

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, through you and to this Assembly, I would like to introduce a group of 25 grade eight students sitting in the east gallery from the Division III School in Rosetown. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Isabel Berntson and Mr. Wayne Torwalt. I believe that is the correct pronunciation — I would hope so.

I might point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this Assembly, that the member for Souris-Cannington has to be on his best behavior today because one of the teachers accompanying this group happens to be the member's aunt, so I know that we can expect him to be on his best behavior.

We welcome you to the Assembly and I am looking forward to meeting with you immediately following the question period. We have arranged to have some pictures taken as well; if you wish, we have some drinks for you and some cokes. We hope that you enjoy the Assembly and we certainly hope that you have a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J.G. Allen (Regina-Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you to the other members of the House, a group of 35 students — grade six students from Walker School who are seated over in the west gallery. They are accompanied today by Mr. C.B. Wilson, the principal of the school and Mrs. Sloan.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this group of students and the students in general at Walker School have a oratorical contest every year which I have the pleasure of helping to sponsor. We had the oratorical contest here just a couple of weeks ago and there were a number of students from the school who participated. I was particularly impressed with the way that the students presented their views and presented themselves. It is an indication that we have got a lot of young people who are taking an interest in things public in Saskatchewan and hopefully many of them will seek careers in the political life of our province.

I am sure that all of us would like to welcome them to the House this afternoon and I look forward to meeting them a little bit later.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure on behalf of my colleague, the Hon. Gordon Snyder for Moose Jaw South and myself for Moose Jaw North, to welcome the students from the Saskatchewan Technical

April 5, 1978

Institute from Moose Jaw here this afternoon.

I think all of the members in this House realize that the Saskatchewan Technical Institute at Moose Jaw plays a very useful purpose in the economy and the educational facilities that are provided there, provide job opportunities for many of the people in this province and it is a real pleasure to be able to be here this afternoon. Along with them are their chaperones Mr. Zadorozny, Mr. Dixon and Mr. Horner. I must say that it is a pleasure that they have been able to make it and we will be meeting with them a short time later.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Buena Vista): — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to take this opportunity to welcome a group of students from Lorne Hazelton School. They are seated in the west gallery, I believe, and are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Jerome Rak. I had the opportunity, earlier this year, to meet with all the students of Lorne Hazelton School and I presented the pictures of the Queen and the Prince. I certainly enjoyed my visit to your school. I hope you have an excellent visit to the city, the Queen City, also that you have a very informative and educational time here at the legislature. I, Mr. Speaker, will be meeting with them a little later to answer any questions that they may have, I ask all members to welcome them here today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

\$65 Million Line of Credit

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would address my question to the Premier. In the order in council that was tabled yesterday by the Minister of Finance it stated that the officials in government in negotiating the \$65 million line of credit had negotiated the line of credit rather than that was in process. My question to the Premier is quite simply this, will the Premier, today, tell this Assembly and give the assurance to this Assembly that there will be no short-term borrowings, either in progress now in large sums such as the one that we have been talking about and furthermore that no short-term borrowings, by the Government of Saskatchewan, over the next few months until the Canadian dollar has a chance to settle in and we know where it is going? Thirdly, that limits in terms of borrowings will be set on the officials of government and non-elected officials of government in order that elected officials have the opportunity to review any potential borrowings by the officials of government?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question presupposes or seeks to imply that the order in council was passed after the deal was made and that there was no prior knowledge by ministers that the transaction was going to be proceeded with. In fact, the matter was considered by the Treasury Board in November, prior to March, that is November, 1976, before the officials made their deal with Chemical Bank, subsequently considered in principle. Thereafter the transaction was negotiated in general terms and it was approved by an order in council after the details were known in March. I think that is an entirely appropriate way to conduct business of that nature.

With respect to the request of the hon. member that I give him assurances that there will be no short-term borrowing until the Canadian dollar has stabilized, the answer is no; there is no assurance that the Canadian dollar will stabilize, particularly with the prospect of a government headed by either of the parties represented opposite.

Accordingly, I can give him no such assurance.

Mr. Collver: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the Premier's answer and the failure of the Minister of Finance to have any knowledge of short-term borrowing, there seems to be some credibility problem in terms of the discussions that occurred in the Treasury Board prior to any negotiations taking place by the officials of Sask Power and by the officials of the Department of Finance.

My supplementary question is quite simply this: — Will the Premier not give his assurances today, to this Assembly, that limits on the spending and borrowing powers of the officials, especially outside of Canada, have been set or will be set by him so that we can be assured that this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan can be assured that the non-elected officials do not have the capacity to continue to put Saskatchewan people on the hook for large sums of money?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, there are limits; the limits are zero and those limits will continue. The borrowing that can be done outside this country without ministerial knowledge or approval by officials is, except for perhaps trivia — who knows, if one runs up a bill on a credit card in a hotel in New York, that is presumably borrowing; but if we are talking about any significant borrowing the answer is no, it cannot be done, it has not been done, it will not be done.

Mr. Collver: — Why then would your Minister of Finance not be able, even though it is printed in the Saskatchewan Power bulletin . . .

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — A year ago, Dick.

Mr. Collver: — . . . a year ago, says the Attorney General. Why would your Minister of Finance not have knowledge of a \$65 million borrowing in the United States of America, that had been concluded by his officials, prior to the order in council being issued by the Government of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the particular question which was addressed to the Minister of Finance. I was away in Banff at the time, as some hon. members will know so I do not know what question it was which did not trigger in this mind this particular transaction; however, I think it is entirely reasonable for a Minister of Finance not to keep the details of every borrowing transaction in his mind. Whether it be \$65 million or \$365 million, the — over a period of many months and asking which official bargained and which official carried out the transactions. So I think the simple facts are these: — if the hon. members wish to have detailed questions, I am sure they can put them on the order paper and we will produce the paper; if the hon. members wish to raise issues which are one year old, on the basis of urgent questions, it will therefore be understandable why all the facts may not be at somebody's finger tips.

Advertising on Radio and T.V.

Mr. E.C. Malone (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. For some time now, we have been directing questions to you and your ministers about, what is in our view, the blatant political propaganda that is being churned out on the air waves, TV, radio advertising Crown corporations, Land Bank, Department of Industry and Commerce, and so on. We have yet to receive answers on the order papers as to the cost of this. My question to the Premier at this time is, how long is the campaign of political propaganda going to carry on and when

can the people of Saskatchewan expect it is going to stop and their money spent on more useful purposes?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am unfamiliar with the ‘campaign of political propaganda’ that the hon. member refers to and, accordingly, cannot tell him when it will stop. (Laughter)

Mr. Malone: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the Premier, therefore, is telling me he doesn’t read the newspaper, listen to the radio, or watch TV . . . because the Premier is very well acquainted, I am sure, with the propaganda about the family of Crown corporations and so on. But I want to bring to the Premier’s attention, Mr. Speaker, and then ask him a question — what I want to bring to his attention is Section 13(7) of the Canada Elections Act, which provides for a fine of \$25,000 in the event that political parties advertise during a certain period during a federal election campaign. In our view, the propaganda that I talk about, the political advertising I talk about, can well fall within this particular provision of the Canada Elections Act. My question to the Premier is, is it your intention to stop advertising at the time the federal election campaign is called?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, if indeed there is a violation of the Canada Elections Act, I know the hon. members can find someone who can give them some legal advice and they will be able to lay a charge and proceed with it through the courts. In our judgment, this will not be a violation of the Canada Elections Act and we do not propose to regard it as such.

Sale of Gasoline on the Saskatchewan-Alberta Border

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Revenue. Mr. Minister, we are now in our sixth day of difficulty with regard to the sale of gasoline along the Saskatchewan-Alberta border taking place. We now have indications as to the method by which certain operators, on the Saskatchewan side of the border, are using. They are simply going over and claiming Alberta residency and therefore importing the gasoline into the Saskatchewan stations at Alberta prices and selling them here. Mr. Minister, while this may be a difficult thing on which to arrest these people because of a contradiction of the Petroleum Fuel Act as it applies, are you contemplating any such legal action against the operators, any place along the border, who are doing just exactly as people in some areas are doing at this particular time? Have you made any such arrests?

Hon. W.A. Robbins (Minister of Revenue): — Mr. Speaker, no, we haven’t done so and we are looking at all the alternatives open to us and we expect to have a decision soon and to announce it soon.

Mr. Bailey: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I have some appreciation of what the minister is saying, expecting announcement, but, Mr. Minister, are you aware that at the particular time we already have indications that certain gas stations on the Saskatchewan side of the border closed their doors. Certainly, if your program doesn’t come forward soon, that there will be many more.

Now, what I am asking is: — Will you give some help to re-establishing the Saskatchewan businesses which are being forced out of business?

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, obviously we will have to look at the situation that applies at the time that we come forth with what we feel is a reasonable solution. I must point out that some of the statistics used by people opposite with respect to 300 operators close to the border, are incorrect; there are only 142. That doesn't mean that it isn't a severe problem for those vendors and it is also a severe problem to us in terms of revenues of the province of Saskatchewan. We don't have instant solutions like the opposition may have; we have to live with the consequences and, therefore, we have to look at all the alternatives . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Government Advertising

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the premier, too, in relation to what my colleague has indicated.

First of all, I am sure that the Premier is aware that government advertising doesn't just happen. It is not like the tulips flowering in the spring. It comes from a very conscious government decision. All MLAs are receiving a large number of complaints about the amount of money being spent in government advertising. Could the Premier tell me, when the government made the decision to initiate the most massive government advertising program in the history — and perhaps as the Minister of Finance would say — in North America, when that government decision was made and how it was transmitted to the Crown corporations and other government departments?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I am unable to give the hon. member details about the most massive advertising campaign in North America and I decline to do so. He is asking me when the current campaign of advertising carried on by Crown corporations was agreed to. It was agreed to some time last year by the government Finance office. I don't recall the date, but it would be last fall some time. It was done by the board of directors of the Government Finance Office, doubtless in consultation with the board of directors of the participating Crown corporations.

Mr. MacDonald: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier indicate to me what is the possible benefit to the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation which sells its entire produce on the international market outside of the province of Saskatchewan, or the advantage of Saskatchewan Minerals or Saskoil and other Crown corporations in Saskatchewan which are not trying to sell to Saskatchewan people. What possible benefits can those Crown corporations generate by spending taxpayers' money to advertise something that is going to be utilized in India, in China, in Japan and the United States?

Mr. Blakeney: — Presumably the same benefits that IMC (International Minerals and Chemical Corporation) seeks to achieve by advertising extensively in Saskatchewan. Their potash is sold in precisely the same markets as ours are sold and they sponsor football games of the Saskatchewan Roughriders and I very much doubt whether those broadcasts are picked up in India, but IMC continues to believe that that's sound business on the part of IMC and doubtless. PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan), with the same good business judgment or bad business judgment, is following the same line of thought.

Dairy Pool Workers Strike

Mr. R Katzman (Rosthern): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. No doubt you are aware that on Monday, April 10, the strike by the Dairy Pool workers will cause the farmers of the province some hardship regarding their milk. Have you done anything about it yet?

Hon. E.E. Kaeding (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Chairman, I don't think the member is suggesting that we involve ourselves with negotiations between the Dairy Producer's Association and their staff. I wouldn't think that you would suggest that we should in some way, interfere with the bargaining process. We are aware of the problem. We are watching it and we have — I understand a mediator has been appointed to try to determine where the common ground could be in this particular negotiation and we are certainly aware of the problem.

