportunity to decide, as government, whether or not there is going to be mining activity in northern Saskatchewan, particularly on these properties.

MR. MALONE:— Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would tell the Assembly whether the first right of refusal, which you hold, would amount to paying the same amount as offered by Denison to Inexco or whether it would be a lesser amount or some amount determined by evaluation by independent authorities?

MR. MESSER:— Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier we have not, at this particular point

in time as far as Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation is concerned, considered the position that we may take in regard to the 60 day option. We are fully aware of the \$158.5 million US that has been offered. I would expect that if we were going to exercise our 60 day option and expect to give some sort of consideration by Inexco, the offer would have to equal that or be better than that. We are not, at this particular point in time, disclosing whether we are interested in making that kind of offer. We first have to wait, as I said earlier, on the Bayda Report and the ultimate decision of the government.

GASOLINE PRICE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General. Yesterday, I understand that in the House a number of questions were asked related to the gasoline price difference between Alberta and Saskatchewan. The question I want to direct to you, Mr. Attorney General, is this, is there anything within the provincial regulations that will prevent anyone in Saskatchewan — and I am thinking of those from a 50 to 100 mile radius — of trucking their fuel from out of Saskatchewan, from Alberta into Saskatchewan? Is there any regulation to prevent this because my own area was informed yesterday that a number of people intend on doing just this thing — like the old rum running, it now becomes gas running and diesel fuel running. Is there any stipulation within provincial government to prevent this?

MR. ROMANOW:— I will take notice.

MR. BAILEY:— A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If there are no provincial regulations in order, Mr. Attorney General, would it not seem advisable for the government then, in order to give protection to those who are dealing in this petroleum industry within the radius of 100 miles of the border, to give some protection to them and, secondly, Mr. Attorney General, if there were some regulations in place, to have some idea as to the enforcement of the regulations of the transporting of fuel for individual purposes?

MR. SPEAKER:— Just on that particular point the member raises, the member is getting very close to being out of order on the type of question because he is asking a solution or an interpretation of a document which is equally available to him as it is to other members of the House and, "He shall not seek interpretation of a statute or a minister's powers," and I think it is falling very close to that area.

HEAVY OIL DEVELOPMENT

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):— Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources with respect to heavy oil development. In view of the fact that until an announcement can be made about whether or not that heavy oil plant at Lloydminster will proceed, heavy oil production and expansion of production in Saskatchewan is going to remain in limbo. I would like to ask the minister what positive steps he is taking and what success he is having with respect to a guarantee of supply to the potential plant in Lloydminster?

MR. MESSER:— Mr. Speaker, I believe the member is somewhat misinformed if he thinks that heavy oil extraction activity is in limbo. There is, I think, a record pace in regard to primary, secondary and tertiary recovery ventures in Saskatchewan pertaining to heavy oil recovery. I convey to him as I have conveyed to other members of

this Legislature on occasions in the past that we have a joint program \$16.2 million between the federal and provincial governments to encourage tertiary recovery of heavy oil in Saskatchewan that has been received very well by the industry and there is considerable activity because of that program. I might also remind the member that the last two land sales in the province of Saskatchewan have been, Mr. Speaker, record land sales in regard to obtaining properties which have potential heavy oil development. All in all I am sure that the member for Kindersley, if he was to talk to the oil industry and I suggest that he would on occasion, they would convey to him that there is an accelerating interest in regard to heavy oil extraction in Saskatchewan and it is by no means in limbo at this particular point in time.

MR. McMILLAN:— Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that virtually all of the heavy oil production and prospective production of heavy oil in Saskatchewan is in the hands of private companies and that they are not at this time prepared to proceed with extensive drilling programs until they find out what happens with respect to heavy oil plants, can you tell me what steps you have taken either through Saskoil or the Department of Mineral Resources to see that the allocation of that heavy oil production can be directed towards a heavy oil plant?

MR. MESSER:— Mr. Speaker, we have had ongoing discussions with the oil industry in total. Just last week we introduced to them the regulations that we are considering in regard to Bill 47, The Oil Well Income Tax Act. The industry is now considering those regulations. Certainly some of the industry will be relating those regulations to heavy oil and what incentives there may be there for them to accelerate beyond the present level their activities in relation to the extraction of heavy oil in the Lloydminster area, oil that will be designated to the upgrading facility. Mr. Speaker, I again say that there is no evidence and certainly there has been no communiqué from the oil industry to my department or to myself indicating that they are somewhat concerned about the present situation in relation to the upgrading facility or the lack of activity or the lack of enthusiasm of the government of Saskatchewan pertaining to primary, secondary or tertiary recovery of heavy oil in this province.

MR. McMILLAN:— Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that as a result of the fact that you are not even proceeding with negotiations for the direct receipt of heavy oil production in Saskatchewan from the private companies, that you, yourself, hold little or no hope for the development of a heavy oil refinery or upgrading plant at Lloydminster?

MR. MESSER:— Mr. Speaker, there is not one scrap of truth to the statement that the member for Kindersley made. We have for some months been negotiating and discussing with the oil industry means of encouraging increased and enhanced recovery of heavy oil in the province of Saskatchewan. We have in effect, Mr. Speaker, given evidence through those negotiations to the oil industry and created an environment of optimism and enthusiasm for increased recovery of heavy oil in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that we are not able, with precision, to give to them the terms in a final sense, until we're able to finally introduce the regulations pertaining to Bill 47. They have said to us that that is not deterring them at this particular point in time and they are carrying on as they would have carried on had Bill 42 been in effect, and we would've been able to give to them the royalty concessions we proposed to them in December of 1977.

RAP

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):— Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of

the DNS — I asked earlier about some payments by the DNS to contractors under the RAP (Regional Assistance Program), payments which were made before the work was completed, and some more information has come to light from the Prince Albert Daily Herald last Friday. It says, "Some of the residents in Cumberland House were short-changed because the Department of Northern Saskatchewan had authorized payments for work on their homes before the work was completed." A councillor for Cumberland House said, "Because of this problem, local residents are now being requested to pay for the balance of the work that had to be done." This problem is well over a year old, Mr. Minister. Can you tell us today what the DNS is doing for these eight residents in the Cumberland House area to try to help them get their homes finished and also what steps the DNS has taken to get the contractor back to finish the work he has been paid for in total, a year ago?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan):— Mr. Speaker, I attempted to answer this question many times for the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake but in order that I can get a more detailed answer for him with respect to the specific questions he raises today, I'll take the matter as notice and will attempt to get the information for which he asks. I indicate to you again that the investigation, which is being conducted as a result of the information raised regarding the RAP in Cumberland House, is taking place. Until our investigation is concluded I cannot give the member a specific answer with respect to it but I'll take the questions under notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WIPF:— Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Mr. Minister, this investigation has been going on for over a year now and these homes have not been finished for over a year. I'm wondering how much time you feel you have to have yet, another year or are you hiding behind the RCMP and blaming them for holding you up and holding up the investigation?

MR. BOWERMAN:— I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the only member who is really blaming the RCMP is the member across the floor. He's found it appropriate to continue to raise in the House this question when I have continued to give him the answer with respect to the investigation. The only conclusion that I can draw from the member's questions is that he wants to implicate the RCMP in not doing their job.

MR. SPEAKER:— I'll take the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE — UTILITY INDUSTRY

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):— A question to the Minister in charge of SPC. Mr. Minister, the deputy general manager of SPC is quoted in the Regina Leader Post today as saying that consumer groups, environmentalists, land owners, politicians, individual customers and other groups are detractors and have created a crisis of confidence in the utility industry. Mr. Minister, do we take it that this is a policy of the minister and SPC and that he does intend to continue to ignore these groups?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):— No, Mr. Speaker. It was the intention, as it always has been of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and/or other Crown corporations to have the minister announce the policy of that corporation, not some other official. I am not aware of the news article that the member relates to, so I can't comment further on it.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest the minister reads those remarks. I was wondering if the minister feels that we should have cheap

power at the expense of the local people, the local governments, the local landowners and that I should not have the right to speak on behalf of my constituents as his deputy minister says.

MR. MESSER:— Mr. Speaker, I think the member knows full well, as do the people of Saskatchewan, that Saskatchewan Power Corporation's record will speak for itself as to its charges for power and gas in the province of Saskatchewan.

REDUCTION IN AUTO INSURANCE PREMIUMS

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):— A question to the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office (SGIO). Mr. Speaker, in light of the Minister of Finance's statement in the Budget Address of March 7, that because of reduced injuries resulting from compulsory seat belt use, auto premiums would be reduced by an average of 5 per cent, effective May 1, 1978. Mr. Minister, given the fact the tobacco tax increase was effective at midnight March 7, adding \$3.2 million to government coffers, do you not agree that the people who by no fault of their own, must make application for their auto insurance prior to May 1, should be allowed this 5 per cent reduction effective on the day it was announced similar to the tobacco tax?

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs):— Well, it depends on your options, I suppose, but one must look carefully at the procedure that has to be taken in order to get the materials printed in order to put the material in the computer and it does take that much lead time, I assure you.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, you have just admitted that you are in fact penalizing those people who chose the month of April to renew their license and are not getting the rebate. Would you not make it effective the same date as the tobacco tax, the penalty tax that you have placed, and give the rebate to these people on the same basis?

MR. WHELAN:— The only observation I want to make is that whatever decrease there is will be stretched over a period of 12 months and if you don't get it this April, you'll get next April. I think that's fair. I don't see anything wrong with that.

REDUCTION IN SGIO RATES

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):— A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister in charge of SGIO. In view of the indication yesterday in the Annual Report of SGIO that the number of automobile claims in 1977 increased about 3,200, and that the dollar value of the increase of those claims was \$7.4 million over '76, I'm curious to know how you support the statement in the Minister of Finance's Budget Speech that you are reducing the rate 5 per cent as a result of the Safety '77 Program?

MR. WHELAN:— I think it is clearly enunciated in the annual report. You're just not reading it right. I suggest you take a good look at it. I have already gone over this a couple of times with you. I thought that you could wait until you got into Crown Corporations Committee and ask the question the proper place and the proper time. Just for your own reference, I think the hon. member should look at the increase in the number of accidents from 120,000 to 123,000 and the year before it jumped from 112,000 to 120,000. I said that the percentage increase in accidents had dropped and that is correct. I think if you look at page 11 you will find the explanation for it. I suggest that we will be prepared to explain in detail that explanation when we are in Crown

Corporations Committee.

