

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

April 11, 1978

EVENING SESSION

WELCOME TO CUBS

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can be given leave to introduce a group in the galleries. Mr. Speaker, seated in the Speaker's gallery are a group of cubs, 68 Upland Cub Pack. I think there are 13 of them in number accompanied by their cubmaster, Mr. Angus Gordon and assisted by Phillip Mueller and Gary Hubick. I'd like to welcome them to the Legislature and express the hope that their short stay with us this evening will be a pleasant experience. I do propose to meet them later on, about 7:30 'clock.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Priority of Debate — Dairy Workers Strike cont'd

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to, by way of making a few remarks, ask a question of the Attorney General which I hope he'll respond to when he closes debate. It was most noticeable that he didn't enter into the debate when he proposed the resolution or even to move it. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that on the matter in question, the milk workers' strike that the government has tonight tried to bring the parties together with an attempt to settle the differences and I commend the government for doing that, if that indeed, is the case. But I understand as well that the government intends tomorrow on bringing in legislation to force the men to the dispute in the event that the situation is not resolved this evening or in the early hours of the morning. I'd just like to ask the Attorney General when he closes debate as to whether he would confirm these reports that we have been getting from the local media and indeed, whether or not we can anticipate tomorrow of the government coming in with a bill asking for leave of the House to proceed with first, second and third reading. With those words, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members, of course, to support the amendment.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 15

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

NAYS — 28

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Tchorzewski
Pepper	Mostoway	Vickar

Thibault	Banda	Skoberg
Bowerman	Whelan	Nelson (Yktn)
Smishek	MacAuley	Allen
Romanow	Feschuk	Koskie
Messer	Faris	Johnson
Kowalchuk	Rolfes	Thompson
Matsalla	Cowley	Lusney
Robbins		

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — In light of the ultimatum that has been given to settle and get the show on the road, so to speak, and the likelihood of the matter being settled tonight or back to work through legislation tomorrow, with the possibility of compulsory binding arbitration, my comments are limited to urging the Attorney General to advise the Assembly when he closes debate as to whether the government has been in contact with an arbitrator and if so, the name of the individual if it can be given to us at this time or whether or not, in fact, the government has been in contact with an arbitrator so that the mechanism can be in place and ready to go tomorrow.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief on this particular motion of the Attorney General which was rather unusual in the way it was presented in the House and it seemed to me to be a method of escaping the inevitable. It is an unfortunate way in which the government of Saskatchewan has handled a very difficult situation in the province. Today in the Legislature I introduced a bill. All I would like to do is mention what the bill is in contrast. It is the government across the way that is supposed to be the supporters of the labor union movement in the province of Saskatchewan. Yet, here we find the Attorney General of Saskatchewan advocating binding arbitration which, by the very nature of binding arbitration, removes the collective bargaining principle whether it be voluntary or compulsory. What I suggested this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, was a very simple and what I consider to be a very practical way out of the dilemma that faces the government of Saskatchewan and, of course, the dairy producers, the union and management. That particular bill was one which would immediately force the workers or the unions back on the job to do things; number one, to protect the dairy producers of Saskatchewan so they no longer would have to pour a valuable commodity, a food commodity, down the drain to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars of their income. Secondly, to protect those people in Saskatchewan who required milk, whether they be those mothers who had infants to feed or those in hospitals, who are in a serious condition.

Mr. Speaker, I merely requested a 60-day cooling-off period which would have permitted the collective bargaining process to continue whereby labor and management then would have had an opportunity to sit down at the collective bargaining table and once again resume the negotiation process. I am sure that the government and all the people of Saskatchewan are aware that the collective bargaining agreement has only receded or stopped a few weeks ago or a very short time ago. Many collective bargaining agreements or the negotiation process between labor and management goes on for months before a final settlement is reached. What my legislation urged the government to do was to provide a 60-day cooling-off period, the same concept as the Taft-Hartley legislation in the United States. Some people say that the Taft-Hartley legislation never really worked. The reason it has never worked is because it has always been forecast. This was not forecast. All of a sudden labor and management would have been confronted with a different situation that they have never had before in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would once again suggest that this particular resolution does absolutely nothing to solve the problem of the dairy producers in the province of Saskatchewan and the contingency problems that may follow from it. I urge the government, once this particular motion is passed, that once again they will turn around and consider very carefully the legislation that was introduced and which will be now on the Order Paper as of Thursday. I am going to support this particular motion of the Attorney General because what does it do? It is like mother love it says nothing; it provides no concrete offer of help to the dairy producers of Saskatchewan; it offers no concrete effort to say that a solution will be arrived at.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion. I'm disappointed in the Attorney General. I'm disappointed in the government.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my wrap-up remarks with respect to the motion that is before the House.