Out-of-Province Advertising

Mr. G.H. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Premier along the same line as the questions put forward by my colleagues. I have a copy of an ad which has been taken out of the Moose Jaw Herald and I understand copies of this ad have appeared in eastern newspapers like the Toronto Globe and Mail — an ad entitled 'Saskatchewan Today, we've come a long way.' I wonder if the minister or the Premier would care to comment as to why this kind of political advertising is taking place in an eastern newspaper.

Mr. Blakeney: — I think our basic reason is this, that it will be observed that eastern Canada has provincial government of old line parties and depression. They seem to go together. There are lots of people in eastern Canada who are looking for a place to set up business where they have an opportunity to make a profit and where it looks like economic prosperity is going to continue. We therefore want to attract them to this province where businessmen are making more money than they ever have before, and where working people are making higher wages than they ever have before.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Penner: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier has disclosed the political nature of the advertising. I wonder if the Premier would care to comment on why there is an ad appearing in the Ottawa Citizen entitled, "Building A Canadian Future", which advertises copies of a speech given by the Premier of the province. Why is that kind of Saskatchewan money being spent in eastern Canada?

Mr. Blakeney: — I am more than happy to answer that question because that booklet which was advertised was our position at the First Ministers Conference and if members opposite don't want the people of Ontario to know the Saskatchewan position on the Canadian economy and the Canadian constitution, I am ashamed for them, I am ashamed for them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We have to put our position and we have to put it clearly and forcibly. I have tried to do that. We put out a booklet; I invited everybody in Canada to read the booklet. The booklet is not particularly political in content except to say that it states the position of Saskatchewan and western Canada in this Confederation and I

say we can't state it often enough.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Dairy Producers Strike

Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, the dairy producers' strike that is pending on the tenth is going to cost the dairy farmers of this province a lot of money and, Mr. Minister, reflecting that loss to the consumer will mean an increase to the consumers of 6.5 cents. Mr. Minister, in your reply to the member for Rosthern, you have said that, in fact, you do not care about the dairy producers of this province, you do not care about the consumers of this province. My question to you, Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that you have stated today that you will not involve yourself with this dairy producers' strike, can you give this Assembly your assurances that you will not interfere with the dairy farmers of this province when they take the measures that they have to when this strike takes place? Will you give this Assembly that assurance?

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, I think the member — the outburst of the member wasn't really very becoming. As in every labor negotiation there are those people who are in the middle and in this particular case it could very well be the dairy producers. We will have to see whether the strike actually takes place. We don't know there is going to be a strike. They are in negotiation. We don't know there is going to be a strike and we will have to wait and see what really takes place. If a serious confrontation takes place we may have to take some action, but until it does we certainly can't anticipate that.

Mr. Speaker: — I will take a new question.

Government Advertising

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Arising out of his responses to the last question, I wonder if the Premier would not agree with me that since he had to run advertisements all through eastern Canada, publicizing his position and Saskatchewan's position, that we should be left, in Saskatchewan, with the impression that, therefore, your position was much weaker than the position advanced by other premiers, who counted on the ordinary media to publicize their position to people in Ontario.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, it may well be that the ordinary media can be counted upon to put the case of Ontario and put the case of Quebec in this confederation. I am of the view that the eastern press does not carry extensively the views of the Atlantic provinces or western provinces. If members opposite are of a different view, they may hold it, but my experience is that they do not feature, those papers, do not feature the views of either the Atlantic provinces or the western provinces. I think it is entirely appropriate that we attempt to make our point of view known to as many people in the two central provinces of Canada, as we can. Be the case weak or strong, it seems to me we should not hesitate to publicize it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: — I wonder if the Premier can tell which point of view he is putting across. The point of view of a year ago, where he said we must co-operate with Mr. Levesque and be kind to him and give him facilities like SGIO, or the point of view that he

enunciated in Banff, last week, where he said we can't co-operate with Mr. Levesque and the Quebec government, or the point of view that you may come to a year from now when you find it politically advisable to take another point of view? Which point of view are you talking about?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the point of view that I put forward was the one I put forward at the First Ministers Conference on Economic Prospects of Canada and the basic point of view was this: — That we should not allow unemployment to go unchecked; that we should not exercise government restraint to the point of cutting back our capital spending; that we should, in fact, spend capital moneys to create jobs, today, for energy tomorrow. I put the point of view that it is better to pay people for working than for not working. That is the point of view that I put forward, rather consistently, both at the conference and in the booklet referred to in the advertisement referred to by the hon. member.

Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Premier, a page from the daily newspaper with three government ads costing about \$1,000 — I ask him if it would not be better to have used that \$1,000 to provide dental care for four or five families in this province rather than wasting it that way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of the cost of putting advertisements in the paper because I do not know what paper he is holding up.

With respect to providing dental care for the people of Saskatchewan, whether adults or children, I do not know how any member opposite can hold up his head and say that. The Liberal Party has consistently opposed dental care for adults or for children at public expense and we now have the Conservative Party on record as opposing the federal care plan for children. I think . . . (interjections)
...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Wasting of Milk — Dairy Producers Strike

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture, if we could have quiet for a minute. You have indicated some awareness of the potential strike on Monday and you have indicated that you are not prepared to take action. Have the threats of the dairy producers to follow one of two options (or possibly both), which is to dump fluid milk and waste it because of the strike or to sell the milk through their own efforts, been communicated to you — if so, what actions do you intend to take to prevent the potential wasting of food due to that serious strike which is going to commence Monday?

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out again that there is a negotiation process going on and we cannot anticipate what people might do if an agreement is not reached. We will have to deal with the problem when it arises. I would hope that there will be a settlement before anything as serious as dumping milk would take place but we cannot contemplate that; we cannot anticipate that. We will just have to wait and see.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. You are hopeful that negotiations will continue. Are you, today, expressing ignorance of the fact that the mediator walked out over the weekend and negotiations have not commenced since then? Perhaps your wishes are totally unfounded and you are showing a complete lack of knowledge, and I suggest ignorance, of a very serious problem facing the consumers and dairy producers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the member opposite suggests that we should do. Is he suggesting that we should say to the dairy producers, 'O.K., go ahead' and give the unions all they want and we will provide an increase in the price of milk to accommodate that? Is he saying that we should say to the processors that you hold the line and whatever comes we will stand by you. We have to let this process take its course and we have to make our decisions when the problem arises.

Newspaper Ad — Land Bank Rental Change

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I showed the Premier an ad that appeared in a daily newspaper, called the 'The Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission is Changing with the Times' which advises of changes in rentals under Land Bank leases. I ask you what you couldn't do with a simple letter to the lessees advising them of the change of rents that you couldn't do by that expensive ad in the newspaper?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think by the acknowledged word of the hon. member that it states a change in government policy — that change in government policy is certainly of interest to Land Bank lessees but also to people who may be potential Land Bank lessees. We can't possibly know who they are. We have put a simple advertisement in the paper setting out the change in Land Bank policy. We make no apology for it.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Appointment of Mr. R. Clayton

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Mr. Ray Clayton will be assuming responsibility as Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Clayton is a native of Saskatchewan who obtained his high school education in Canwood. He went to take his Bachelor of Commerce and Master of Arts in Economics at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon. From 1965 to 1967, Mr. Clayton was Director of Research with the Department of Municipal Affairs. From 1967 to 1969 he was Director of Research for the Department of Education and from 1969 to 1977 he was Director of Grants in the Finance branch in the Department of Education. In April of last year Mr. Clayton became Director of the Taxation and Fiscal Policy branch in the Department of Finance.

Many of the members will know Ray Clayton and I think they have come to respect his ability as we have on this side. His time in the Department of Education and most recently, his work in developing the revenue-sharing program has gained him the respect of school boards in this province and with municipalities, both rural and urban.

I am sure all members will wish him well in this new work.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 5, 1978

Mr. G.H. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make a brief comment with regard to the minister's statement and to add the best wishes of the Liberal caucus to the statement made by the minister.

As he has said, those of us who have come to know Mr. Clayton, and many of us came to know him through the field of education, always held him in high regard. He was the kind of individual in the field of educational finance who most of us felt, knew what was going on and he knew the answers. He was very straightforward and very honest and very fair in the way he dealt with other people. I expect that that will be the same kind of attitude that he will take with him into his new position and that he will build confidence and trust with those with whom he works. So we congratulate Mr. Clayton on his new appointment.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the words of the member for Saskatoon. I'm wondering, with such a calibre, that Mr. Clayton and such a reputation that he carries with him, that perhaps as a senior minister that, perhaps, you were able to steal him from another department. I am sure that he will be a great asset to the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Clayton is one of the outstanding people in the Department of Education over the years and I can assure the minister that he probably recognizes the value that Mr. Clayton will be to him in the Department of Municipal Affairs. And, certainly, we on this side of the House and in this caucus, wish Ray all the success.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Point of Order re Supplementary Questions

He said: — I spent most of the night preparing these two statements and I know the member wouldn't want to deny me the opportunity of putting them forward at this time.

The Attorney General raised a point of order yesterday seeking clarification concerning whether a member can ask a supplementary question when the original question had been taken as notice by the minister.

I wish to quote the recommendation of the Rules and Procedures Committee dated March 12, 1976 as follows:

Supplementary questions may be allowed at the discretion of the Speaker and must pertain to the question in order to clarify the answer or elicit further information on that issue.

All hon. members will see that the guidelines as set forth by the committee give the Speaker some discretion on the admissibility of certain supplementary questions. Further, the guidelines provide for a member to ask a supplementary to "elicit further information on that issue." This practice has been, which is in accordance with the committee's report, that when a minister has taken notice on a question, that the member may, at the discretion of Mr. Speaker, ask a supplementary question seeking further information on that issue. The minister may reply to the supplementary question if he has the answer at hand or he may take notice on the supplementary

question as well and report back to the Assembly at a later time.

STATEMENT OF MR. SPEAKER

Point of Privilege re Certain Comments

He said: — A point of privilege was raised by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle yesterday regarding certain comments made by the Minister of Finance outside the Assembly, concerning possible abuse of franking privileges.

The case of privilege involving the member for Souris-Cannington during the last session has been put forward as a precedent in this case. I want to make it clear to all members, that at no time during that case, did the Chair rule that remarks withdrawn in the Assembly, which were subsequently referred to again outside the Assembly, constituted a renewal of the charge. Individual members may have based their decision in that case of privilege on such circumstances, but at no time was there a decision by the Chair to that effect, and in fact, at no time was an express motion to that effect passed by the Assembly. That case of privilege clearly does not constitute a relevant precedent in the present case.

Sincere remarks made inside the Assembly by the minister on this issue, were withdrawn without qualification on March 30, 1978, the question remaining before the Chair is to determine whether the remarks made outside the Assembly by the Minister of Finance constitute a breach of privileges of the Assembly or of any member thereof. As reported to this Assembly yesterday by the member for Qu'Appelle, the Minister of Finance, when asked outside the Assembly whether he had made up the allegations said: — “No, I didn't make them up.” I rule that those remarks of the Minister of Finance did not constitute an allegation against any member; they do not constitute a Contempt of the Assembly; nor do they interfere with or obstruct any member in the performance of his duties. I therefore rule that a prima facie case of privilege has not been established.

POINTS OF ORDER ON THE QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of order with reference to the question period today.

Today, our member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) raised an extremely important and urgent matter and you refused to allow him a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know why.