MR. CAMERON:— In view of two things, in view firstly of the direction that you had from the Crown Corporations Committee unanimously a year ago to bring in amendments to avoid the discrimination of housewives under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act and in view secondly, of the fact that you report 120 per cent increase in net profit, I am asking you when can we expect some amendments to the act to increase the benefits which are so badly eroded by inflation?

MR. WHELAN:— Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, we should look at all of the circumstances. I am prepared to read into the record, if you like, the recommendations of the Reformatory Committee, the recommendations of the Sickness and Accident Committee. I also want to make reference to the hon. member since he is a candidate for that certain group, there are 37 recommendations that are far more important than any one you have raised in the Status of Women in Canada and you people are sitting there doing nothing about it. You are talking in terms of their income and their wages within the civil service. Why don't you do something about this?

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! I will take the next question.

SASK TEL HEAD OFFICE

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):— Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Sask Tel or the Minister in charge of Government Services. It is my information that the new Sask Tel head office that is being built downtown is a building that is not required, that the people of Sask Tel felt they had enough room, said they had enough room and that this new \$27 million "Byer's Palace" downtown is nothing but a political decision and had nothing to do with the people that operate Sask Tel at all. Could you answer that?

MR. BYERS:— I think it is more like the "Byer's Bungalow" than the "Byer's Palace". Mr. Speaker, I think there is an obvious need for the new head office. At present the administrative staff cannot be accommodated in the present head office at College and Albert. The total staff complement of Sask Tel is growing and will continue to grow. It is now in the order of 3,840 people whereas six years ago when there was very little activity, if any, in putting in coaxial cable there were 2,400, the staff has grown. It is therefore required to house the head office staff for that corporation.

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 3

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 3 showing:

The payments made, if any, outside Saskatchewan for repairs, gas or maintenance, etc. for government vehicles from January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977. (a) The number and charges made out of Saskatchewan for repairs, gas, oil and maintenance. (b) The employees who were assigned to each of the vehicles at the time of such maintenance or repairs or gas or oil purchase.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these are a series of questions that were asked prior to the

previous prorogation. At that time the minister responsible indicated, I believe in each case that they were endeavoring to obtain the information for me. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Bailey, the member for Rosetown-Elrose return no. 3.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my judgment this is a resolution which, by its very width, is incapable of a correct answer, a full answer.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— That's not what you said last time.

MR. ROMANOW:— That's exactly what I said last time. Just take a look at it, "The payments for repairs, gas, maintenance, etc. (I don't know what etc. means, what kind of a legal interpretation could be put on etc.) that there is for government vehicles outside the province of Saskatchewan."

Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear to everybody that the government is involved in all kinds of border work, at Flin Flon, the Creighton area, Lloydminster, Saskatchewan area. I just don't know how one could reasonably answer this. But perhaps I am in error so we'll let the Minister of Revenue make a comment on it.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue):— Mr. Speaker, I would simply make a few comments in line with what the Attorney General has said. There are 1,982 vehicles in the CVA fleet and there are employees going back and forth in the Flin Flon area, the Lloydminster area and the border points down around Estevan and Portal and places of that nature and to ask us to get the information that you are specifically asking for we would have to go through every credit slip. These are issued credit cards and they charge those items on those credit cards. We would have to thumb through every single credit slip. It would take two employees at least two months to find out whether or not the information the member is asking for is available. I think on that basis we should simply defeat that motion.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make a few comments on this particular item that has been requested by the member for Qu'Appelle. Now as an administrator I think that I can say that the amount of administration that the Minister of Revenue has suggested is going to take place with reference to this particular item is incorrect. The kind of procedures necessary to find this information would not necessitate going through every single bill and every single item of expense that had occurred outside the province of Saskatchewan because I am certain that the expenditures of the province of Saskatchewan are gauged such that the expenditures like that that are made outside the province of Saskatchewan, where they are involved in other kinds of jurisdictions, are kept separately in a separate account for purposes of accounting for the necessary records. I am sure that the Minister of Finance would concur with this that if it is necessary for the government employees to go outside of the province of Saskatchewan that they record their expenditures as being expenditures outside of the province of Saskatchewan rather than the ones that were inside and those are recorded and coded to a specific account. Said account could be pulled relatively easily and the expenditures for that particular item of expense could in fact be summarized relatively quickly and, therefore, the answers to the question could be relatively easily to obtain.

Now why ask such a question? Well, there are two reasons primarily. One, I think that it would be of importance for the people of Saskatchewan to know what kind of expenditures are being made by employees of the government of Saskatchewan

outside the jurisdiction of the province of Saskatchewan. For example, they might like to know what is the extent of the government of Saskatchewan employees' involvement outside the province of Saskatchewan? Are they involved in activities in Alberta and to what extent are they involved in activities in Alberta? Are they involved in activities in Manitoba and to what extent are they involved in activities in Manitoba? How much, for example, is that costing the people of Saskatchewan to involve the employees for travel expenses outside the province of Saskatchewan. By obtaining such information it may be possible for the people of Saskatchewan to discern to what extent — in other words if this is a significant number in terms of payments for this kind of expense then naturally the amount of time spent by the employees outside the province of Saskatchewan would be a significant number and should be reported to the people of Saskatchewan. I think that for two reasons: (1) it would be relatively easy to obtain this information, and (2) I think it's important that the people recognize the extent of the involvement of their civil service outside the province. I think it should be relatively easy for the government to answer this question and relatively quickly as well.

MR. BOWERMAN:— Mr. Speaker, just a comment with respect to the area in the northern administration district that would be affected by this resolution. Perhaps the member doesn't realize or doesn't understand that in order to get facilities — cars, trucks, services and goods to Uranium City during the summer you go up to Waterways and into Lake Athabasca. And then you suggest that the purchasing of gas when you leave Saskatchewan and go into Alberta, that the unit — take whatever unit number you want to, unit number 270 or whatever it is — that somehow that is recorded differently. It is not recorded differently. The gas purchases in Alberta as opposed to the purchase of gas in Saskatchewan and the tickets that would be kept in that way are not kept differently. I say that with respect to Flin Flon, Saskatchewan as opposed to Flin Flon, Manitoba. On what side of the boundary do you happen to buy a tank full of gas? Anytime that I go into Flin Flon by air I go out to Baker's Narrows and the employees if they are going to meet me, come to Baker's Narrows. Now that is 20 miles inside of the Manitoba border.

It is not anything that is going on in terms of a project or a program but in fact it does happen. Those people who travel from Creighton for example when number 106 is out and who come down via The Pas, Manitoba and come around by that route and then go back up into Cumberland House by car, again don't keep gas purchases separate or may not keep maintenance separate, that would be incurred on a trip of such kind. I don't see the significance of that but to go through every gas purchase ticket that is purchased in the public service in order to be able to accommodate that particular question seems to me to be far more extensive than what the information would serve the public of Saskatchewan.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):— I would just like to make a few comments on this. There must have been a change in government policy because under the old government at least, government credit cards were not applicable outside the province of Saskatchewan. If they are at this time that is something new. No, it's a fact; they weren't. If you made a purchase of gas or repairs outside the province of Saskatchewan you would have to obtain the bill and get reimbursement and that was a very logical reason. Is this not still the same policy?

MR. BOWERMAN:— How can you limit a credit card?

MR. MacDONALD:— No, no. I'm talking about the government white credit card — I mean the way we used to establish a white government credit card (I'm not sure if it's

still available). It wasn't applicable outside the province of Saskatchewan so therefore anybody who has a bill or a credit card other than the government white card they should be very easy to trace and it should not be a very difficult job to do. If you don't use the government credit card any more and you're using different ones, I can see the point.

Please have the minister, when he winds up debate, indicate: (1) are you still not using that white government credit card?

MR. ROBBINS:— Within the province.

MR. MacDONALD:— Within the province. Outside the province you are using credit cards and paying for the gas so there should be no problem with identification whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order!

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— Well, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that we caught the government with its pants down on this one. I wish the reporter from the CBC was in to observe this because if he wanted something about election expenses he would find that we were attempting to find how much the government opposite had spent around the time of the Manitoba election. It is very interesting that the government last session was prepared to give us the information. They wanted to consider it and now when they see the ramifications of it, oh, we have a big cover up. Now we can't figure it out. It is not that they can't figure it out, Mr. Speaker, it is that they won't give it to us and they won't give it to the people of this province. The reason for the refusal to give this information is because the government opposite is trying to hide the expenses that it paid for in the last Manitoba election, not really that it paid for, that the public of Saskatchewan, in fact, paid for.

The Attorney General was very alert when he picked that up and decided that the government was going to vote against this because that is the type of operation that he knows full well goes on and, in fact, he doesn't want the opposition to get that information.

The answers given by the treasury benches were, of course, specious, no validity. You know to have the Minister responsible for Revenue in this province decide that it is a little too much work to try and get the information is typical of what we are going to be running into in the future, when it is no longer the prerogative of this Assembly to demand public accountability and to demand information on government and public expenditures. You are going to fall behind the guise of, oh, it is a little too much work to look up, if it is politically embarrassing. Or it is Crown Corporations — we don't have to answer here or we can put it off a year later by changing the year end in the Crown corporations.

This refusal to give us the answer on this question, I think, typifies the attitude of the government opposite but I, in a way, commend the Attorney General for astutely picking up the question and very quickly ruling that, in fact, the government refused to give the answer to the opposition because it is going to be embarrassing. I think that that is just another nail in the coffin of the ability of this Assembly to review public expenditures and review expenditures of the public purse.

Motion negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 21

Malone	Stodalka	Lane (Qu'Ap)
Wiebe	McMillan	Birkbeck
Merchant	Nelson (As-Gr)	Berntson
MacDonald	Clifford	Lane (Sa-Su)
Penner	Collver	Wipf
Cameron	Larter	Thatcher
Anderson	Bailey	Katzman

NAYS — 30

Pepper	Banda	Cowley
Thibault	Whelan	Tchorzewski
Bowerman	Kaeding	Shillington
Smishek	Kwasnica	Vickar
Romanow	Dyck	Skoberg
Snyder	McNeill	Nelson (Yktn)
Byers	MacAuley	Allen
Lange	Feschuk	Johnson
Kowalchuk	Faris	Thompson
Robbins	Rolfes	Lusney

WELCOME TO STUDENTS — SENIOR CITIZENS

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont):— Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce a group of 30 student who have just come in to the Speaker's Gallery; they are 30 senior citizens from the University of Saskatchewan, Extension Division. Would you like to stand up and be recognized?

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— They are accompanied today by Dr. M. Alexander. I understand that we are going to be getting together for a few minutes after you leave the gallery and I look forward to that. I would like to welcome you this afternoon on behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):— Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join with the member for Rosemont in welcoming the university students. I must say that university students are getting younger and prettier every day and welcome to the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 5

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 5 showing:

The names of companies or individuals or partnerships under contract with the Government of Saskatchewan to supply personal services and copies of each contract, and if such contract is verbal, the dates of each contract and the amount of payment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have seen a proliferation on the federal and provincial level of rather than government firing employees as such, they are hiring individuals through contracts of services or they are hiring the personal management companies of individuals and apply paying their companies rather than paying the individuals. Now in many cases this has pretty great advantages for the individual employee, particularly now in light of the new income tax rules on the dividend tax credit. As well, however, it allows a great deal of flexibility on the part of the government because the individual is not paid as an employee although he does, in many cases, employee's work. He is allowed the flexibility of having a straight contract paid to his management company and then as long as he supplies particular services to the government, pursuant to a contract, it doesn't matter to the government when those are supplied. A prime example I suggest is the management contract I understand with one of the members, one of the employees of the Executive Council — the press officer, of the government opposite. Now obviously I think it incumbent upon the Assembly, if we are trying to review public expenditures, that we now look at a totally new direction in determining the expenses by the government for employment or for services rendered.

I have attempted, by the use of the words 'companies or individuals, or partnerships' so that there is no technical question as to payments being made, but as I say, we have seen both on the federal and the provincial level a great proliferation of governments paying individuals to keep them outside of the scope of the public service giving them one, the flexibility to determine the terms of employment by contract and individual contract between the government and the individual and in many cases, as I say, to give an advantage, an economic advantage to the employee who through a limited company will have greater take-home pay than he would if he were paid direct.

I, therefore, move, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) (and if I could have more than one seconder — the member for Regina South) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 5.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance):— Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the hon. member who has just moved the motion whether it was really his intention to word the motion in the way that he did because this motion creates some very serious problems, whether by intent or by accident, and I want to draw it to his attention.

If we were to answer or provide information based on this question we would have to reveal a great deal of information which at the present time is prohibited even by statute.

We enter into contracts with the medical profession. Every doctor, in the case of MCIC, enters into an agreement with the Medical Care Insurance Commission to provide medical services. Those are personal services. We would have to provide the income of

every physician. Now I am surprised that the member is seeking that kind of information. We saw, during the fall session, the Conservatives asking for information to reveal the names of social assistance recipients, how much they were paid. They even went as far as asking this House to provide information of whether those social assistance recipients were Indian, or of native ancestry.

Today, they are asking us to provide information, particular contracts, the wages, or the fees that are paid to all the doctors, to all the chiropractors, to all the physiotherapists and the dentists, because we do have contracts with them and the information that is requested would obligate us to provide that information contrary to some of the statutes.

Now I really wonder whether that was the hon. member's intent. I notice he is shaking his head that it was not his intent. I refer him to item No. 14 on page four, where his colleague seems to be asking the question that he was talking about. If that is the case, I would like the two Conservative members to get together. The hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake asks the names of persons presently employed under contract in the service of the government agencies, the length of term of contracts, and the amount of remuneration paid on a daily, monthly, or annual basis. Now, that is what the hon. member seemed to have talked about, but in his resolution, Mr. Speaker, he went much further. The next thing we know, not only will they be asking, once they get the information about all the doctors and the amount they were paid, I suppose they will next ask what particular service they provide to a particular patient. I think that is carrying things too far. There is such a thing as confidential information which is not in the interest, and which is, in fact, prohibited. I again raise the question with the hon. member, is he seeking the information that his colleague is seeking in Item 14? If he is, that should satisfy him because this goes much, much too far — it goes beyond the proper and legitimate bounds.

I ask the hon. members to defeat this resolution.

Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 6

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 6) showing:

The rate per mile charged the Executive Council by the Central Vehicle Agency for use of each of the government aircrafts in each of the years 1975, 1976 and January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I did not request that it be stood. Is there some reason for the alacrity with which you moved on that? Again, this is a matter that was raised prior to prorogation and it is requesting the rate for mile charged the Executive Council by the CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) for use of each of the government aircraft. Again, the minister responsible at that time undertook to supply that information. I assume we can expect it shortly and I therefore move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 6) showing. Seconded by the member from Saskatoon-Sutherland.

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue):— Mr. Speaker, I might just make one brief remark. I think we can supply this information very shortly and we will be agreeable to it.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 7

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 7) showing:

The amount budgeted and spent to November 15, 1977 for the government promotion of the Saskatchewan Family of Crown Corporations and the advertising agency or agencies who produced or placed the advertisements and the amount budgeted for on each ad agency and the amount paid to each agency as of November 15, 1977.

He said: I am glad this one is agreed by members opposite, because it indicates a complete change of views since prior to prorogation.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI:— Put in a sensible resolution and we will agree to it.

MR. LANE:— I am glad the Minister of Health agrees that this one is sensible, because the motion will read that the Order do issue for the amount budgeted and spent to November 15, 1977, for the government promotion of the Saskatchewan Family of Crown Corporations and the advertising agency or agencies who produced or placed the advertisements and the amount budgeted for on each ad agency and the amount paid to each agency as of November 15, 1977. The Minister of Health has already indicated from the Chair, Mr. Speaker, which gratifies me immensely that this was a sensible resolution that he agreed with. I know that the Minister of Revenue has also agreed. Rather than go through I think it would be in order for all members of the Assembly to indicate that the debate we went through prior to prorogation could be taken as read, and we do not have to go through it. I think the American system is that you can just table the speeches. I suppose that would be in order. That is the information requested, Mr. Speaker, and I therefore move Return No. 7.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 8

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 8 showing:

The names of companies or individuals or partnerships contracting with the Government of Saskatchewan for the supply of personal services to which were assigned or leased government vehicles or the names of shareholders of such vehicles who were assigned or leased government vehicles.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Return No. 8 basically deals with whether or not any of the individuals under contract of service or any company under contracts of services, or to supply personal services, where assigned government vehicles in which case we want the information as to those individuals affected who received government vehicles, if any. Seconded by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) that an Order of the Assembly to do issue for Return No. 8 showing.

MR. ROBBINS:— Mr. Speaker, I think I should make a few brief remarks with respect to this particular one that states the names of companies or individuals or partnerships

contracting with the Government of Saskatchewan for the supply of personal services to which were assigned or leased government vehicles or the names of shareholders of such vehicles who were assigned or leased government vehicles. For what period?

How could we be held responsible for knowing what went on in the period 1964 to 1971? Obviously, there is no way we could know all the contracts and agreements that were made between companies or individuals or partnerships at that time. I think, simply because it doesn't provide any single date at all in relation to the period of time that it requests this information, the Assembly should have no alternative other than to defeat the motion.

Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 9

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 9 showing:

The number of non-government employees who used government owned vehicles in each of the years 1976, and January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977 and the reason for such usage.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the next motion deals with a question tabled before the Assembly. Obviously, I am referring to on businesses opposed to the spouse of an employee who has been assigned a government vehicle for purposes other than which they were intended. I, therefore, move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 9 showing, seconded by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane).

MR. ROBBINS:— Mr. Speaker, I think I should say a few brief words with respect to this one. I note that the member for Qu'Appelle pointed out that non-government employees didn't include — if I heard him correctly — wives and families of personnel to whom vehicles have been assigned and I appreciate that information. I think we have to look at what is a non-government employee. Does it include contractual employees? Are they deemed to be non-government employees? And because I think we have to have a look at this one, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 10

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 10 showing:

Copies of the studies, if any, by the Government of Saskatchewan with regard to instituting minimum performance standards for licensed real estate agents.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is some concern among the real estate industry in Saskatchewan as to what direction the government may take with regard to regulating the industry, if it intends to do so and my request is merely for copies of the studies, if any, by the government of Saskatchewan with regard to instituting minimum performance standards for licensed real estate agents. I so move, seconded by the

member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane).

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):— Mr. Speaker, just a couple of brief comments here. With respect to this question, the answer is since 1971 there have been no studies. I don't know whether there were some in 1911 or not, which is the problem with the question. On the assumption that the member is asking sort of in the recent period, then I am prepared to accept the motion and we will provide him with the answer, nil, in due course.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 11

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 11 showing:

The agreements entered into between the Government of Saskatchewan or its correctional centres employees and prisoners in the correctional centres since 1971; and dates and copies of such agreements and the criteria used for selecting the prisoner representative.

He said: Mr. Speaker, one of the matters that came forward at the Moore Inquiry was an alleged agreement or an agreement between the correctional centre and some of the inmates and their representatives or their representative. I have requested that the government table before the Assembly any agreements entered into between the government of Saskatchewan or its correctional centres, employees and prisoners in the correctional centres since 1971 and dates and copies of such agreements and the criteria used for selecting the prisoner representative. I will assume that perhaps the criteria could differ from one institution to another. I would be interested in seeing the various criteria used. I therefore move, seconded by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) Return No. 11.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 12

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 12 showing:

The number of mailing lists supplied by the Government of Saskatchewan to individuals or groups in each of the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977. (a) The names of the individuals or groups that such lists were supplied and the source of each list. (b) The amount charged or paid for each list.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I, in reviewing my files, note that I have copies of the mailing list in 1974 but not for the year '75-76 and with leave of the Assembly, I would like to delete the number 1974 from the motion, if the members insist I will withdraw it and resubmit it on that basis. As I say I have the list for 1974, the list of the mailing list supplied by the government to individuals or groups, the names of the groups or individuals that such lists were supplied to and the amount charged or paid for each list. I therefore, move, seconded by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) Return No. 12.