Mr. Speaker: — The question in my view was hypothetical and it involved a jurisdiction other than the provincial government. Consequently, I didn't allow the member a supplementary.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, if I might just make a brief comment on that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I am going to stand by my ruling. I think that it is quite clear that the question was obviously hypothetical. He was talking about a subject which had not occurred at this time. It is true that questions were raised later, but those questions were in order.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to question then, on this point of order, the ability — and I ask you for your advice in this matter — the ability of the

April 5, 1978

Speaker to determine whether or not a particular question is within the confines of provincial or federal jurisdiction. Surely that is something that must be determined. If the minister doesn't want to answer it . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think it is quite clear that the question was hypothetical. I believed it at the time to be not within the jurisdiction of the provincial government or the federal government, but some other body outside of this Chamber. The way in which the question was placed, I believed it at that time not to be within the jurisdiction of the government to reply.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Second Readings

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Faris that Bill No. 22 — **An Act respecting Elementary and Secondary Education in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

Mr. W.H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, we have spent approximately three years in the mammoth exercise of developing a new education Act. The government's stated intention was to consolidate 15 Acts and to make school law more accessible and comprehensible. This, indeed, is a commendable objective. But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened?

Both trustees and teachers decided that this was an opportune time to make gains in controversial areas. Pressure was on the government to change legislation concerning collective bargaining and employment security. The result was increased polarization of the two viewpoints.

What has been the government's reaction to these pressures? First of all, the situation undoubtedly was affected by the fact that we have had three ministers of Education during that period. Secondly, when pressure began to develop, the government strayed away from its initial purpose, which was that of consolidation and to make the legislation more comprehensible. The government ventured into highly sensitive and controversial areas and began to make changes — changes that have also proved to be highly controversial.

Thirdly, the pressures on the government have produced many examples of inexcusable changes in their position. Changes were made that were in complete opposition to previously stated positions. If there ever was an award for a government which lacks policy, foresight and determination, this government would win hands down.

The ferris wheel approach of getting this legislation passed could be considered to be comical in nature if it were not for the problems and tensions that it has created in educational circles. Like the ferris wheel, the minister's proposed legislation goes 'round and 'round. Nobody knows where it will stop — things get on while others get off. Where will it lead us? Nobody knows — presumably, not even the minister himself.

Fourth, what is the present state of affairs? The latest changes partly appeased the teachers but angered the trustees. The minister is obviously aware that the heat is on again. The trustees are holding meetings throughout the province; they are contacting members of this Legislative Assembly and will shortly be beginning an information

program to outline weaknesses that they have recognized. It is their hope that the pressure of the trustees and the parents will ultimately force the minister to make changes once again.

Fifth, we in our caucus have continuously suggested that the minister should convene the education committee of this Assembly — a committee that would enable members of this Assembly to understand the implications of the legislation. The minister has scoffed at that idea. I am certain that his refusal was based on a fear of the pressure that such a committee might bring, but the minister has not and will not avoid this pressure. He simply will be receiving it in a more uncontrolled fashion.

Mr. Speaker, by venturing into the controversial areas the government has threatened the whole operation of consolidation. In my opinion, the swath has simply become too wide and because of this, the entire operation is in jeopardy.

While the government certainly has the responsibility for legislation in these highly controversial areas, this was not the time to do it. As stated earlier, the initial intent of the government was commendable. It would be a shame if the many excellent changes made in the proposed legislation are lost due to the government's straying away from what was their stated original intent.

In the fall of 1973, the Department of Education sponsored a number of regional conferences on education in Saskatchewan. These regional conferences were followed by many mini-seminars held throughout various locations in the province. The purpose of these seminars is indicated in a Department of Education publication called 'Issues and Choices'. This was a publication which summarized the general consensus arrived at, following those conferences. I would like to quote a passage from that document. "The fall conferences on education were the first phase of a new approach to the formulation of educational policy in Saskatchewan."

It goes on to state, "That policy further should evolve through several cycles of scrutiny and modification and it should have the support of those concerned about education."

The point is, what conclusion did these conferences reach; these conferences which brought in students, parents, teachers, and school trustees, as well as the general public? What conclusion did they reach about the issue of teacher tenure?

I would like to quote the opening paragraph of a section called 'Assessment of Teacher Performance' which can be found on page 19 of that document. It states "Considerable criticism of The Teacher Tenure Act was recorded in the conferences. It was felt, as the Act now stands, incompetent teachers are protected from censure or dismissal."

I would like to ask the minister how well he thinks his proposed section on teacher job security fulfills the aspirations of those attending the seminars. Previous tenure legislation provided for a conciliation board, a device whereby a teacher could ultimately verify that his dismissal was not justified. No guarantee of reinstatement was available, as the decisions were not binding. This form of job security was available to those teachers with two or more years of service with the same board.

The proposed legislation provides more security for some teachers. Teachers with more than two years or service with the same board would be able to appeal any dismissal to a reference board, whose decisions would be binding. There is an improvement over legislation that would limit a reference board to the two options of

April 5, 1978

reinstatement or dismissal justification. That is the section that permits the Board of Reference to make a type of recommendation. The untenable situations, such as placing a teacher back into a community that does not want him, will not be necessary under the new legislation and this is an improvement. While the idea is an improvement, the wording of the proposed section, we feel, could certainly be improved.

While more security is available to some teachers, there is a possibility that the beginning teacher or the teacher who changes teaching positions, will have less security. Teachers such as the aforementioned will be subjected to very careful scrutiny during their first two years with a new board. I am afraid the administration and boards will not be willing to risk keeping teachers who have problems with adjustment, which many teachers often have when beginning teaching or when changing schools. Boards and their administrators will probably be unwilling to take chances.

There is no doubt in my mind that boards of reference will prove to be messy affairs. Legal counsel will undoubtedly represent both parties of the dispute. They will leave no stone unturned in representing their party. This brings me to a personal fear of what boards of reference may possibly do. I, personally, am afraid that much of the evidence presented will be of such a nature that the entire educational program and system could suffer. The teacher, administrators and often the community could become victims of the hearings and ultimately the student will be affected.

I fear that a good deal of harm to the entire educational system could possibly occur by the washing of this dirty linen in public. I personally witnessed one such hearing and came away with a feeling that all of the participants were losers.

There is, indeed, a possibility that teachers may be unjustly dismissed. I also realize that these dismissals may result from factors entirely unrelated to the job that the teacher does in the classroom. I certainly do not condone unjust dismissals and do have a sympathy for those dismissed.

Contrary to what many believe, there is a degree of protection for teachers in the existing legislation. Even though boards could ignore the recommendations of the Tenure Board, teachers were afforded the opportunity of being able to prove their dismissal was unjustified.

It is true that boards were not obliged to reinstate the teacher. Many question the advisability of forcing a board to reinstate a teacher because of the negative effect it can have on the school and the community. This is particularly true in rural Saskatchewan.

An example is the situation that often occurs in rural Saskatchewan when a teacher may be doing an admirable job in the school but is having a difficult time in the community. Reinstatement will not solve this type of problem.

Trustees have often criticized existing legislation, claiming that they could not dismiss incompetent teachers. This view was often transferred to the general public. The fact is that the legislation did permit dismissals of incompetent teachers. It is true that teachers had an appeal mechanism, but shouldn't they have? The existing appeal mechanism, at the very least, permitted the teacher to clear his name. Certainly such a

right should be available if there is to be a degree of fairness.

We, in our caucus, have some reservations about the proposed legislation and we will be introducing amendments at what we consider to be the appropriate time.

Collective Bargaining — In his speech, the minister indicated that collective bargaining was a highly controversial issue for all concerned. Because of high sensitivity and the effect it could have in present relationships which exist between teachers, trustees and the government, the minister decided not to change existing legislation.

It is odd that the minister used an entirely different approach when considering the other highly sensitive issue of job security.

The minister has indicated that he hopes the problems associated with the collective bargaining legislation will disappear or will be settled by holding further discussions with trustees and teachers. An interesting dichotomy seems to exist between this proposal and what the minister has experienced in the past.

In drafting Bill 22, the department has just come through a three-year period of participatory democracy designed to reach a consensus. But what has been the result? An answer to that question can be found in the minister's address to the STF Council this week. I would like to quote:

In the two cases which have traditionally been the most contentious, employment security and collective bargaining, no compromise position developed.

In fact, the minister recognized that increased polarization actually developed. In light of the aforementioned it makes one question the minister's reason for delaying action on collective bargaining, if that is the reason. It also makes one wonder how much success he will have in resolving this issue by further discussions.

The Liberal Party opposed the concept of bi-level bargaining when it was introduced and we still do. Listing negotiable items has caused nothing but controversy. We further question the makeup of the management side of the negotiations committee. The present structure of this committee decidedly places the committee in the hands of the government. Trustees have been designed for the role of a eunuch — they can sit around and talk but they can't do anything about it.

If the government is concerned about the portion of the settlement that they must pay for, they can resolve this issue in other ways. Actual increases in grants could be announced before negotiations begin, allowing negotiators to know in advance what the province would pay for.

Local control in education — we in the Liberal Party strongly believe in local control by local governments. We are concerned that some of the changes made to Bill 22 have reduced local control. As the legislation proceeds through third reading we will be introducing amendments designed to give more responsibility to locally elected officials.

The section on functions and duties of teachers — as a former teacher, I am personally disturbed at some of the changes made in section 227. I always enjoyed teaching and was proud of being a teacher. To me, any suggestion that the responsibility to teach be

April 5, 1978

replaced by the requirement to give instruction is degrading. The word 'instruction' seems to imply that it is only essential to make education materials available to the students. The obligation to actually teach seems to be removed. While I may be only playing with words, I do consider that it is a teacher's responsibility to diligently and faithfully teach children and I never minded being told to do so.

Everyone recognizes that the most vital component in a quality education is the teacher. Certainly, the teacher is responsible for the quality and if we are to prepare a list of the general functions and duties of teachers as is done in this legislation, certainly it is hard not to visualize that a section on quality had to be mentioned. I realize that because of the nature of the word — the term 'quality' is hard to define but if teachers are concerned about malpractice suits being centred around the word 'quality' in its definition, are there not other ways of protecting teachers and boards from these malpractice suits?

General elections — most rural trustees do not like the idea of general elections replacing the continuity that staggered elections bring, and I am not sure that the minister's claim that general elections will arouse more interest is valid. There is no doubt in my mind that a complete change of board members (if it did occur) would have an effect upon the school system.

As to school hours — I believe changing of 165 back to what was in the previous legislation was a good move. I do not believe the intention of Bill 43 was to require teachers to work additional hours but the change has eliminated the confusion. To my knowledge this legislation worked well in the past and should serve the future well.

Regarding separate schools — the change to permit separate school districts to extend their boundaries to the local attendance area should help some of the problems that have occurred due to centralization and we certainly support it.

The conflict of interest legislation for trustees is also a noted improvement, particularly for rural Saskatchewan. Changes made to conflict of interest legislation is welcome. In rural Saskatchewan a limited number of specialized personnel are available. Previous legislation made it difficult for rural boards, where one of the members might have provided the service. The changes made should make it easier for boards to obtain the necessary services and yet protect the public purse.

In conclusion, I might say that many of the proposed changes in Bill 22 are welcome. In numerous areas more control to local authorities was granted. Pupil and parental rights have been enhanced and obsolete legislation was eliminated. Bill 22 is certainly more comprehensible.

In my opinion it is just too bad that the government attempted to do too much at one time. It would be a shame if we would lose all the good things because of a few isolated controversial areas. Mr. Speaker, that concludes my remarks.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.W. Lane (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, I have a great many comments that I should like to make on this matter and I beg leave of the House to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 23 — **An Act to provide Loans to Saskatchewan Homeowners for the purpose of Promoting Energy Conservation** — be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion? Carried.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I am sorry. The whip was standing between you and me, Mr. Speaker, and you couldn't see me.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I have called the question and it has been dealt with. I put myself in the Assembly's hands. That can be dangerous at times. Does the Assembly wish to hear the minister?