MR. SMISHEK:— Mr. Speaker, the motion as it is worded creates some problems in us being able to answer it. I have an amendment. The hon. member says he has the information for 1974. This was a resolution; I am not sure whether it was he who submitted it, but it is putting it in those words that we were able to answer it, which would read:

That all the words after the word ‘showing’ be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) The names of all Government departments which supplied mailing lists to any individuals or groups in each of the years 1975, 1976, and January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977. (2) In cases where the department maintains records of such information, the names of those to whom such mailing lists were supplied.

I think that was the question we answered the last time and we are prepared to answer it in its same form. I can tell the hon. member that in the case of lists that we do provide there are no charges or collections made on those.

MR. LANE (Qu’Ap):— Perhaps would the minister . . .

MR. SMISHEK:— Yes, give the hon. member a copy of this.

MR. LANE (Qu’Ap):— I am wondering if the minister, before he tables his amendment would include in there, departments, Crown corporations or agencies?

MR. SMISHEK:— Well, that is not what you asked for in the original question, the government of Saskatchewan, and that is what I am directing myself to. I can’t amend my own motion now, and neither can you. So, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can adopt this motion and if he wants the additional information, ask an additional question.

MR. LANE (Qu’Ap):— Obviously, as a result of the amendment I will have to submit another series of questions. I will be asking the government when the policy changed as to charging for mailing lists because the last return that I had, mailing lists were supplied at varying rates of so many cents or quarter cents per name. One, for example, I believe was R.L. Poke which dealt with automobile listing. I will be asking for the Crown corporations and other government agencies, the phraseology, I believe, government of Saskatchewan usually is the umbrella phrase which includes all and the restriction to government departments limits it to what are formally referred to as departments.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 13

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu’Appelle) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 13 showing:

The rate per mile charged by the Central Vehicle Agency (or the Government of Saskatchewan) for each of the government aircrafts in the years 1974 to November 1, 1977: (i) the total mileage flown by government aircraft in each of the three years; (ii) the total mileage charged to government departments or agencies for each of the aircrafts in each of the years; and (iii) the amounts

charged to each department or agency in each of the years.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be requesting the information from the government as to the rate per mile charged by the Central Vehicle Agency or the government of Saskatchewan for each of the government aircrafts in the years 1974 to November 1, 1977: (i) the total mileage flown by government aircraft in each of the three years; (ii) the total mileage charged to government departments or agencies for each of the aircrafts in each of the years; and (iii) the amounts charged to each department or agency in each of the years. I know that this was one of the motions brought forward at the last session prior to prorogation. I therefore move, seconded by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) Return No. 13.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 14

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 14 showing:

The names of all persons presently employed under contract in the service of the government: (a) the agencies; (b) the length of term of contract; and (c) the amount of remuneration paid daily, monthly or yearly.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a motion carried forward from the last session. I suppose one has to put it on but over the break I've heard some rumors out in the communities and in the province that the government has some people under contract and it's rather hard to find out who it is. In order to quell these rumors I would like to put forward this motion, seconded by Collin Thatcher the member for Thunder Creek.

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance):— Mr. Speaker, we'll be glad to provide the information. This is the problem that the Conservatives have. They should operate on fact rather than on rumor. We have nothing to hide. There are a few people on contract, we'll be glad to provide the information to them. We always have. Stop operating in rumor, start living in a real world, not one of suspicion and doubt.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservative Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, I would just like to commend the Minister of Finance for his co-operation and enthusiastic response to this question. We are certain that once we have the facts in this regard we will be able to dispel all the rumors in Saskatchewan, not started by Progressive Conservatives, mind you, Mr. Speaker, but possibly started by others. Once we have this information I am sure all the rumors in the province will be dispelled. I do thank the minister for his response in this question.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 15

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 15 showing:

A list of all projects under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan with cost overruns for the period of January 1, 1974 to October 31, 1977 and the amount of cost overruns on each project.

He said: I know I can't amend my own motion, Mr. Speaker, but if the minister would be kind enough or whatever it takes to have this up to the end of December if it's easier, for a cut-off date. Maybe the October 31 was a bad cut-off date, maybe the end of December is a better cut-off date — to have the cut-off date somewhere in that area.

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan):— Mr. Speaker, the problem with the motion as moved by the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake is not necessarily with the dates, as he indicated, but for us to be able to interpret what in fact is meant by 'all projects'. We would not be able to determine under a list of all projects whether or not there were cost overruns because maybe those projects which are included under ordinary expenditures appear in the blue book and naturally follow the budgetary item with respect to that. I will propose, Mr. Speaker, to amend his motion by clarifying it at least. If it doesn't meet with his full objectives he can re-submit a second question. I would therefore move seconded by my seatmate, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) that the Order for Return No. 15 be amended to read as follows:

That all words following 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

A list of all tendered capital projects under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan with cost overruns for the period April 1, 1974 to October 31, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER:— The introduction into the amendment is the only part that I find some difficulty with because it should normally read, delete all the words after showing, and substitute therefor rather than, that order for Return No. 15 be amended to read as follows. If the House will accept that, delete all the words after showing and substitute therefor, we could move ahead. Agreed.

MR. WIPF:— Mr. Speaker, there is just one thing on this motion, I am wondering if I could ask the minister a question, if we could get the amount of cost overrun put in this? The projects with cost overruns but also the amount of the overrun on each project. This is what was sought in the original question also.

MR. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — SECRET BALLOT — BRAILLE MARKINGS

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) moved, seconded by Mr. H.W. Lane (Saskatoon-Sutherland):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to adopt a suitable ballot with braille markings to ensure that those with visual handicaps enjoy the right to secret ballot.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a question brought forward again from the last sitting urging this Assembly to adopt a suitable ballot for the visually handicapped, as I put in

here, one with braille markings. In discussion the last time the Attorney General said that they would be looking into this and see what they could do. We haven't heard any reply from him. Realizing of course that this could cost some money, I would like the Attorney General's comments on this to see where they stand on this now. In talking with many of the visually handicapped or blind people in the province since then, the braille markings as I had written in here weren't really the big part of it. They would like a ballot with an embossed line on it so they could feel the area between the different candidates. Some mark in there that they can feel where the different candidates are and then they can be told as they go into the polling booth the name of the candidate, in which square he is or which section of the ballot it is. This would ensure that the blind in our province do have a secret ballot, totally secret ballot. In discussing this again with a gentleman in Prince Albert who travels all over America, apparently this would be a first in America. It is something that is talked about amongst the blind people throughout Canada and the United States, to get this opportunity to have a totally secret ballot and I would like to see the Assembly urge the government to put this through and let's have another first for Saskatchewan. I think it is in keeping with working and trying to help the handicapped.

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):— Mr. Speaker, this is one of those resolutions — no one in the House will disagree with the intent of the resolution put forward by the member.

I was interested in his comments with respect to — he wasn't sure whether what he wanted was braille ballots but perhaps ballots with embossed — they were raised so that you could feel the spaces between the candidates, etc. I think the Assembly obviously has to deal with the resolution as it stands, which talks about braille. I think there are some problems with this. First of all I think we would have difficulty in printing all the ballots (obviously everybody's ballots) in braille. I don't think that is what the member is suggesting but rather that some braille ballots be provided for people who are either blind or seriously visually handicapped.

The problem you would run into there I think is that you would likely in many ridings have less secrecy with a braille ballot than more secrecy. In the Saskatoon-Sutherland by-election for example which is one of the larger ridings in the province (there are 14,000 voters) there were only three blind people who voted. I think they were all in different polls which would mean that you would end up with one braille ballot in the poll ballot box which could obviously be easily identified because it would be a braille ballot. You would eliminate the person who went into the poll and helped mark the X but you would then have three scrutineers, the poll clerk and the district returning officer. In my riding if I recall last time there was only one blind person who voted in the whole riding, so even if you sent them all in (all the blind ballots to one place) you would again have the person identified. It seems to me that we can't print all the ballots with braille markings because even if it was technically possible, we would have to print them all in one place and now we use printers all over the province. I don't think we want to concentrate the printing of the ballots in Regina or Saskatoon and I'm not sure that you could print them all with braille markings as well as the ones that I can get along with that I can see. On the other hand if you just have a special braille ballot for the person I think it is quite possible that you make it so that more people would be aware of how he votes — not the people of his choosing but people of each of our choosing.

That is a problem. I am going to ask the Assembly to defeat the motion. I want to assure the member that the embossed argument that he is making . . . , I'm not a printer so I don't know how much problem it is for the Nipawin Journal or the Biggar Independent

to deal with that. Maybe there is no problem at all.

I will certainly assure the member that I will personally take a look into it and I will have the people in the electoral office respond personally to him with respect to that comment. I can't assure you that it will be done; I just don't know what the problems are.

I would like the Assembly to support the good intentions behind this resolution but defeat the wording because from my point of view at least, it is impractical to use braille on the ballots.

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a few comments about the comments made by the Provincial Secretary.

First of all I think that no one would suggest, nor does the resolution in any way suggest, that only those ballots that are for blind people should be either embossed or imprinted in braille. No one is suggesting that at all. That, as the minister has quite rightly put forward, because of the few (fortunately, few) people in our society who are blind, it would mean that there would be less secrecy in terms of their casting of the ballot than otherwise. However, part of the minister's comments I believe, are (and I can appreciate that he doesn't understand about embossing or he doesn't understand about braille. But you can understand or appreciate, of course, that it is not a monumental task to imprint ballots with the machinery available to all printers today in braille. In other words to over print or subprint near a corner or near a space, to subprint in braille the name of the person whose name appears on the ballot. In other words it is not a big deal and very, very less than costly to imprint a ballot with braille at the same time that they are printing the ballot in printing so that that ballot then becomes not only available for sighted people but also is available at the same time for people who can go in and feel the area or feel the places where candidates' names are outlined and can, in fact, using their sense of touch and using their sense of direction, cast their X on the ballot that has been imprinted in braille and, therefore, enjoy the same privileges at election time as those of us who are sighted enjoy. The cost of this is very, very small relative to the position that it would place handicapped people in the province of Saskatchewan. It would mean that the government of Saskatchewan for very, very little expenditure is saying to the handicapped people, as we are, yes, we are prepared to do for you and to provide for you as much as we possibly can. And I want to at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, to say that the government members opposite generally speaking, I think, in the last six or seven years have in fact made a real effort to assist the handicapped in our province . . . , (interjection) . . . , No, no, that's a different kind of handicap. I think that the members to my right seem to be laughing at this matter but quite frankly being a handicapped person I don't think is a laughing matter.

Mr. Speaker, I think the members opposite have made a real attempt but here is another area where with a very, very small expense we can in fact print our ballots in braille; the equipment is available I understand. The equipment is relatively inexpensive I understand. Then the ballot would be available to all people in Saskatchewan whether sighted or otherwise. I think that this may be a way, not only for the actual physically handicapped people that we can also tell them that they are full-fledged members of the community, which is what the handicapped after all are really shooting for and shooting towards, that they want to be treated by the rest of us as full-fledged members of the community with an understanding of their handicap and at the same time treated the same.

So I would urge all members of this Assembly to adopt this motion. It is possible to print

these ballots in braille; it is possible to prove to our handicapped that we can take the necessary measures and must take the necessary measures to ensure that they are treated as full-fledged first class citizens of the province of Saskatchewan at a very, very low expense.

MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):— Mr. Speaker, I recognize the problems that the people without sight have and certainly I would be in support of the motion but it reminds me of some of the problems that we do have in election campaigns and some of the things that we quite can't fix, particularly when people have a problem with the ability to read. It reminds me of the 1956 campaign in the constituency of Maple Creek when two contestants in the provincial election at that time where Mr. Alex Cameron and Mr. Les Benjamin. I believe it was the second time that Mr. Cameron defeated Mr. Les Benjamin, the member of parliament . . . ,

AN HON. MEMBER:— Two out of three . . . ,

MR. STODALKA:— But anyway he always used to have very active and well organized campaigns in that area and this particular election campaign happened in one of the villages. One of the poll workers picked up one of the ladies in the village who was unable to read. On the way to the poll she tried to convince the person that the proper person to vote for was Mr. Benjamin. After some time, the lady listened and listened and then finally before she went into the poll she said, no, she said she still thought she was going to have to support Mr. Cameron. Well, the lady said, well that's fine then she said, if you are going to support Mr. Cameron just mark the top name on the ballot. So the lady went into the poll and after she returned she said, well, did you remember to mark the top name on the ballot? To which the lady replied, no, she said, when I listened to you you convinced me that I should vote for Mr. Benjamin so I marked the second name on the ballot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA:— But these are some of the things that can happen and I'm sure that they are not peculiar to any one political party.

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

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 6 — DELAY LEGISLATION ON LEGALIZING MARIJUANA

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose) moved, seconded by Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to delay any legislation that would legalize the sale of marijuana until broader research has been conducted.

He said: Mr. Speaker, last session I put this resolution on the order paper and I know it may seem strange to the Attorney General and perhaps the Minister of Health but I left the wording of the resolution in exactly the same way. I might ensure them that I did that intentionally because I do believe that the impact of what I had to say when I presented my case for the non-legalization of marijuana still stands.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention, at this time, to go through that same speech and to bring out all the points which I thought I had very carefully researched. I think that the Minister of Health, in particular, in trying to use the opportunity while speaking on this

same resolution to talk about all his government's achievements was somewhat distracting from the resolution itself.

Mr. Speaker, I think since last fall when I introduced this resolution, there is even more evidence and more research available now than there was then to show that the legalization and the sale of marijuana would be a very dangerous thing to society. And despite the fact that a recent political convention voted in favor of it, two to one, it still does not change my resolution and still does not change my strong feeling about the legalization of marijuana.

I agree with the Attorney General that, perhaps, the resolution should be reworded differently but at the same time I think it is clear to everyone that what I am saying is that this Assembly should, in fact, recommend very strongly to the federal government because it is a federal matter, that there shall be no legalization of marijuana until it is recognized that it is a safe drug in society. I am not going to change the resolution. If the Minister of Health wants to use an opportunity to talk about other programs of his government, that is fine. I am going to keep it very much to the point. I believe that I have the support of the vast majority of members of this Assembly in that we do not want to see the legalization of marijuana. I think it is much too soon because, as the researchers tell me in conversation with them, they continue to say that it will be a very dangerous thing, indeed.

Up until this point in time I might remind this Assembly that the only people, Mr. Speaker, the only people who have advocated the legalization of marijuana are politicians and some theologians. That is all. Not one researcher has advocated it. Not one single person who works in pharmacology has advocated it. Only those who are attempting to gain some short-term advantage, political or otherwise, are those, in fact, who are attempting to promote the idea of the legalization of marijuana.

Mr. Speaker, I moved, seconded by the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) Resolution No. 6.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):— Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a brief comment or two about this resolution.

First of all I want to tell the member for Rosetown-Elrose I think that I and most members of my party in the Legislature and I suppose the majority of members here feel very comfortable in supporting the resolution that he has brought forward at this time. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I really don't know — I think the wording was very badly constructed or drawn up in the resolution because I know of no individual political party in the Dominion of Canada that has advocated the legalization of marijuana. I do know that certain individuals have called for legalization. For example, Mr. Clark, the national Leader of the Conservative Party, has called for the legalization but I don't think that represents the feeling of the party that the member for Rosetown-Elrose represents, but he was speaking as an individual. Certain other political parties have considered the decriminalization of marijuana. I only want to say one or two words and then I would like to consider the remarks a little further.

I did have the opportunity at one time a few years ago to have the responsibility of being the minister in charge of the correctional centres in Saskatchewan. One of the great, great tragedies of the correctional centres was that there were young people who were criminally charged under the Criminal Code because of marijuana offences, of 17, 18 or 19 years of age who ended up in jail and who might have on a first or second

occasion been experimenting with marijuana. It eventually ended up to become an education in crime. When they left that particular institution they had a far broader interpretation of life and a far broader experience of the criminal element in Saskatchewan and in Canada than when they entered. I only point that out to indicate the kind of difficulty there is in finding an adequate solution to the problem. However, I want to say to the Speaker and to the member for Rosetown-Elrose that I do support the resolution. I find the wording a little strange because I don't know anybody that does except maybe he is looking into the future. I will have a few more remarks to make on this at a later date. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 7 — MIGRATORY BIRD DAMAGE TO CROPS

MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melfort) moved, seconded by Mr. Banda (Redberry):

That this Assembly urges the federal government to fully accept its responsibilities under The Migratory Birds Convention Act and demands that the federal government take immediate action to initiate a program to compensate for migratory bird damage to Saskatchewan farmers' crops.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution that I am about to speak on and which presents some of the view points, is a very important one in view of some of the events that have happened in the past couple of weeks.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that farmers in Saskatchewan incurred great losses through waterfowl crop depredation over the years and the 1977 losses being over \$10 million, and that with the exception of a very minimum input by the federal government, this loss was borne in the main by the farmers and the province of Saskatchewan. Also, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact of the federal government's recent announcement in Brandon concerning the funding of crop depredation program, increasing the fund for Saskatchewan by possibly less than \$1 million when the loss, as I have already stated, amounts to over \$10 million. This, then, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of urgent importance and the motion I present to this House on the matter, I think is urgent.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Saskatchewan and the province have borne the brunt of the depredation carried on by the waterfowl of the North American continent. More than 60 per cent of all wild ducks, geese and other waterfowl use the western fly way and prey upon the farmers' crops in the southern half of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, causing millions of dollars of uncollectable crop damage. As far back as one can remember this picture has been the same, Mr. Speaker. In 1953, the provincial government of Saskatchewan under the Department of Natural Resources initiated a program and made funds available to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to administer a program designed to assist in the wildlife damage. But in no way could a province stand the cost of a total coverage program.

The Migratory Birds Convention Act — and I understand some of the members from the opposition benches say that it is not a convention act — I sort of like the name. I know of many other birds that like to meet in conventions, I suppose it applies pretty good here, but it is I understand, The Migratory Birds Convention Act that places squarely the responsibility of waterfowl depredation on the federal government. And so it should be, Mr. Speaker. Waterfowl are creatures that have no domicile residence. Their habitat

and residence change with the seasons. They are continental without any border restrictions, their hunting is licensed under the federal government. In every way it is the federal authorities, Mr. Speaker, that should be almost totally responsible for losses under the crop depredation, since it's all of North America that benefits. The damage, however, caused by the waterfowl is borne to the greatest degree by farmers with almost no compensation except that provided by the province under crop insurance and subsidized to a very limited degree by Ottawa. Only in 1974, Mr. Speaker, after a prolonged and protracted negotiation, did the federal government finally recognize its obligations and responsibilities. We considered it then a breakthrough for the province. An agreement was signed in 1974, retroactive to 1973, a four-year agreement which last year was extended for another year, in the form of a letter. The agreement called for a million dollars, yearly, divided between the costs of projects such as lure crops, which is a preventative measure and in compensation only contributed to premium costs of all crop insurance and also half of administration costs, Mr. Speaker. Where the loss is the greatest and not recoverable to the greatest extent under all-risk crop insurance, the federal government has contributed nothing, nor does it seem that they intend to from the Brandon Report, just recently announced. In other words, there is no protection for individual farmers' crop coverage for specific fields which were damaged or totally destroyed by migratory birds. That is where all the losses are, Mr. Speaker. That is the weakness in the federal participation today. As already I have stated, Mr. Speaker, a \$10 million spot loss last year and possibly a bit of a recovery through crop insurance, but to the greatest degree it's the farmers and the province that are the losers.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more discouraging and scary is that the most recent news from informal talks now being held with the officials, the provincial officials, is that even the Brandon proposal is of a one year duration only, so the federal people say and further, Mr. Speaker, is that Ottawa then wants to get out of their responsibility in the crop depredation program altogether.

That's amazing, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government continues to display that kind of irresponsible attitude. I say it is irresponsible. This isn't the program that was first inaugurated by the province and so interpreted as indirectly being forced on the federal government. It isn't the program that can be branded as some sort of a welfare scheme. It isn't a program that could be interpreted as a socialist brain wave. It is a problem, Mr. Speaker, that became a problem when the first settlers came to this province to farm. It's a problem that has had continuous disastrous consequences for the farmers for many, many years. It's distinctly and definitely a national problem and in no way should be sloughed off by the Canadian government onto Saskatchewan people.