Mr. Penner: — No.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the matter is concluded. We have had second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Penner: — Mr. Speaker, I said no facetiously and if the minister wants to speak I don't want my no to prevent him from doing so.

Mr. Speaker: — We are for a second time put into a position of going back and dealing with a subject which has been dealt with. I will ask everybody to be non-facetious this time. Shall the minister be heard?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I won't take a great deal of time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my apologies for having to go through this procedure. As I said, I probably got up a little late, but also there was some interference between you and me which made it not possible for you to see me. But I appreciate the members opposite giving the leave for a continuation of my comments.

I just want to say some words in support of this legislation, Mr. Speaker. As an MLA who has had a large number of people in my constituency express a need and a desire that we proceed to provide some assistance in this way or in some other form, but certainly meet the particular need which is being provided through this legislation. We have had a considerable amount of discussion nationally, we have had a considerable amount of discussion internationally about the need for conservation. We as a society unfortunately, around the world, at least the part of the world that I and most members of this House are familiar with, have tended to become great users of those resources which have been very accessible to us in large volumes. Unfortunately, those before us and maybe until recent times all of us have never come to realize or appreciate the fact that there could come a day when some of those resources would become depleted. We should have been able to realize that because it was clearly known they were not renewable resources but unfortunately when there is a great volume of a resource, we don't tend to pay attention to this fact until we are on the verge of having it depleted.

I am pleased I will be able to go to my constituents and inform them that the Government of Saskatchewan is providing this assistance to them. It provides a need that they have expressed; it also involves some responsibility on their part. I know there may be some who might claim that it is one of those give-away programs; those who like to criticize governments and their programs sometimes describe them as such. I don't think this is.

I think it is a program that redistributes once again, as many of our programs do, the wealth of this province that comes not only from the taxpayers but from our resources and therefore is a very positive move. I, for one, am very pleased to support this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words to say on this Bill. I appreciate the comments made by the member for Humboldt. Mr. Minister, I have some concerns I would like to direct to you in the way of safeguarding or protection not only to the department that will be administering this Bill and looking after the loans but also to the overall benefit of all the people of Saskatchewan.

In our drive across Canada to become energy conscious, we have on the market, at the present time, many types of insulation. And, Mr. Minister, I am afraid we have some insulating products on sale that should be carefully examined and scrutinized for the protection of the homeowner. I suggest to you and I say this not as a criticism but in the manner of safeguarding the consumer that the department looking after the loans and making them applicable to the people of Saskatchewan to be well aware that all the insulation on the market today does not measure up to standards and that the consumer should be very careful before making a purchase as such. I say that as a way of caution to the minister.

Mr. Minister, there is something else that I would like to add at this time very briefly in the matter of energy — and I am somewhat disappointed that we haven't had some results at the present time in the way of utilizing, what is very common here in the western prairies, the wind and the energy that it can produce. I keep reading and I keep thinking about this as a great potential to the people of Saskatchewan. I keep looking at the ways and means by which we once produced a fair degree of electricity from this source, and having the modern techniques that we have now and the aerodynamic technical facts that we have, I am somewhat disappointed, not in this government necessarily but in science research altogether, that we haven't been a little more speedy in this area. I have awaited from the SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation), and I see that the minister in charge is here and I wait, with some eager anticipation, for the results of even the egg-beater experiment on No. 1 Highway.

A recent report from the United States, Mr. Minister, indicated the cost factor of putting these into operation, how they can be easily converted from DC to AC in the electric current, and it would, to me, be advantageous, for the three prairie provinces in particular, to kind of pool resources here and see if we could not speed up this particular area of utilizing a resource. One thing about the wind in western Canada, it certainly is renewable because we can get it for weeks at a time.

Those are all the comments I have, Mr. Minister, I caution the department looking after these loans to look very carefully at the insulation for the protection of our consumers, and to speed up, through the various departments of the government, the utilization which I am quite confident can be made in harnessing the wind resources of the western plains.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to address a few closing words to this particular piece of legislation. I am sure that most members of the Legislative Assembly realize that this will provide, to Saskatchewan citizens, one of the most meaningful, one of the most progressive, and I think one of the most worthwhile endeavors to educate consumers of power in Saskatchewan that we absolutely have to respect the needs to conserve that energy — I notice the member is

speaking from his seat again. I do not know whether he had the opportunity to speak in this debate or not. I think the record will show that he did not. That is unfortunate but it is not inconsistent with the member in regard to some of these — unfortunate for him, fortunate for us, I say to the member for Rosetown — But, Mr. Speaker, this will provide Saskatchewan citizens with a conservation program which is more progressive than any other conservation program in Canada today. I think it should be reiterated, Mr. Speaker, that this program was an endeavor to compensate for the total failure of the federal program. The federal program, as you are well aware, when it was first announced was to conserve or undertake to insulate homes built prior to 1921 and that was not going to be of any real reward or benefit to Saskatchewan homeowners. With some extensive negotiation which emanated from the province of Saskatchewan, that was ultimately changed so that houses built prior to 1946 would be eligible for the federal CHIP program; however that still was not sufficient. This program will provide \$1,000 interest-free to any homeowner in Saskatchewan so that he may undertake to get better value for a dollar spent on energy.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Kindersley is not here. He undertook, in his remarks pertaining to this Bill, to criticize the government for its development policy; criticized it he has, for some time — the increase in electrical charges for the province of Saskatchewan. He does that quite regularly but he never undertakes to convey to this Legislative Assembly or to the people of Saskatchewan that Saskatchewan Power Corporation rates are cheaper than most other areas in Canada — almost any other area, certainly on average. For 500 kilowatt hours consumed per month, the consumer in Saskatchewan is \$2 below the Canadian average and it is lower than in most other provinces, there only being some districts of British Columbia, Alberta and Quebec where they have access to some extensive energy resources, primarily hydro.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Kindersley also undertook to criticize the government in regard to its natural gas development policy. Strange, I hear the Leader of the Liberal Party saying. Strange that those criticisms would come from Liberals opposite who sold the Hatton Gas Fields for literally nothing and we are now buying that gas back at a dollar and thirty-some cents per mcf, Mr. Speaker. Strange that the Liberal Party should undertake to criticize this government for the way it undertakes to develop energy resources in this province when they literally gave away energy a few short years ago. I know that is a sore spot for them, Mr. Speaker. The member for Kindersley has a bit of a warped mind when it comes to criticizing our gas development policy. He tries to somehow convey to the citizens of Saskatchewan because we don't pay high prices for gas we are charging them too much for gas consumed. Because the wellhead price is low we are somehow robbing the citizens of Saskatchewan because we are charging too much for gas.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the member for Kindersley and his colleagues that it is because of that wellhead price we are able to subsidize the expensive gas that is brought into the province of Saskatchewan from Alberta, almost 65 per cent to 70 per cent of it, Mr. Speaker. Now, they say, don't bring any gas in from Alberta; use up all of Saskatchewan's gas. We know, Mr. Speaker, that we have a supply of gas for only 15 or 20 years at best and energy prices are going to continue to rise. If we were to undertake to put ourselves in that position, in 15 or 20 years time we would be totally vulnerable to Alberta gas and Alberta prices. That would not be wise planning of energy for Saskatchewan consumers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker . . . the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, I am sorry you missed your opportunity to speak but would you please let me finish; perhaps during committee you

will have an opportunity to review some of the sections of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to turn my remarks very briefly to the comments made by the member for Rosetown-Elrose. He talks about the egg-beater experiment. I do not disagree with the comments he makes. We do have some co-operative undertaking not only with the prairie provinces, with research carried on in Canada and North America as a whole, in regard to harnessing wind energy. There are certainly large sums of money being expended in other jurisdictions, for example, in the United States something in excess of \$250 million a year. There is no sense in us undertaking to try and compete with that kind of research. I think the best thing we can do is try and plug into the result of that research and I think we are doing that. I think that we ultimately will be able to perhaps enjoy some production of energy through wind power.

One of our major problems is devising a system which can both take the power that is generated from the wind and put it into the system for consumption by consumers in Saskatchewan and on other occasions, when we can't generate that power by wind, have a system which can reverse the flow of energy and provide it through our more normal means that we are used to at this particular point in time such as thermal and hydro. The problem is that if there isn't a reasonable balance we find that we have to have a very extensive thermal and hydro system, costly, which is not operating all the time because you need it for backup. We have to make some decision at some point in time as to how far we want to go with risking the non-expansion of that system in order to put into place a system which provides energy by wind. We haven't got that worked out; I don't think anybody in North America, I don't think anybody on this globe really has yet. It is something that will have to be achieved before we can really enjoy significant benefits from the generation of electrical power from wind. I might say, though, we have undertaken in other areas as well means to conserve energy or get better utilization of energy. I am sure the member is aware of the off heat furnace so that we can put our system into almost full productivity at all points in time and the furnace when demand for electricity is low would store energy during the night time and we would be able to use that to generate heat during the day time when our system is put into peak performance and production.

We have built a conservation house in Regina. I hope the member has undertaken to look at it. I think that there is some potential for solar energy and he comments that he is going to build one himself. I am glad to hear that. But we have shown that just through proper construction methods, proper insulation standards that we can get 85 to 90 per cent more efficiency out of the energy that we now consume and that is a very, very significant improvement from what we have. If one applies that across the province of Saskatchewan we can literally save hundreds of millions of dollars in a very short period of time by utilizing energy which would have otherwise been wasted. I hope, Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate that the program of insulation for Saskatchewan homes will not only provide a direct saving to Saskatchewan citizens but it also will make them aware of the need to conserve because that has to be part of the solution to our energy problem, today, and I think a bigger part of our solution for the energy problem of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, having said those few short words in closing up debate on Bill 23, I move second reading and recommend all members of the House to support this particular piece of legislation.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 13 — **An Act to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and**

Compensation Act, 1968 be now read a second time.

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, with your permission I believe that I asked the Attorney General a question concerning this Bill.

Mr. Romanow: — . . . in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Bailey: — Committee of the Whole, fine, thank you.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Kaeding that Bill No. 6 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act, 1974** be now read a second time.

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, a few brief comments in regard to this particular Bill and I welcome the opportunity to be allowed to participate in the second reading debate on Bill No. 6. I was a bit leery as to whether that occasion would ever arise. I had expected the agricultural critic for the party to my left to continue on with the debate in regard to this particular Bill, as each and every time the Bill came up for second reading it continued to be stood. I image they are having a difficult time in deciding what their position is on this particular Bill. The agricultural critic, when he did speak on the legislation, spoke for about 16 minutes. On going through the records in Hansard I could not determine from those comments what the Conservative Party's position was on that particular piece of legislation.

I and the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan have no hesitation whatsoever in saying that we wholeheartedly support the concept behind this particular legislation. We do, however, have some reservations in regard to it and proper amendments to the legislation will be introduced when we get into the section by section study of this particular piece of legislation.

A few of the areas that I could mention in my remarks at this time deal with section 16, subsection 3 in which the offences and the penalties are outlined. Subsection 1, I believe, the penalty is a good one; subsection 2, the penalty is a good one. However, in subsection 3 it deals again with the corporation which is similar to subsection 2 which sets out a fine if the corporation is found to be guilty of \$100,000. We have no objections to this whatsoever. However, section 3 subjects a member, an officer, director or agent of the corporation who directed, authorized, assented or participated in the commissioning of an offence is guilty as well and subject to a fine of up to \$10,000 whether or not the corporation has been prosecuted or convicted. I think that the onus on the individual member of the corporation is far too severe in regard to subsection 3 and it is our hope to make some amendments there as well.