We thought we had gained a toehold and I think we did in 1974 with the federal government, but it seems like it wasn't enough. It was mutually agreed upon then that migratory waterfowl depredation was a national responsibility. The then Minister of the Environment, Jack Davis, was most responsive in that respect. He admitted that of the loss costs involved these should be considered as national and not as an impost on Saskatchewan people and Saskatchewan sportsmen, and certainly not on Saskatchewan farmers, Mr. Speaker. After all it is again, I repeat, fully recognized that all of that waterfowl, ducks, geese, and so on are hunted all over Canada, they are hunted all over the United States, Mexico and even some of the smaller countries in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, what was so disturbing then, that almost immediately after the signing of the Waterfowl Crop Depredation Agreement in 1974, the federal government raised

the price of the waterfowl hunting license from \$2 to \$3.50 — and even worse, they reneged on a commitment they had made. They were stating that the financial input by the federal government was in fact going to be recovered through an additional \$1.50 impost on Saskatchewan hunters. The fact that it was a national and international obligation was forgotten and was completely ignored and I would like to read some of the correspondence that went on between the then department of Tourism of the provincial government and the federal government in Ottawa.

To show you and document to you just exactly how it occurred and in reality that the federal government was taking the position that they were responsible for it and as I said, at the end of April we had just completed signing the agreement when the letter of July 4 stated to me then, which says this and I quote: (From Mr. Jack Davis)

I have been instructed by Treasury Board to increase the price of Canada migratory game bird hunting permit from \$2 to \$3.50 starting with the 1974 season. The Treasury Board's reason for increasing the price of the permit is to raise revenues to cover the requirements for federal funds for compensation and insurance programs under the Waterfowl Crop Damage Agreements with the prairie provinces.

And so Mr. Davis, in the next paragraph, acknowledges that they indeed have made certain commitments.

The purpose of attaching a fee to the Canada Migratory Bird Hunting permit was originally to ensure that it became an effective sampling to the universe for the purpose of getting information from hunters. That purpose remains valid.

What the Treasury Board has now decided in effect is that the new costs of the Waterfowl Crop Damage Agreements should not be borne by all of Canada (the people of Canada) but by waterfowl hunters (and in this case mostly Saskatchewan hunters) since they formed a segment of the population most concerned with the maintenance of the high waterfowl regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I could quote a number of letters in that regard again, where Mr. Davis stated that it is a waterfowl depredation. The waterfowl are a federal responsibility. Right after he let that post go and, I think, if I pronounce it correctly, Jeanne Sauve reiterated the same remarks but still maintained that the impost is going to be put on Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan hunters and Saskatchewan farmers who are going to have to bear the loss. We think that is not correct.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed about this and I know many other farmers in Saskatchewan are. I am even more disturbed that they didn't even have the courtesy to ask for a meeting to discuss this cost sharing. They first flatly announced, in Brandon, what they were going to do, and then later proceeded to discuss their actions with the provinces. I think it's a most unforgivable and discourteous procedure, Mr. Speaker. I think it's time Ottawa bore up to its responsibilities in this matter. When you look at the losses incurred, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a point for us to consider very strongly. The losses incurred by the Saskatchewan farmers, as recorded since 1974 and I have the figure which says 1974, \$6.1 million, 1975, \$4.5 million and 1976, \$5 million. In 1977 the loss was \$10 million, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the figure of a half million dollars as a federal share for Saskatchewan, as it was until the end of this year, is unacceptable. The new Brandon proposal giving an additional \$2.8 million for all of western Canada is totally inadequate and unacceptable.

Let me repeat to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members of this Legislature that The Migratory Birds Convention Act and the international treaty with the United States placed the responsibility of migratory birds squarely on the shoulders of the federal government. We know that waterfowl are protected birds and so it should be. We also know that the provincial government has made a most valiant attempt, through crop insurance, through newer programs, etc., to do all in its power to alleviate the great losses to farmers.

Let us not forget as well, Mr. Speaker, that this province has the added responsibility of all other creatures of the Crown — elk, deer, bear and so on, where at times depredations by these animals are indeed a costly item and totally borne by the province. Therefore it is imperative that Ottawa do far, far more in this area of waterfowl crop depredation than is now being proposed.

Mr. Speaker, recently a western provincial proposal set out the formula of shared costs with Ottawa on a 75/25 per cent basis — Ottawa, 75 per cent, Saskatchewan 25 per cent. This proposal has merits, Mr. Speaker. I think we should put strong, unanimous pressure on Ottawa to accept this proposal. I know that all members of this House acknowledge and recognize the problem, know where the responsibility lies, and will jointly support us in asking for a more equal and responsible share of the depredation costs. It's with this point in view that I propose this motion, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member for Redberry. I sincerely hope that unanimous support will endorse this message.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):— Mr. Speaker, in reply to the motion put on the order paper by the member for Melville, I appreciate the concern he has and the sincerity by which he presents the motion as he's introduced it to this Assembly on the wings of a snow white dove. I think it becomes a question of just whose birds are these? After all, the only thing that's stopping in Saskatchewan now is those things that don't use fuel. I wonder if the member for Melville has consulted with the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. After all, if we stop these birds from coming in here, we're not going to have anything else. Furthermore, if I was a bird, I can't think of any other place I'd sooner stop than on NDP area on this continent, after all they're feeding everyone else, they may as well feed the birds, too.

We know that the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Prime Minister of Canada have got tremendous dictatorial powers but I don't know whether they have the powers to keep the birds up in the air or to bring them down in the right places or not. And after all, these birds really come from the United States, in reality they're Carter's birds. They're only exercising their right to mate and after all, we don't want to come down too hard on the birds' rights to mate, and we think Canada's a good place. We welcome the birds here in Canada and in particular in Saskatchewan. You speak of \$10 million that losses to Saskatchewan farmers and you suggest possible federal government funding, handled by SGIO and distributed by SGIO might be the answer. I suggest that any funding we might be so fortunate to get from Ottawa for this province of ours would be placed in serious jeopardy if we left it in the hands of SGIO.

There's one thing that we don't want to happen as a result of damage to farmers' crops. We don't want to see the hunting permits go up. It's questionable as to whether those losses should be placed on the shoulders of those that enjoy the right to hunt in our province. I'm wondering if we could not maybe consider placing more of the responsibility under the crop insurance program which the Minister of Agriculture speaks so highly of. And I might note too, at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the crop insurance program does not cost this government any money. It is not an expense to this government.

I would like to look further into that possible solution of making better use of the crop insurance program that we have, in covering some of these losses. Furthermore, I always have to balk a little when I see the government here in Saskatchewan trying to slough its problems off on Ottawa. After all, Ottawa has an \$11 billion deficit now. I suppose your thinking is, well, what's a few more million in \$11 billion. Well, I suggest it's time that the federal government started bringing its budget in line as well as the provincial government here in Saskatchewan. Therefore I don't accept that approach wholeheartedly, it may in part that the federal government could share in a cost-share program with Saskatchewan in offsetting these tremendous losses that you speak of to our farmers here in Saskatchewan.

The new Minister of our new Department of Revenue spoke yesterday or the day before. I heard him make reference to himself being associated with birds and I'd like to spend some time talking to him. Maybe he's got some answers to this problem. But I certainly am not convinced that the motion as you have presented it is the clear-cut answer. I would like to look further into it and to see if there aren't some more workable solutions, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — BREACHES OF THE ELECTION ACT, 1971.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South):

That this Assembly records its contempt for the decision of the Government not to further inquire into the breaches of The Election Act, 1972, as disclosed in the Bryant Report and as underlined in the Report of the Director of Criminal Justice.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the NDP government brought in an amendment to The Elections Act in the province of Saskatchewan with a great deal of fanfare and acclaim. They were going to control the expenses of political parties and attempt to prevent an individual political party from buying an election campaign or buying a by-election because of the amount of money that they might spend, or the amount of money that they were capable of generating from their own supporters.

Mr. Speaker, at that time, we in the Liberal opposition accused the government of deliberately drafting a bill that was specifically designed to give every advantage to the government of the day. Today we have a report, today we have almost evidence that is without question of the violation of that act by all three parties and yet the government of the day has refused to prosecute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go very briefly into the background. All of us are aware that there

was a by-election fought in Pelly this spring. That by-election was one of the hardest fought campaigns that in my brief tenure in the politics of Saskatchewan, which included about five elections and about eight or nine by-elections. It was without question the hardest fought, but what is even more important, it was the most extravagant. And that the cost, I hesitate to say, would run not to the \$60,000 limit, but I would question if there could have been spent less than \$160,000. Mr. Speaker, despite that, all three political parties have submitted an election return that would appear to comply with the act, the act that has been more honored in the breach than the observance. All three political parties, my own included, provided weak excuses as to the non-compliance with that act. They appeared to have a lack of knowledge of the spending of their parties and the reasons behind it. In other words, the act itself was not important. They seemed to have a clear lack of respect for the law.

The NDP then asked the Chief Electoral Officer of the province of Saskatchewan to investigate. I want to talk about that investigation in a few moments.

When it was finished the NDP then issued a statement saying that they would follow the recommendation of the criminal officer and not prosecute. I have to ask a question — why? Because I think everyone in the province of Saskatchewan is asking that question, why? Mr. Speaker, I think there are three basic reasons why I object to that decision.

1. As my colleague the member for Regina South has indicated, surely if we believe in equality before the law, then no political party or institution should be treated any differently before the law than an individual citizen of this province. The most unfortunate part of it is that the man who made the decision was the Attorney General of the province who has the responsibility of upholding the law and enforcing the law.

I am not going to go into the legal jurisdiction of the individual versus the political parties in this regard. I hope some of my legal friends will go into the legal implications as to what has occurred by the refusal of the government to prosecute what I consider a deliberate attempt by all three political parties to violate the law. Surely the heavens we as legislators cannot place ourselves or treat ourselves any different than we would treat ourselves as individuals.