We have some qualifications as to the maximum amount of land that an individual or corporation is allowed to own in the province of Saskatchewan under the Bill; it is listed as 160 acres. My feeling and the feeling of the delegates at the policy convention of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party held in Saskatoon last fall was that that limit be no greater than 20 acres. I don't see why in the world we should allow a corporation to come in and own more than 20 acres. It's for that reason that I disagree with the particular legislation as presently written in that they are allowing corporations and foreign owners to come into this province and own 160 acres of land. One argument that could

be raised — a potash mine would require more than 20 acres — I think that there would be enough leeway if a section was added to the Act to allow cabinet to make a decision to extend the maximum of 20 acres that were to apply to corporations such as a potash mine coming in and needing more than 20 acres in order to establish their operation. That is about the only criticism that I have in regard to this particular legislation.

What I find strange though is that this piece of legislation in my mind is one of the most significant and one of the most important pieces of legislation in regard to land use that this legislature has dealt with, I think, for a considerable length of time. I was rather disappointed to see the response given to this particular Act by the press when it was introduced by the Minister of Agriculture. In effect, hardly any notice was given to the fact that a piece of legislation, I feel as important as this one, was not given more coverage in the press and the media throughout the province of Saskatchewan. I think that it's important that legislation such as this does receive proper coverage and not just one little corner, two or three lines at the bottom of a full page.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn some of my remarks to some comments made by the Minister of Agriculture in the introduction of this particular legislation. He talked about the threat of corporate farming in Saskatchewan and related that to some of the articles that appeared in *The Furrow* which is a farm machinery magazine. But let me say as well and I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture fully realizes that corporate farming as outlined in that *Furrow* magazine and corporate farming which some of us may be afraid of, I don't believe is going to be a threat in the province of Saskatchewan nor will it be a threat any longer in the United States.

Let me remind the Minister of Agriculture that a number of years ago he and I had the privilege of serving on the Ownership of Agricultural Lands Committee which was set up or established by this legislature to look into the very thing, ownership of agricultural lands, especially in relation to huge corporations.

We couldn't find any corporate farms in the province of Saskatchewan to investigate mainly because there were none, so we had to go into North Dakota, South Dakota and also as far south as the State of Colorado. We visited five of these corporate farms. Of the five corporate farms that we visited, there was only one that was still in operation. Two were in the process of winding up their operations and the other two had completely closed down and were no longer in existence.

When I talk about corporate farms I am talking about a farm being owned by a corporation such as Goodyear Tire, Imperial Oil or corporations in this light. The problem that they are encountering are problems that they are going to continue to encounter because there is no way that you can hire someone else to do an adequate job of farming large tracts of land. They wish to work eight hours a day, five days a week and anyone knows that a farm will not be successful with those kinds of hours and those kinds of days. It was for that reason that each and every one of the corporate farms that we did visit — it was that reason that they gave us as to why they were in financial difficulty and why they were in the process of closing up their particular operation. I have nothing against corporate farming in the province of Saskatchewan if that corporate farming is being undertaken by father and son or father and sons. It is exactly the same type of a farm as a farm being set up under the Co-operatives Act — it is just the mechanics in which they set up the particular company or corporation that they function under. There is nothing wrong, in my mind, with a father and four sons owning ten sections of land. It may look like a big tract of land because it is being farmed by one corporation or one company if that is the proper word to use, but there

are five families making a living off of ten sections of land. We have no objection to one individual making a living off of two sections of land so why should we object to five individuals making a living off of ten sections? The same thing applies.

I think we have to make a clear distinction when we talk about corporate farming in Saskatchewan to ensure that when we use the word 'corporate' that it is the large company, the huge company that is not interested whatsoever in the farming operation and, in my mind, the last thing in the world these corporations should be involved in is farming in the province of Saskatchewan.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing my remarks on this particular Bill, that we support it wholeheartedly, that we will be introducing some amendments to it, hopefully when we get into third reading. My criticism again, is the fact that the government did not go far enough in this particular piece of legislation. We felt that 20 acres should be the maximum allowed to non-residents, foreigners in the province of Saskatchewan. It is my hope that the minister, when he does close debate on this particular piece of legislation, gives some reasoning as to why the 160 acre maximum was put into the Bill, and not something that I believe would be more realistic, such as 20 acres.

Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the amendment to The Farm Ownership Act. Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal primarily with the reasons behind the need for this type of amendment. Very simply, the amendments are going to place restrictions on non-residents of farm lands in Saskatchewan. That being the principle of the Bill, I can say that the progressive Conservative Party will be supporting this Bill, that the PC caucus will be supporting this Bill in terms of the principle.

My 'but' is a very justified 'but', Mr. Attorney General. I think that we look for reasons again behind amendments to The Farm Ownership Act. Why is it that others are purchasing Saskatchewan land and not residents in Saskatchewan? If that were the case, if it were the case where our residents purchasing the land, then we really wouldn't have this problem of non-residents coming in and purchasing our farm lands.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I might just for a moment take a look at some of those reasons. We have taken a position now that these amendments, we are going to discourage those who attempt to farm and own our lands in this province; rather we would like to see an approach taken to encourage the people of Saskatchewan to buy, own, live on Saskatchewan lands and maintain our rural Saskatchewan because it is the strength of this province.

The comments from the member for Morse who more and more is sounding like a member of the government, I don't know why, he is slipping a little to the left, I guess. I guess there is not an awful lot I can do about that, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we have already recognized the good intent of this legislation, but again, we must look at why. Since 1971 in the province of Alberta, they have 4,100 new farmers. They have competition there in their own province for those lands which discourages non-residents or foreigners if you like. Personal income tax in Alberta 38.5 per cent, 53 per cent in Saskatchewan. Farm fuels cost 15 per cent more. I see the Minister of Agriculture taking all these things down, he takes them down because he's going to find out they are true. No sales tax in the province of Alberta and there is in Saskatchewan and as the Minister of Agriculture would be well aware, removal of the sales tax or a decrease of the sales tax in this province would greatly enhance growth and the stability of our rural

towns which, in fact, support those people who are farming our rural lands in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Romanow: — Where would we get the money from?

Mr. Birkbeck: — Well, the Attorney General says, where would we get the money from? Well, I'm sure, Mr. Attorney General, that a Progressive Conservative government in the province of Saskatchewan with just plain simple ordinary common business sense and administration could make up the 5 per cent sales tax in this province.

The member for Morse might note when he was speaking he didn't get any hot stuff from the other side and when I'm speaking on this amendment, the same Bill, the same amendments, I seem to be getting a lot of catcalls and shooting across the floor and even from the member for the Battlefords who has always hollered across, "oh, look at the decorum now," and I see him walking around in total disrespect for the other members of this legislature who are trying to make their points on this amendment.

We are looking at a great number of agricultural societies in the province of Alberta — 208 as a matter of fact compared to 64 in this province — societies which again encourage rural development. We look at capital grants for these agricultural societies in the neighborhood of \$75,000. None whatsoever in Saskatchewan. We look at \$800,000 into weather modification in the province of Alberta where you, Mr. Minister, are on record as opposing my suggestions that we should have some program of weather modification, a program of trying to assist the federal government in its budget and in its efforts to try and help the rural growth of Saskatchewan. You discount that. You say, well, the weather is going to be what it is going to be. You made a rather ridiculous reply to say the least. Well, we can't do anything about the weather. Now, Mr. Minister, no one ever suggested that we could do anything about the weather. The point was being made that there could be programs here placed, in effect, so that the farmers in this province would have a better change of standing their odds against acts of God, if you like. That is something that you could have taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already outlined again for clarification of the Attorney General, I am trying to tell you why, in my estimation, we have to bring in non-resident restrictions, that it seems to be quite a lack of competition by our own Saskatchewan people and for good reason. We have a centralization of government in this province which in turn is drawing people off of the farms and into the cities. The Minister of Agriculture knows that. You can look at municipal seed cleaning plants; there are 75 in Alberta; there are only four in Saskatchewan. Now the Minister of Agriculture is always making many statements about how he is serving the agricultural industry in this province in order to enhance this residential ownership of land. Your own Premier, leader of your party, by his own admission said that in 17 or 18 years of his activity in politics he was unable to do anything whatsoever for our grain farmers in this province regarding high demurrage charges at the west coast, rising continually, expected to be in the neighborhood of \$10 million, unable to do anything. I refer to the Minister of Finance as the \$2 billion man and I am beginning to wonder if the Minister of Agriculture is the two cent Minister of Agriculture because he always does nothing.

Mr. Minister, I am only suggesting that you have a golden opportunity to take the lead. Saskatchewan — and you know it — Saskatchewan is on the very of being a very prominent province in this country in terms of the economy and it can be that way if our agricultural industry flourishes. Food production — you can look at some of the other things that are a problem to us which you have taken no lead in, that being — well, Mr.

Speaker, the Attorney General is in a hurry. The more interrupts I suppose the longer I am going to take.

Mr. Minister, the Canadian Grain Commission as you know has set maximum rates allowable for the grain companies to charge. The member for Morse says all these are only maximum rates, and the elevator companies through their membership and particularly the Wheat Pools, in trying to line themselves up behind the Wheat Pool, said that they would adjust those, and that the elevator companies would not necessarily charge the maximum rate — well, maybe, Mr. Minister, you should be aware and the hon. member for Morse should be aware, that when maximum allowable rate is increased, naturally the average rate charged for handling grain in this province is going to increase — there is no denying that. We are only supporting the government's position, the Wheat Pool's position, and our own position, when we all supported the recommendations of the Hall Commission report, and then we look at a decision by the Canadian Grain Commission which can, in effect, totally undermine those recommendations of the Hall report.

Look at the numbers of millions of dollars involved — just taking the ceiling it can go from \$65.9 million to 94 million, and you don't think that is important, and you are not prepared to take the lead as Minister of Agriculture in that area either. Now, Mr. Minister, the Attorney General again is impatient, but I am sure the Minister of Agriculture knows that the points that I am making are valid. The Attorney General keeps reiterating well we are on The Farm Ownership Bill, the amendments thereof. One question, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you and I want you to take note of it. I can't find anywhere in the amendments or in the Act, what actually constitutes a farmer. Now maybe I have overlooked it and if so, well I am sure you will correct me . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the word 'farmer' is used in the amendment; it is used in the original Act, and we are going to have to know what constitutes a farmer if we are going to properly impose the regulations the Act has set out. We are told as well in the amendment (you want to know how it pertains to being a farmer and what the importance of being a farmer is), that once you are not a farmer, once you are not something you don't know what you are in the first place, being as there is no legal definition in the Act, then you are going to have to reduce your landholding within five years, to the minimum allowed — 160 acres. I think that is important and, Mr. Minister, I would appreciate your commenting on that when you close debate on this. The fines were increased, in some areas possibly justified, but the onus of proof was placed on the non-resident. In other words, he is guilty until he proves himself innocent. You will place more power in the hands of the board and, Mr. Minister, you would know we are opposed to that centralization of power. We feel that you have too much power there now. We have questioned you regarding the allocations of land at Saskatoon to a multinational, which was authorized by the Farm Ownership Board. You can talk about the merits of some of these amendments, if you like, but the Farm Ownership Board, by the Minister of Agriculture and through his direction, can overrule any of the amendments or clauses that are set out in the original Bill or the amendment.

An Hon. Member: — Bunk!

Mr. Birkbeck: — And that is not bunk. The minister should read the legislation. Mr. Minister, what you are saying is, well what would a Progressive Conservative Party have done? I clearly remember you asking me, how would you approach this?