The second one, I believe and I think the Liberal Party believes that the basic law is unjust and is nothing more than a gerrymander far more vicious than the gerrymander that the NDP criticised so violently a few years ago. And when I talk about a gerrymander I mean a financial gerrymander which can strangle the activities of a political party far more than the movement of 100 votes on one side of a line or another. And a political gerrymander that occurred with the passage of The Election Act by the NDP government in '71 and 1972 was in my judgment far worse than any that Clarence Fines or that the Liberal government from 1964 to 1971 ever perpetrated, far worse. It was an economic gerrymander, a financial gerrymander which was deliberately designed to perpetuate the government in power or the government of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that the refusal to prosecute was a cover up. A cover up to prevent embarrassment of a government to re-pass the act, to prevent the embarrassment of a government who had put themselves up in front of the people of Canada as a political party who are going to reform the electioneering process in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just quote very quickly a few passages but one to begin with on page two where the chief electoral officer said, "I spent a great deal of time in the Pelly constituency during the by-election" (and I am quoting) "a number of people brought to my attention their concerns about the amount of money apparently being spent by the political parties during their campaign."

Mr. Speaker, I have run five campaigns for myself for a \$10,000 limit. Everyone in this establishment knows how difficult it is to stay within them. To get a 1,000 papers signed the limited amount of advertising, a very basic constituency office and constituency expenses for organizers, an extremely difficult ask to stay within the limits. You know we could have had the Legislative Assembly in session during the Pelly by-election, not only that we would have had enough civil servants and executive assistants to run and provide all the information for all the departments that we might have needed just as if we had had it in the Kamsack Hotel. We might well have had a better attendance if we had had the Legislature in Kamsack than it would this afternoon in the city of Regina in our current Legislative Assembly and, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, anybody that dropped in there at breakfast time and saw how long you had to wait to get bacon and eggs or even toast and coffee, will know and visualize the amount of money that was invested by all three political parties.

Mr. Speaker, the sign campaign, I say of the Conservative Party, could never have been done with less than \$20,000. I say that if the RCMP investigated this today, it would validate this. Mr. Speaker, the sign campaign of all three parties was far, far the most extravagant I have ever seen. MLAs and people who worked for the government of Saskatchewan spent days and weeks and some of them a month or more in that constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that when the Chief Electoral Officer said that people brought to her attention the amount of money that was spent in Pelly, she was not exaggerating in any sense of the imagination.

We are going to have an Election Expenses Act. I have also participated in by-elections with \$30,000 and \$40,000 expenses in our political party which could never have touched the Pelly by-election. I say any news media or any MLA or anybody who has ever had any experience in the province of Saskatchewan in electioneering would know that what I say is the truth. The expenditures of all three parties were astronomical. With the entrance of a third party on the political scene in Saskatchewan, the vying of those two parties of the opposition vote in Pelly generated the kind of a contest rarely seen in this province. The government not only attempted to match it, but to surpass it, for the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, that to me, is the real issue and what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that The Election Act and the expenditures and the amendments or the law passed by the NDP government in no way attempted to control the expenditures of political parties; it only intended to control the type of expenditure of political parties. It only intended to control the type. Oh yes, the media — some of the signs and so forth were very visible — but left loopholes in The Election Act where the NDP or the government of the day could spend not only thousands, but many thousands of dollars and then have the Chief Electoral Officer come in and say that the return is in compliance with the act. The act has such gaping holes that it makes it possible for the government of the day to utilize that act to their own advantage. Let me give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker. I am going to quote a little thing that my colleague, the former leader of the

Liberal Party, said the last time this particular act was amended in the House. He said,

I am extremely suspicious when a government, in a very sanctimonious way as this government does, we are going to put limits — but the limits are on whom? They are on the opposition because there is literally no limit on the number of civil servants who will be plodding around Sutherland from now until the by-election is called and until that election is held. There is no limit on the mail-outs. Ministers will find that it is incumbent on themselves to suddenly mail out, and Sutherland will be the target for a great many of these mail-outs. There is no limit on that — they have the public purse.

This leads me to the point that I am going to ask the Attorney General to consider — this very article and this very document of the Chief Electoral Officer, that she brings those two things very clearly to the attention of Saskatchewan into the House.

Look at page 10. "I talked to Mr. Lowell Monkhouse (and I am quoting again) General Manager of Struthers Advertising on Wednesday, December 28, 1977, regarding the invoice deleted from the Return". Of course the invoice was the strange and sudden letter of the Premier of Saskatchewan to every voter in the Pelly constituency. He has never written a letter to the voters in Indian Head-Wolseley; he never wrote a letter to the voters in Milestone. Is there anybody in the opposition that the Premier bothered to write a letter to?

MR. MERCHANT:— . . . , Lakeview, in the by-election.

MR. MacDONALD:— Oh Lakeview in the by-election. Pardon me. But that particular mail-out and the costs of that mail-out were deleted, just as Mr. Steuart said they would be. They were deleted from the election expenses. Now, Mr. Speaker, on page 14, the most interesting one . . . , Inaudible interjection . . . , we are talking about expenses, we are not talking about who paid them. Now, Mr. Speaker, on page 14, the second thing — Mr. Steuart talked about civil servants. Here is what the Chief Electoral Officer says about Pelly:

Mr. Knight indicated that they have no record of the contribution of \$1,500 from a Mr. Alex Leis of Runnymede. The amount shown on the voucher for the Duck Mountain Motor Hotel was the amount deemed not to be the normal expenditures of the party or its staff. Therefore, the amount shown on the return for \$422.60 is accurate. Executive Assistants and civil servants volunteered their time during the election campaign and executive assistants and civil servants did not act as scrutineers on that polling day.

Wasn't that nice of them, not to have as scrutineers, civil servants from the city of Regina acting as scrutineers in Pelly by-election on election day!

In other words, Mr. Speaker, what that Election Expenses Act has done, has made it possible for the government of the day to utilize executive assistants or a political machine that is fostered and nurtured by the taxpayers' money and paid for with the taxpayers' money to perpetuate their own existence. That, Mr. Speaker, is first of all, what we are speaking of, executive assistants. Now, let's talk about civil servants. You know, the funny thing, Mr. Speaker, is that if that happened in Ottawa there would be a revolution by the national press that would drive the government of the day out of office, if they were to use the taxpayers' money and civil servants and executive assistants to campaign on a door-to-door basis for weeks and days and days on end in a

by-election in any part of the country.

Ralph Goodale, the member of Parliament, used a telex machine to send a press release and was severely criticized right across the nation. Mr. Speaker, I say to you, that The Election Expenses Act is a deliberate attempt by the government of the day to perpetuate their own existence by limiting the expenses of the opposition and making it possible for them to expend all kinds of money of a different kind and a different type.

Let me give you an example. When that act was first brought in, I brought up the question of personal services, how the National Act defines personal services and people are charged for it. Oh no, the NDP said, we won't include personal services. How many thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars of personal services of the NDP were put into the Pelly by-election and other by-elections? Union workers from across this nation can come in; the union can pay for their time and their salary, gas, hotel and meals. You do that for a month at maybe \$2,000 or \$3,000, with no exaggeration, just for one man. Mr. Speaker, that was eliminated. Mr. Speaker, that is the major reason why the NDP has refused to prosecute. What is really even more astounding about this report, and I want to talk about that, how in heaven's name, when the Conservative Party was accused by members of the press of submitting a false statement — or a false election return — how would the Attorney General of the day ask the Chief Electoral Officer, who has no investigative responsibility or authority, to do the investigation? When she does investigate and call the president of the Liberal Party before her, he has no legal responsibility even to reply. He can lie, he can say what he likes and she can do absolutely nothing about it. That's some investigation; that's some investigation. Despite that, Mr. Speaker, despite that, this young lady, and to her credit, makes some very specific accusations in this document, very specific. I could go through some of them if you wanted, the lumber Conservatives on page 16, the Liberals on page, I think it's 7 and 8; anybody can read them and I'm not trying to white wash any political party. I'm just saying that in 1971 we told the NDP that they would make crooks out of every political party in Saskatchewan because their terms and their expenses were unrealistic and dishonest. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what has occurred. Mr. Speaker, after the Chief Electoral Officer goes to the thing and makes this kind of a report with specific accusations, specific ones, then the NDP turn around and the Attorney General, the man responsible for the upholding of justice in Saskatchewan, says, no, I will not prosecute. And I'm going to tell you something, Mr. Minister, during the next by-election, if there's two held, there may be two held when my two colleagues get elected in the fall, it's going to be very difficult for you to insist on those constituency organizations to abide by the law when the Attorney General of the province of Saskatchewan has ignored the law. Very difficult. Very difficult indeed, Mr. Speaker. I want to say some other things and I would like to have some other debate on this and I hope that every member will get into this and that everybody on this side and you know because I don't think that The Election Expenses Act of this province is the personal prerogative of the member for Biggar and that's what it's been and of the Attorney General. Can you imagine any Election Expenses Act in the Dominion of Canada or any democratic country being controlled strictly by the government? Can you imagine that? Can you imagine in Ottawa what all the political parties would say — the howl of Tommy Douglas, Mr. Broadbent, Mr. Benjamin, Mr. Nystrom and Stanley Knowles, that old vicar of parliament — if the Liberal Government said, oh no we would will have a little committee in the back room of our political cabinet ministers, like the member for Biggar and the Attorney General and we will decide how this Election Expenses Act will be written . . . , interjection . . . , what will the terms of office be? No, no, everybody knows that the Premier has removed all of your responsibilities, my goodness, you never even speak in the House any more and yet you're one of the very

capable ministers because you don't have political responsibilities anymore. So that's the reason you have. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask yea, if it wasn't for this debate, he wouldn't even be here. Yea, he wouldn't even be here if it wasn't for this debate. And it would be interesting to hear, Mr. Speaker, you know what he'll do, he'll go back over all that gerrymander of the Liberals, you remember back in 1969 and they moved the boundaries for the old Minister of Environment there and oh, I remember my, that zig zag line was an interesting one, I had to approve, I was even on the committee.

But, Mr. Speaker, they presented themselves to the people of Saskatchewan as the sanctimonious saviour of honesty in electioneering. That is how they attempted to present themselves to the people of Saskatchewan and I say there has never been a more dishonest by-election statement of election returns filed anywhere perhaps in Canada than the Pelly by-election the NDP completes to ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have a lot more to say because I do have the opportunity of winding up the debate and am very interested in hearing what the others have to say, but I do want to say that I am throwing out two suggestions to the government. Number one is a full judicial inquiry into the Pelly by-election with full investigative powers so that the truth can come out and the fallaciousness and the hypocrisy of this Election Expenses Act is put forward and because the judge, if its an honest judge, will comment and the terms of reference should include the total spending, the total spending that was involved in the Pelly by-election, the total spending and show what kind of an Election Expenses Act we have in Saskatchewan.