Because you know that it was a Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan that was telling you, as Minister of Agriculture, that we needed to place some restrictions on non-resident ownership of land, in particular to foreigners, outside of Canada. I am sure that the member for last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy), as I said before, placed a great deal of pressure on you when he lost 3,000 acres out of his own

April 5, 1978

constituency. You might elaborate when you are speaking, what his recommendations were to you.

I say, in all sincerity, that this House and you, Mr. Minister, could have done well by taking the suggestions of both Liberal and Conservative opposition parties in this Assembly before drafting your legislation.

Any government that introduces legislation has to concern itself with what the opposition is going to be. All that I am saying is that if you would consult somewhat with the opposition, whether it be behind the bar of the Assembly, or whatever, and get some of those recommendations, then we could spend a lot less time debating it in the House. Because like the member for Morse, there are a number of clauses, subclauses, that we do not like and that we will be introducing amendments to.

Mr. Attorney General, if you think we are taking a while now, wait until we get into third reading.

Mr. Minister, if I might, in concluding, tell you that we do agree with these amendments on the principle; we disagree in a number of areas in the way that you have approached it. As I said at the outset, you are penalizing those who are abusing, which could be considered by a great number of people as a good approach. I am only saying that our approach would have been to reward those who do not provide incentives, encourage people to habitat in Saskatchewan on the land that they own. That could have been done, Mr. Minister, through a tax credit system. A system which you never discussed with myself. And I am sure if you take the approach of this government on other Bills and on other pieces of legislation you would not have listened to it anyway.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying that we do support the principle of the Bill, but we will be introducing amendments.

Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the debates this afternoon regarding this Bill. I think this is one of the most important Bills brought into this House this session. I think, as already a comment made by the member for Morse, the kind of debate that he has brought down, sensible and practical, is the kind that we are looking forward to. The last speaker's comments, I don't think we should make any remarks about them because they made about as much sense as his remarks regarding the resolution on The Migratory Birds Depredation Act.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because I have more things to say and I know some of the other members on this side of the House have as well, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Department of Health — Vote 32

Item 10 agreed.

Item 11

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Very briefly, Mr. Minister, can you tell me what this program does?

Hon. E.L. Tchorzewski (Minister of Health): — Mr. Chairman, this program is the administration of the payment of accounts for non-insured health services to persons receiving assistance of other programs administered by the Department of Social Services.

Mr. MacDonald: — I can hear.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — You can't hear? I will read off the other book and then I will be able to get closer to the mike. The function is to administer the payment of accounts for non-insured health services to persons receiving assistance under program administered by the Department of Social Services, in other words, MSD (Medical Services Division) payments, beneficiary classifications include Saskatchewan Assistance Plan beneficiaries, government wards, inmates in correctional institutions and so on.

Item 11 agreed.

Item 12

Mr. E.C. Malone (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I want to ask a series of questions about medical research and I can find no other item in the estimates that they would be appropriate on so I will ask them on this particular item.

Firstly, perhaps you would explain to me what the Policy Research and Management Services Division actually does.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Its purpose is to conduct policy and program reviews and evaluations in order to suggest policy program and cost benefit improvements to research design and assist in the development of new health programs, to develop, negotiate and advise government on legislation for health professionals. I am introducing two Bills into the legislature in this session to provide day to day management of support services to the minister and the deputy minister and the department's executive committee.

Mr. Malone: — I take it then that it is sort of an in-house research operation. It has nothing to do with pure medical research, re cancer, etc. I would like to ask the minister — I hope you won't follow the pattern set by your predecessor when I ask you these questions about the University of Saskatchewan Medical School. We have had occasion in the past where the minister just bounded these questions over to the Minister of Education. I hope you won't follow that policy. But can you tell me what amount of money is allotted to the University of Saskatchewan Medical School for the purpose of pure research? I don't want you to get hung up on money allotted to the Alcoholism Commission or the Cancer Commission or whatever. I am just talking now about the University of Saskatchewan Medical School.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — After his preamble, I may disappoint the member but I hope not, because that is the way things happen to be organized. First of all, through the Department of Health we are considering now, there is no money allotted to the university medical school for pure research. There is no such money through the Department of Health. I am advised though, that through the Department of Continuing Education's grant to the university's commission, there indeed is a component that is provided for research. I do not know whether my staff has that. I do not have that; I kind of doubt that they do but I will consult with them. Go ahead with your next question.

Mr. Malone: — I suggest to the minister that the component for research is not tied to medical research. It is research in other areas. Indeed, what we now find with the University of Saskatchewan Medical School is that they receive absolutely nothing from the provincial government for the purposes of research, whether it is from the Department of Education or from your department.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I do not recall whether the member asked a question. He made a comment which I will not argue with at this point in time although I can indicate to the member and to the House that we do have some particular interest in research — where it is at and where it ought to be going. I have had some correspondence with Dr. Hickey from the University of Saskatchewan, who the member may know. We have arranged a meeting later this month, I think it is, or the early part of May, to discuss medical research with him. He is the president of — There is an organization called 'Canadians for Research in Saskatchewan; and he is a member of that organization. We will be having some initial discussions with him so that we can determine where things are at and where they might be going. But it is true. As I said before, we do not have money in the Department of Health for research for the college of medicine or in the medical school. The money for research is provided to the university's commission. Now, the member suggests that we should be saying to the university's commission that it ought to be allocating X numbers of dollars and X numbers of dollars for some other research. That is fine. That is the position that he may want to state.

Mr. Malone: — The position is not what I take or what you take; it is the position that the university finds itself in at the medical school faculty. Firstly, the medical school is neither fish nor fowl and your officials will recall I have been saying this for the last couple of years. It is that it has to deal with the Department of Education and the University of Saskatchewan and at the same time it has to deal with your department. There is a tendency to pass the buck between departments all the time and the people that suffer from this attitude of your government are the people at the University of Saskatchewan Medical School. I will tell you how it is of concern to them. For them to continue to operate and run a first-rate medical school in Saskatchewan, they have to have funds available to them to have pure research undertaken during the school year by the personnel that they try to get to come and teach. If those funds are not available, the people they want to attract, of a first-class nature, invariably go somewhere else because if a doctor is going to pursue the academic career, he is more interested in research and teaching than he is in the actual practice of medicine. When it comes to the University of Saskatchewan Medical School to attract these people,, they have very great difficulty in doing so because they do not have the budget component available to them to pay for pure research. Now I ask the minister, are you prepared, in your department, to undertake to look into this situation and next year, have some allotment in your budget for the University of Saskatchewan Medical School for research, pure and simple? I say to you as well that other provinces are moving along these lines. The minister will be aware that in Alberta, the sum of \$15 million was allocated from their Heritage Fund for cancer research. In Ontario, part of the Wintario lottery, part of their funds are allocated for medical research. In the province of Quebec, there are moneys allocated to the medical schools there for research. So, it's not something new and it's something that you should be looking into very soon and trying to do something to improve the status of our medical school in this province. No, I'm not finished yet.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, I remind the member that before his last comment, I indicated that I was indeed pursuing this with some people in the university, particularly Dr. Hickey. Dr. Hickey is at the university at the medical school

and I did not make that clear before. I would like the member to know that. I want also to point out that with regard to his suggestion that the medical school here is neither fish nor fowl, and I would argue with that, that point of view, we don't consider that to be the case. We had a committee this summer, commonly known as the Adams Committee which did some very extensive work, some very extensive consultations that I believe firmly have clarified the sort of, I guess you could call it, dilemma, that may have existed to some extent with regard to some of the things that were happening. You will find, if you were to consult the people at the medical school at the university, that they will support that statement of mine. One of the results of that was the establishment of a separate subvote in here, which we will consider later. I think it's subvote 31 for the services fund and that is now clearly indicated and has helped to put before the university as well as anyone else you might be interested that the Department of Health at the present time deals only with the service component of the medical school. During those hearings of the Adams Committee, I might point out, that the president of the university made it very clear that the research function was an education function and that there should be no changes in the funding for research that was being provided from the system that was now being utilized. I'm not prepared to argue with that. I have a great deal of respect for the people at university who make those kinds of suggestions to us, but at the same time as I have said initially, I will conclude on the statement that it's a question of government policy whether there will be separate funding for a separate function such as for the medical school. Right now it is not government policy to do it separately. From time to time things are reviewed and I'm prepared to review that policy.

Mr. Malone: — You refer to the Adams report. Is that report with you now and if so have you been able to make it public? If you haven't, can you table it with us?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The report was released by me at a press conference in Saskatoon following a meeting with the university community in September and the report was also tabled in this legislature last fall. I don't have a copy of it here; I assumed that the questions directed at me it's from between then and now, that there would not be any, but I don't know, if the member wants a copy and doesn't have it, we can get it. Sure.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Chairman, I am not sure exactly under what subvote . . . and perhaps we can discuss it now because it will lead into the area of research and planning.

We have had a strange silence on the position of the provincial gerontologist. Is there a staff increase this year and if so, what is the staff complement increase and what activities are you projecting — increased activities are you predicting for this forthcoming year?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — This item was in subvote 1 but, Mr. Chairman, I will answer the question because the member is obviously interested.

There is no change in positions. There are two positions under gerontology, a Dr. Skoll who will be well known by the members here, and a secretary; so there is no increase in positions.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — What exactly is he doing?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The provincial gerontologist does not run programs. I'm sure

that the member will not be surprised at that. He acts as a resources person on the elderly to branches of the Department of Health and the Department of Social Services in particular, and with various departments and agencies, gets involved in the planning and development of programs for senior citizens in the province and with various departments and agencies, gets involved in reviewing the effectiveness of existing programs in meeting the needs of the elderly.

You will find that on page 33 of the annual report which the member received last fall. There is a section on the role of the provincial gerontologist which goes on to page 34. If you want more details (although I can provide them for you from here) you will see that they are there. I might add that Dr. Skoll has done an outstanding job in the field of gerontology for the government. The member will be aware of one thing in particular (although I could mention others) but the project in particular is the senior citizens day hospital in Moose Jaw which is an experiment with us. It is not an experiment in other parts of the world. But it is these kinds of things on which Dr. Skoll has been able to give us a great deal of guidance and leadership. We have found and will continue to find his services exceptionally valuable at a time when we are trying to provide a greater balance of programs for senior citizens in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — That is what I am trying to find out — exactly what was done.

I can recall when we decided to have a position of provincial gerontologist that this was going to be a new direction for the government in the care of senior citizens — that the book *Adding Life to Years* was the new base or the new publication on which the government was to go ever onward and upward in dealing with senior citizens. All I see is that I see no change in the position. So far they have given birth to a book. We have had a position created and it is simply a resource person and I am wondering whether or not in fact we wouldn't have had access to your library system for some of the information that, in fact, we have had. And whether or not in reality what you have done is created a sop to the senior citizens without pursuing it further. Frankly, I am very disappointed at the lack of commitment by the government opposite to this very vital area and, in particular, a failure of the government to increase the staff of the provincial gerontologist and make that a much more visible aspect of the health services. I am, frankly, very surprised that there has been no increase in staff given the great fanfare that was made a year ago.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, we see a little tinge of hypocrisy from the Conservative benches again. On one side of their mouths they will scream and holler about what they consider to be the bloated civil service. You know the terrible job the civil service is doing; how there are too many of them all over the place. I don't happen to agree with that philosophy that the Conservatives seem to have, opposite. I think that our civil service, and I know from experience, is doing an exceptionally good job. I am not even going to argue against the proposition that in some cases we could probably use additional people. We have made a conscious decision as a government in light of the times that we are living in, not to increase the size of the civil service and what that in some cases will do, is some of our officials who work very hard and long hours probably work just as hard in some cases, and maybe harder and we respect them for that.