And the second, Mr. Speaker, the second thing that we should do is to inform the government in no uncertain terms that we and the opposition and the people of Saskatchewan will not tolerate the government of the day bringing forth more amendments to plug the small loopholes that they see in The Election Expenses Act in this session of the Legislature. And if they want to have a reform of the Election Expenses Act, they want to have a honest and sincere one, then let's have a three party committee, a legislative committee set up throughout the summer, with an independent judge as Chairman if you like, and let them investigate the report of the judicial inquiry and judiciously and honestly with some integrity come up with recommendations for an Election Expenses Act that can be a model for Canada, that isn't a farce, that isn't designed to help the NDP, that isn't designed to limit and strangle the opposition and that isn't designed in such a way that political parties will have no alternative but to be dishonest. Because to suggest that for \$20,000 you would have to pay for a TV market that involved 20 or 30 constituencies, it is time that some realistic and honest limits on spending are placed before the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, that is the two things that I recommend. I urge the government to look at them carefully, I ask the Attorney General to respond to both of them, I ask them to hold back the amendments to The Election Act. We have another year and a half to go before a provincial election unless you want to spring one. You will have lots of time next fall and next winter to pass those amendments to the election expenses and plug the loopholes that are so apparent. But at the same time we can come up with an Election Expenses Act or an Election Act that the people of Canada can be proud of and that would be a three party operation and not just a one party deal like a one party state.

Mr. Speaker, I so move the resolution.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):— Mr. Speaker, as the seconder of the resolution

and as a member who has taken a particular interest in this matter, I want to speak to the resolution briefly.

I take no relish in a debate of this variety as I am sure no other members of the House do either, because essentially what we have under debate is a breach of the law, in the province, by each of three political parties. There can be no credit really in this situation to anyone with one or two rather small exceptions. I have said in the House before and I repeat that the Liberal Party overexpended its limit and there is no proper justification for that. The law was there before, like it was before everybody else, and it ignored it. For that there is no proper justification. What one can say is at least it was candid and honest in admitting that it had overexpended.

I think the attitude that was abroad in Pelly, and it is an attitude that is still abroad in the political parties and in the politics of this province, is the thing that we have to get at. It is an attitude which is reflected as we see every day of the extensive government advertising that is now underway in the province. Every morning when you turn on your radio, or you pick up your newspaper, or turn on the television you see extensive and expensive advertising by the government of the day. For what purpose? For the same purpose to perpetuate itself in office. It is that kind of attitude that we have to get at in respect to this debate and in respect to the politics in this province.

The government knows full well that it has some problems, politically, on its hands. It has had them now for some months. Maybe 65 per cent or 70 per cent of the electorate in this province at the moment is not prepared to support the government. It is being challenged by the Liberals, it is being challenged by the Conservatives and it knows it. That's what accounts for the fact that we are seeing a flood of government advertising of the kind we have never witnessed before. That is the kind of attitude, which is so very wrong and that is the kind of attitude that was so prevalent in the entire Pelly by-election.

When you look, Mr. Speaker, at the question here, it isn't so much what happened in detail in Pelly past. The question here, the more essential one is whether or not there was a proper administration of justice in the province and whether we are going to have the proper administration of justice in the province in the future with respect to this and similar matters.

The investigation that was here conducted by Carol Bryant was totally and completely inadequate. She was faced, and freely acknowledges that she was faced with each of the three political parties filing less than adequate returns under The Elections Act. In the case of the Liberal Party — a clear overexpenditure.

MR. MESSER:— A blatant disregard for the law.

MR. CAMERON:— No question; no justification for it — overexpended by a large measure. The Conservative Party return which showed spending under the limit but accompanied by no receipts with respect to two or three vital expenditures and receipts which she was never able to obtain, despite having been assured by the people that she would have those receipts. But nonetheless, an oral indication from persons from whom the Conservative Party ordered material indicating that they had spent substantially more than what had been indicated in the return.

The New Democratic Party filed again, a most interesting return and, as members know, had no right to begin with, in filing an amended return — a second return. It had no right

to amend its return in the first instance. All kinds of interesting little things there — juggling out \$1,500 of expenditure here, taking it out of the return, inserting something else in the return, adding this and removing that — in effect, filing a new return which it had no right to file.

One of the aspects, if the Chief Electoral Officer was to investigate, was the allegation that someone in Runnymede by the name of Mr. Laize or Lize had made a donation to the NDP of \$1,500 which had not been reported and had not been disclosed. That in itself, if accurate would be a major offence under this act. How did she investigate it? Did she go to this gentleman? Did she even telephone him? Did she go to him and say, did you make that donation? No, she didn't. Did she ask for his bank records? No, she didn't. Did she ask for his checking records? No. Did she ask for the records of the NDP? No. What did she do? She went to Bill Knight, her old friend, Bill Knight and said, what is this donation of \$1,500 — did you know anything about it? He said, oh no we have no record of it. That was the investigation and on that basis he received total absolution. That was the extent of that investigation.

Then there is an item of an expense account in the Duck Lake Motor Hotel. The return shows some \$400 spent. There is a suggestion by the president of the Conservative Party that it was more like \$1,500. Again, if the allegation was true it would be the suppression of an expenditure of \$1,100 \$1,100 under the act, which would be a major offense. What was the investigation? What was it? It was virtually non-existent. Did she go to the executive assistants with respect to whose expenses the allegation was made and ask them about it? No. Did she go to the civil servants that were mentioned and ask them? No. Did she go to the Premier, whom she answers to in her responsibilities as the Chief Electoral Officer and say, here, Mr. Premier, I want information on what executive assistants and what civil servants these were, and who was paying them during the period, what are their expenses and why weren't they disclosed? No, she didn't do any of that. What did she do? She talked to Bill Knight, her old friend, Bill Knight. Then there's the matter of Struthers Advertising Agency and an expense there. What does she do in respect to the allegation that was made there? She goes to Lowell Monkhouse, the manager of Struthers, her old friend . . . , Lowell Monkhouse asks about that and gets an explanation. That was the extent of the inquiry there.

One of the things that emerges among all the other questions here is this one. It's almost sort of an incestuous relationship that has developed between people in the party and people in government. Who are the actors in the piece? Carol Bryant, number one. Who is Carol Bryant? She's an activist in the NDP Party, came up through its ranks. And I don't make any condemnation for that fact. But she rises ultimately to become the Chief Electoral Officer. Whom is she dealing with? She's dealing with Lowell Monkhouse. Who is he again? Another party activist who rose through the government ranks, minister's assistant; ultimately got to be the manager of Struthers Advertising firm which is, as all members know, is the firm that now does the government's advertising. Bill Knight, well known, and again I say this with no condemnation of him. But an active member of the NDP Party and a very effective one, a former government employee. Former NDP member of Parliament, now a candidate, secretary of the NDP Party. Whom does Carol Bryant go to? When she doesn't go to Lowell Monkhouse, her old friend, she goes to Bill Knight, her old friend.

Then we see disclosed as well again, Service Printers arising. Service Printers. A printing party which we all know and have known for a long time and which for some reason or another has never embarrassed the NDP Party into doing something right about that. A printing company owned by the government; a printing company which

does the NDP Party's printing. And again, the question of Service Printer's expenditure arises here. There's the company owed by the NDP Party doing the NDP Party's printing in the by-election, all the while doing the government printing at taxpayers' expense as well. The Attorney General, a power in his party as deputy leader, aspirant for the leadership of the party — known to us all as a political activist and a very effective one in his party. Charged though, as well, with the responsibility of the function and the office of the Attorney General in the province, an issue that we have long said, those offices are not compatible because the Office of the Attorney General has to be exercised in the absence of political considerations and how difficult it is for an Attorney General, who is so active within his political party, to make decisions stripped of political consideration. It's again something that that government ought to be giving its attention to and here again is another example rising to the surface of an Attorney General who has to be concerned about his party on the one hand and the proper administration of the other when his party is involved. If there is the improper administration of justice here, I don't know with certainty, but I know it has every appearance of the improper administration of justice and as the Attorney General will recognize, that's as important as the reality.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— The ones here, Mr. Speaker, to make the point of a totally inadequate investigation, ought to be clear to all members if they have taken the time to read the report. My colleague has asked, why in those circumstances was the investigation so incomplete? What embarrassment was the government sustaining or about to sustain, the question a lot of people ask, resulted in the non-investigation. That's the dilemma the government is in with respect to this question.

Mr. Speaker, the universal symbol of justice, as all members will know, is a clothed lady holding in her hand a finely tuned scale, the balance scale, and is blindfolded. Why is she blindfolded? She is blindfolded to reinforce the notion that has been with us ever since we adopted the British system of justice and that is that in the administration of justice there is no room for extraneous consideration, such as political considerations to enter into the decision making. That is why she is blindfolded, blindfolded to reinforce the point that she cannot see, matters of prejudice or issues of political consideration, color, creed and so on. She is to be blinded from all that. The question here is whether in this situation we had a blindfolded lady of justice administering justice here because it has every appearance that the blindfold being off, and the eyes of the lady shifting around from side to side to see what embarrassment there might be here for the government or what political consideration should apply here or what political personality was involved on this side. That is the kind of justice which I don't want to see in our province and I am sure most others don't either.

Then was does Attorney General say as to why there is no follow-up investigation despite these sentences taken from his own department's report and I read them, three of them. The Bryant Report is not clear and if we were to further pursue this matter, further investigation would have to be done to pin down what hard evidence there was to sustain a prosecution. And he goes on to say, a second reference, the next allegation relates to an incomplete return pursuant to Section 202(j) related to Elections Expenses. There would have to be a substantial investigation to obtain hard evidence to sustain a prosecution for this alleged violation. Then again, a third reference, the last alleged breach of The Election Act is the allegation of an incomplete return pursuant to Section 201(c) of The Election Act. This has to do with the expenses and whether they should have been included in the return. Here again, to sustain a prosecution he says

that we would need hard evidence and, therefore, further investigation. Three references to an allegation of the offence, three indications that further investigation was required, three times the further investigation was not undertaken by the Attorney General. Mr. Speaker, I see it's shortly after 5:00 o'clock and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would call 5:00 o'clock.

The Assembly adjourned until 7:00 o'clock p.m.