The fact of the matter, also is, that there is no need for additional staff in the gerontologist office. It does not run programs. The member said he must be a resource person and, indeed, that is exactly what he is. Dr. Skoll is a resource person. He is an initiator of ideas and programs which we can implement.

The member makes comments about no efforts for senior citizens. I want to point out to the member for Qu'Appelle that there is not one province in this country — and I challenge him to tell me and show where there is — but I will say that there isn't one province in this country of Canada that does more for senior citizens than the province of Saskatchewan. I can list you programs and initiatives that exist here. The member shows doubt. Well I want to ask him again to show me where there are places where there is greater effort. I don't want to start an argument so I will just give him examples of some new things that are happening — three.

I announced recently, in Saskatoon, the establishment of a senior citizens service project in that area, a Joint Ministerial Task Force on services for senior citizens in the city of Saskatoon and the rural community. I mentioned the senior citizens day hospital in Moose Jaw and already there has been some talk even in these estimates of the home care program, the province-wide home care program that is being established in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — In the area of policy, research and management, what specific areas is the department researching with regard to the problems of senior citizens? Would you delineate the areas of research that you are embarking on or propose to embark on in this coming fiscal year? Just to give you some indication of some of the things that are now happening, they are not necessarily exclusively for the elderly, but largely they are. There has been some work done and this process will be expanded. I hope to involve the public in some way in this eventually, but there is a very serious look being taken at the whole system of classification of levels of care in the province. I indicated that in my speech when I spoke on the Throne debate. There is a study being done on the nurse practitioner field; there is work being done on a denture program which our party indicated we would implement eventually; there is work being done on a program to provide glasses or optometry. There has been a considerable amount of involvement in the work done to the point where there is now being established a province-wide ambulance program. That was the role of this branch of the department. The Research and Policy Branch provides the resource personnel to the task force in Saskatoon which I just indicated a little while ago.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Chairman, it seems we are talking about the provincial ger . . . whatever you call him . . . gerontologist. I read this happy little book of Dr. Skoll's, and I see he has a kind of a free travelling bursary for a substantial period. I wonder, did the Government of Saskatchewan pay for Dr. Skoll's tour of Europe to visit the places that he did for background material for his book? Could the minister tell me that?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, the government funded for a year Dr. Skoll's study on gerontology and geriatrics, and that is one of the major contributions we are now receiving from the study that Dr. Skoll did. I might add I don't consider it to be free travelling. I consider it to be a very valuable kind of service.

Mr. MacDonald: — Now, you funded Dr. Skoll for a year, and here are a couple of comments. "During the period of August to July I was able to visit a number of centres in Britain, from '75-'76 to in western Europe to see for myself what services and facilities they have provided for their elderly citizens and how well they did so. These visits were made possible through the generous support of the Government of Saskatchewan". Mr. Speaker, first of all, we are all aware that what the Minister of Health did was merely to try to get rid of Dr. Skoll as the deputy minister. He moved him laterally, gave him a very generous grant to travel around the world. He was supposed

to have produced this book, which really is a summary that anybody could pick up (most of it) if you went to the public library (and this is no insinuation toward Dr. Skoll) or anywhere in the health field. I want to know, what was the total cost of the travelling expenses for Dr. Skoll for that period of time; where did he go; and what was the total cost of this book, *Adding Years to Life*? I suggest to you, that this particular book may have been the most expensive publication in paperback that has ever been printed by the Government of Saskatchewan. Could the minister tell me exactly the total cost. Also could you tell me what salary Dr. Skoll is now being paid, and what is the total budget for the gerontologist in the province of Saskatchewan? Could you tell me those things please?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — First of all, Mr. Chairman, I will get the total budget, because we have it here, in a minute — indeed. It is \$54,870 estimated for '78-'79. Having given the answer to the member's question, I want to object very strongly to his allegation that Dr. Skoll was performing the kind of role that he mentions. That is another example, another example of the total disrespect that members opposite have for the public servants of this province. I don't have that total disrespect. Mr. Chairman, I just want to place on the record — the member over there should listen — I want to place on the record my total objection to his allegation that Dr. Skoll was on a touring holiday for a year without serving any useful function. I maintain on behalf of this government and on behalf of Dr. Skoll that he did serve a useful function and continues to do so in a field that's growing greater in importance, not that it's been any less important, but is growing greater in importance because of a magnitude of numbers of senior citizens in this province and whether we like to admit it or not, there are times when we can learn from others. The member should try to pay attention to that.

If they were to pay attention to some of the efforts of the New Democratic Party and some of our policies they might not be seated on the other side of this House right now. And the experience and the knowledge that we can gain from initiatives and new ideas and new programs that have been started in some parts of Europe, I think, we ought to be looking at. We shouldn't be sort of covering up our faces and ignoring these kinds of things and by doing that, it can help us to develop better programming for senior citizens and I'm prepared to do it. I'm prepared to provide that kind of funding, and indeed, when the time comes and if we want to take some other initiatives I'm prepared to seek from the Treasury Board even more funding.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Chairman, I just hope that when I'm finished and retire through the popular will of the people of Saskatchewan that you'll ask me to travel around Europe about some studies. I have some suggestions that I might put into a book. He didn't answer my question. How much would the total travelling expenses be of Dr. Skoll? How much was the total cost of printing this? You've got \$74,000. Did he perform any other function that year besides this book?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The funding I gave you was what is budgeted for 1978-79. I'm prepared to get you the information you require about the cost of the publication of that book, that report, as well as other costs associated with Dr. Skoll. I don't have them here; that was two years ago, you have to keep in mind; this isn't public accounts, but yes, I will indeed get them and provide you with them.

Mr. MacDonald: — Only one more comment, Mr. Minister. I really say this is the most expensive little item that I can ever imagine and I want to say also that to send Dr. Skoll away was a lateral movement — we're not insulting Dr. Skoll here, we're talking about the minister and the government's decision as to what they did with Dr. Skoll and

everybody in the Department of Health, all 3,500 to 4,000 employees know. There was a straight lateral movement and that's all it was and this was his popular little reward to go out gracefully and quietly and it's cost the taxpayers of this province a lot of money.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment on that. I want to say and correct a terrible wrong the member is making. The function of Dr. Skoll's study was not to produce a book. That's a by-product which we consider quite valuable. The purpose was to develop certain skills and knowledge in the area of gerontology and geriatrics. That was what the purpose of it was. And as I said before, I don't consider it a waste of money or a waste of time.

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Minister, earlier you referred to an Adams report or an Adams Commission report that you tabled in this legislature. I'm advised by the Clerk that we cannot find the report. Can you tell me when you tabled it?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I believe it was early in the fall season, maybe tabling wasn't the right word. I had them passed around. I may not have used the formal approach of a tabling. I can have them for you before 5:00 o'clock. I am told we will send somebody or phone and we'll get you a copy or as many as you want.

Mr. Malone: — Can we stand this item until the report becomes available?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, that whole item is dealt with under subvote 31 so you can adequately deal with it there. That is where the whole thing is, so we don't need to stand this one for that.

Item 12 agreed.

Item 13

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — How much revenue does the branch of Vital Statistics bring to the government? I notice there was a major increase in fees.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The projected revenue for '78-'79 privileges, licences, permits, \$10,500, sale services and service fees, \$497,500 for a projected total of \$508,000.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — What was it last year?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — 1977-78 was \$411,340.

Item 13 agreed.

Item 14

Mr. Malone: — Where is the Health Library? Is it in one institution or is it scattered across the province?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It is in the Provincial Health Building.

Mr. Malone: — Who has access to it, is it for the general public, is it for medical practitioners, what is the purpose of it?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I have already said it is located in the Health Building. It will

April 5, 1978

make its services available to pretty well anybody on request. It is extended to the departmental personnel, the Medical Care Insurance Commission, other libraries, so it is basically on request.

Item 14 agreed.

Item 15

Mr. E.A. Berntson (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Chairman, this item 15, Health Promotion. I am interested in finding out what it covers. Is this the Aware program, the Feeling Good program, these sorts of programs and what is the financial breakdown, how much is spent on each program if that is what they are? While you are digging up some figures, what is the salary of the director of health promotion and how does this compare with the other branch heads in government and who is he?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — While we are getting some of the answers I might just outline first of all, for the member, in answer to his question, what the function of the branch is. Its function is to promote attitudes and behaviour which will lead to a healthier lifestyle for Saskatchewan individuals and communities and to provide information to the public about health and related matters. It is within this subvote that programs such as the Aware program and the Lifestyle, Feeling Good program are budgeted for. The director of Health Promotion is Mr. Ian Rogers. We will get you the salary in a minute.

The breakdown of the two programs which you mentioned — Aware and Lifestyle is, Aware — \$426,690 and Lifestyle — \$435,240.

Mr. Berntson: — Are there other programs besides the Aware and the Feeling Good program under this estimate and what qualifications did Ian Rogers bring to this position with him?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes there are other programs, some may think of less importance although I would not support that. There is the production of information pamphlets, you will know, if you have checked, that there are information brochures on our Medical Care Insurance Commission and Saskatchewan Hearing Aid Plan and all these programs which provide information on what the program is and where the individual should go to get an appointment or to get services and so on. That is also a very major function of the Health Promotion Branch.

Mr. Berntson: — Just a minute, the amounts \$427,000 and \$435,000 — did you answer the question as to what qualifications Mr. Ian Rogers brought to the program?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, I will answer the question. Mr. Chairman, as the member will know, this is a management position. Mr. Rogers has been an executive director in the Medical Care Insurance Commission; he has been a deputy minister of Government Services and he has been the Rentalsman, all indicating that he has extensive management experience and ability, which is what this position requires.

Mr. MacDonald: — How much is the salary? That is not what it indicates, of course.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The salary is about \$34,000.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Out of the health promotion, on checking the public accounts,

one notes that a company by the name of Dunskey Advertising may have some degree of familiarity to the members opposite who have been here for a while. There is a payment to Dunskey of \$479,674 and then to Struthers, JAC another very prominent name revealed to pork barrelling \$65,502. Can you tell me what the payments to Dunskey were referred to, what payments were made to Dunskey under the health promotion last year and what you are predicting for next year?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The payments last year, as you know the Aware Program and the Lifestyle Program are done by Dunskey Advertising, the payments in 1977-1978 were: — advertising \$265,000 for Aware, \$250,000 for the Lifestyle Program, the estimated expenditures for 1978-1979 is \$360,000 for Aware, Lifestyles \$350,000.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — So out of the budget estimated for next year, approximately \$710,000 of the Health Promotion budget will be funneled through Dunskey Advertising next year, roughly about 70 percent. No, I never said the Aware ads were silly. I still say that dancing in front of the apple ad that you are promoting is silly and everybody in the province thinks it's silly. Someone who can't find his feet, that should be under another program altogether than that particular ad you have got. But, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, how much is going to be budgeted for Struthers last year and how much went in 1977-1978?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — We don't have the precise amount for last year that was spent on the contract through Struthers. I can tell the member it was very minimal, a very small amount. The only work that we recall they did was for the placement of the VD ads that you may have seen in theatres and that's the only amount. I can assure the member it is very minimal. We don't have it here but if he wants it for last year, I can get that. I don't think that we have any contract with Struthers for the coming year — no, we don't.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — I had asked you earlier for an estimate and I very carefully say I understand and I realize it's tentative but when you have developed the Aware Program you must have had some indication as to how long you intend to run that particular program and you must have some indication as to what your projected expenses would be over the next few years. I would like you, as you have done under the Dental Program, for example, to give — and I realize they are rough in their projections only — what you are going to spend on the Aware Program for each of the next few years.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — What he asked about, is not quite the same as the dental plan or some of those kinds of plan. The allocation of money is something that is determined every year and it depends on the impact that the particular promotional program is having. We will determine in the department the impact that Aware is having in this year and then determine what amount of promotion is needed in the forthcoming year. The same thing with Lifestyles Program. There's no specific amount that we have decided now that we are going to spend next year. That is something that will be considered in the budget reviews that take place in late summer and going on right through until the budget is eventually finalized.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Some of your staff are having a difficult time keeping a straight face on that answer, Mr. Minister, and are you telling us that you have no projections whatsoever, as to how much you are going to spend on the Aware Program for the next fiscal year, none whatsoever? You don't know whether you're going to increase it or decrease it?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It depends on what you want to assume. Mr. Chairman, if the

member wants to assume and if we assume that there would be the same level of program provided next year as there is being provided this year and I'm not able to tell him now what is going to happen a fiscal year later. But assuming that it was the same level, therefore, then the inflationary factors would apply on the amounts that you have before you and that would be basically it. But once again, it's an assumption that one has to make. We haven't concluded at this point of time the level of promotion that we shall be providing for Aware or for Lifestyles after the fiscal year which this Committee of Finance is considering.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — You've gone up on the Aware Program practically \$100,000 and you've gone up \$100,000 on the Feeling Good Program. That you would have to admit is far in excess of any inflation rate. I can't recall whether the Aware Program was in previous to the year which led to the \$265,000 figure, perhaps you can answer that for me. But what would cause you to believe — and I am sure you have some very substantive and in-depth research which proves it and I am sure you will also table that — cause you to believe that the efficacy of the Feeling Good Program is such that it has necessitated the same increase in the budget as the Aware Program. I am sure you are monitoring this and you can explain that and give us some details.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the member is right that the Feeling Good and Lifestyles Program is new. We made a decision on the basis of the impact, it was thought that it was necessary to have some influence on attitudes and that is what determined the amount of funds that is provided there. I want to point out to the member that there are all kinds of resources that are considered in the determination of this. There has been an attitude survey evaluation done in Regina, for example, between 1974 and 1977 and in that it indicated to us that the disapproval of intoxication using the Regina urban situation in 1974 was 72 per cent, in 1977 it had increased to 85 per cent. Something obviously changed that, the disapproval of heavy drinking, in 1974, 72 per cent, in 1977, 85 per cent. The disapproval of the use of alcohol as a means of coping, disapproving in 1974, 78 per cent, disapproving in 1977, 77 per cent. Disapproval of drinking and driving, as a result I am sure of the Safety Program as well as the Aware Program, in 1974 was only 63 per cent, whereas, in 1977 it had risen to 73 per cent. We hope that by continuing the tremendous program of Aware we will be able to increase those statistics even further and when we have had experience with the Lifestyles Program for a year, two years, we will then be able to determine the impact it has had. Depending on that, we will determine the changes we may have to make in it, we will determine whether we should decelerate it or whether we should accelerate it but that will be something you cannot tell until you have had a chance to look at the experience and make your calculations from it.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Would you table the results of your monitoring of those programs and then secondly . . .

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I have just got rough figures here but we will provide the results for you, yes. I said I would get to the committee before 5:00 o'clock the report of the committee on service funding on the college of medicine, University of Saskatchewan. I can send it over to the Leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr. A.N. McMillan (Kindersley): — Mr. Chairman, the question that I have been wanting to bring up for some time and it's particularly appropriate now that you have given us the information about the effect of your Aware Program and that's a general question with respect to health promotion.

At one time in Saskatchewan there was a differential between the retail price of low alcohol beer and regular alcohol beer, the 5 per cent and the 3.9 per cent. Now, I don't know exactly what the differential was, but I'm under the impression that the reduction in or the fact that there was a lower price for low alcohol beer was an attempt to encourage the beer drinking public to consume less volume alcohol than there was in regular beer and I'd like to know if firstly that was the intent? I know that, I know it's his responsibility. You keep pointing your finger at him but the fact of the matter is that you might consider bringing this up with the minister because it's a health matter. Bring it up with the cabinet.

The differential in price between low alcohol beer and standard alcohol beer has been removed. As a result of that, the incentive, if in fact there was one to the public to consume low alcohol beer has been removed and we can expect then that the percentage there will be a greater percentage increase in the consumption of high alcohol beer in Saskatchewan; and I would like to know if your department firstly is concerned about it; secondly if you are prepared to do anything?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made an assertion that there has been a change in policies so that there no longer exists a differential between low alcohol beer and regular beer. That is simply and absolutely false.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Please explain that . . .

Mr. Byers: — Yes, I will explain it. The Liquor Board has followed the policy for the last two or three years of having a price differential between regular beer and lower alcohol beer, the lower alcohol beer being 3.5 or 4 per cent.

What is changing is the definition of low alcohol beer. Yes, this is going to be good and it's a direction in which I think should be moving; that very shortly or if not immediately, there will be a true low alcohol beer, not a lower alcohol beer but a low alcohol beer on the market of low calorie and 2.5 per cent and the price differential will remain between the lower alcohol beer and the regular beer.

The lower alcohol beer has had limited success in being marketed. It is not meeting very good public response. This was an experimental program to have the differential apply to the regular price of beer and the lower alcohol beer. What we now have coming on the market is a low alcohol beer of 12.5 per cent and the price differential between low alcohol beer and regular beer will remain. There is no change in the policy; there is merely a change in the definition of what constitutes low alcohol beer.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. I realize that perhaps beer and health promotion may perhaps be relevant in a sense but I question whether we should be dealing with the topic that you are dealing with now in which the minister there is in charge — but if you can make it relevant to that program, I think that you could deal with it under the Alcoholism Commission and at a better place and expedite things.

Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chairman, firstly, I am not here to apologize for the fact that the Minister responsible for the Liquor Commission answered a question directed to the Minister of Health with respect to alcohol consumption in Saskatchewan. Secondly, there is one reason why I am asking this question on this subvote rather than on subvote 1 and that was at your request. You want us to direct our questions to the particular subvote that clearly deals with it. This is a question of health promotion or

lack of it.

Now, to the Minister of Health, this isn't a question of alcoholism; this is a question of public consumption of alcohol which may not be at all directly related to alcoholism.

The Department of Health has an interest in Saskatchewan in the promotion of healthy attitudes by the public of Saskatchewan as witnessed by your Feeling Good Program and your Aware Program. Now, I am saying that your government, the cabinet in which you sit, has changed government policy in such a way as to contradict the attempt by your department to promote healthy attitudes and lifestyles among the public. I am saying that at one time there was in Saskatchewan a price differential between alcohol of 5 per cent or beer of 5 per cent alcohol and beer of 3.9 per cent alcohol. That price differential has been removed by your government and I will give you the evidence of that, circular number . . . You would like a little order? I will give you a little order. Circular licence 1 on the first of '78 from A.M. Wilkie, merchandise manager for the Saskatchewan Liquor Board; it says, "Standard and low alcohol beer is the same price." I have it here. I think the Department of Health should be concerned about that. Now certainly, there has been a new category established low calorie beer, now if the Department of Health in the provincial government is more concerned about obesity in Saskatchewan than they are about alcoholism on public consumption of alcohol, that's fine. I'd say to you, the Minister of health, that you should be concerned of that incentive for people to consume beer of lower alcohol content should be maintained and it is not. Are you prepared to do anything about that?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I'm struggling to be able to appreciate how that belongs under this subvote. Since the question was asked, I will give the answer. Yes, we happen to believe that there ought to be a differential and if the member doesn't want to listen to the Minister in charge of the Liquor Licensing Commission, who fully explained that we are going to indeed, be having a price differential of a low alcohol beer which is maybe just about on the market now, then that's his business. He doesn't need to listen. If he wants to get up and make a political dissertation in this House under the Department of Health, that's perfectly O.K. with me as well. We've been doing that for 70 hours and 20 minutes already in these estimates and I can tell you we can do it for another 70 hours and 20 minutes. The policy is that there is to be a differential. We have an Aware Program that discourages the consumption of alcohol, we're going to continue that program that discourages the consumption of alcohol . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order! Please. Order! I don't know but I find . . . yes, I think I can bring it to order. And I ask you people as hon. members that have been in here for some time to assist me on it. I acknowledge the member for Qu'Appelle. Honorable . . . member would you take your chair.

Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chairman, I am not finished discussing this matter with the Minister of Health and I wonder if I could be allowed to continue.

Mr. Chairman: — If you make it relevant to the subvote that we're on, a discussion of health promotion and I do not think that the minister that you are addressing it to is the minister that you should be addressing your question to because I think the member for, ah, Mr. Byers, anyhow is the minister whom you should be addressing your question to and that's why I'm asking you to.

Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chairman, I don't see how I fail to do that when my question to the Minister of Health who is trying to promote good health in Saskatchewan by the use

of the Aware Program when my question to him was would he not approach his minister in charge of the Liquor Licensing Commission to see that there is some price differential between low alcohol beer which is, if consumed in the same amounts as high alcohol beer, better for the health of Saskatchewan citizens. I am asking him if he will give me the commitment to try and maintain that differential so that the Saskatchewan people's health will be ensured at least to some greater degree than it will be if the differential there. Can the minister give me that assist?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The dispute is the question of knowledge of the issue, Mr. Chairman, as has already been said on at least two occasions. The differential is being maintained.

Mr. McMillan: — One final question, Mr. Chairman. Would the minister not agree that if the 3.9 per cent alcohol beer and the 5 per cent alcohol beer are being charged the same price then the differential is not being maintained. If you want . . . there are three categories of beer now. According to your government there is standard beer, more alcohol beer and low calorie beer. Now it happens that the low calorie beer also has a lower alcohol content. There is also a lower alcohol content beer and there is no price differential between that and standard beer and I would like to know, in the interest of good public health, if you will give us a commitment to see that that discrepancy in price is re-established.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, we have already said that on the lowest category of beer the price differential is maintained. I certainly am prepared to talk to the minister of the Liquor Licensing Commission about any differentials. As has clearly been stated this government supports a differential and we will continue to support it.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Minister, on the health promotion does Dunskey have any copyrights to the Aware Program or to the Feeling Good Program and is there any agreement with Dunskey to supply the Aware Program or the Feeling Good Program in ensuing years?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I didn't get the last question. The answer to the first question is, no, Dunskey does not have the copyright, the Government of Saskatchewan has the copyright.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — the second part was, is there any agreement, verbal, written or otherwise with the Government of Saskatchewan and Dunskey to supply or do the work on the Aware Program or the Feeling Good Program in future years?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — No, there is not.

Item 15 agreed.

Item 16

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — What was the reason for the 50 per cent just about or 100 per cent increase on Other Expenses, and how many new staff did that require and how many part time or casual?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — There is an increase of one position. The major increase is an

April 5, 1978

increase due to the purchase of a SMAC unit which is going to cost about \$250,000 and having other related costs of about \$96,000. That is the major component. I am not going to do it now but I outlined the other day the value of this SMAC unit and the kind of increased service, and more efficient service, and more effective service the provincial lab will be able to provide, because of the unit.

Item 16 agreed.

Item 17

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — I think, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, there will be a series of questions on the Cancer Commission and I wonder if you want to report progress rather than to start it — leave it till later?

Committee reported progress.

Committee adjourned at 5:00 o'clock p.m.