I think that it is taken for granted by all members of the House that we have a very serious situation that is before the province. I don't think that I need to repeat or state the arguments of concern that members on this side have expressed during the course of the day, nor do I think it's of benefit to anyone to try to take the position of who is in the position of showing more concern for the farmers or for the consumers or the mothers and so forth. I think that is taken as a very important matter that all of us are very much troubled by.

I would like to make two points, however, before I close. Firstly with respect to the member for Indian Head who talked about the advocacy of binding arbitration as doing away, the way he described it, with the principle of free collective bargaining — something which he says this party believes in. Well he is right, this party does believe in free collective bargaining but he is wrong when he suggests that the proposed resolution takes away free collective bargaining. The resolution simply says that we should urge the government of Saskatchewan to continue its efforts to settle the dairy workers strike by all possible means including voluntary binding arbitration which is — whatever that is. The hon. leader of the Liberal Party does not know what voluntary binding arbitration is, and of course if the Liberals understood the process of collective bargaining, they would understand that voluntary binding arbitration is a fairly common occurrence in the course of labor management disputes where both parties agree to be bound by arbitration by a third party arbitrator. That's part of the free collective bargaining system.

MR. MacDONALD: — Collective bargaining no longer exists.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, where collective bargaining no longer exists depends on the definition of when free collective bargaining ceases. There are some that argue that even a strike is part of the free collective bargaining process, that it is an ultimate end of the free collective bargaining process. But I won't get into that because the hon. member tried to make much out of this and then met himself coming around the corner by ending up saying, after first saying the resolution is so horrendous because we took away free collective bargaining, ended up his remarks by saying, but I'm going to vote for the resolution because it's mother love doesn't do anything really in any event which I felt was somewhat a contradictory argument.

The other point that was raised is the concern which I think is a concern with respect to

the provision of milk to hospitals and other institutions where milk is needed. I think that there was perhaps a slight exaggeration of the anxiety in this area. Perhaps if I was a little more partisan I would say a gross exaggeration, but I'm not going to. I think it's common knowledge that the union and the processors have agreed to make milk supplies available to hospitals and other institutions where milk will be needed, thereby circumventing the kind of concern that all of us would have. And to continue making statements based on the argument that there would be this great shortage is as I say a gross exaggeration for what only can be characterized as political purposes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, before I take my place, the questions raised by the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Lakeview respecting legislation — my answer to both members is that the free collective bargaining process is ongoing at the present time. There are mediation attempts if you can describe them that way; meetings are taking place as between the participants and we will simply await the outcome of those meetings before any further action or decisions are to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, I move support of this motion by the members of the House.

MR. E.C. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be prepared to answer a question?

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes.

MR. MALONE: — How long are you going to wait for the free collective bargaining process to continue until you are prepared to bring in legislation?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the parties are as I understand it talking, and it would be premature for me or for anybody from the government at 7:20 tonight to make any kind of a definite statement in this regard. Let's just see what happens in respect to discussions this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I will take this opportunity to inform members that we are still on orders of the day.

MR. ROMANOW: — I would like to raise a point of order before the orders of the day and I am somewhat reluctant to raise it but again I ask for clarification from you. This has to do with our procedure of introduction of special guests. My understanding of the mechanism for the introduction of guests related to the question of visitations by school delegations and the visitation of in effect emissaries or representatives of other legislatures to the Assembly to the Legislative body that we did not go into the practice of the introduction of what may be called vested interest groups or special interest or lobby groups. I say this, quite frankly, because the member for Maple Creek made reference this afternoon to trustees; he was not alone. One of the members of the PC caucus did yesterday the same thing and I think that what really is required here, Mr. Speaker, is a fairly clear delineation of the mechanism for introduction because it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if you allow the introduction of these kinds of groups as meritorious as it is for them to be involved in the democratic system and be here. In a sense we are all happy to see them and you may not believe that but that is true because it gives us a chance to tell our side of the story. The question really is, how far you extend the line. Can I get up and introduce the president of the Nipawin NDP Association who are here watching the actions, or the routine. And I think that that has happened very, very rarely if ever, in my recollection, So, Mr. Speaker, as you can see I would ask you to consider this and perhaps, to give us a bit of a guideline as to the form

of introduction and you can also see from the tenor of my remarks that I would urge on you that we be selective about, or at least not selective, but be careful in the freedom with which use the introduction of guests provision. Unless there is an extension as to make it meaningless as well.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I find it strange that the Attorney General would object to a provincial association as important as the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and I would ask that the speaker consider carefully how are we as members of the Assembly to ask you to put yourself as the judge as to the importance of individuals and groups within the gallery in Saskatchewan in the midst of an introduction. I have heard, for example, the Minister of Highways introduce guests from his constituency. I would urge the speaker before he responds to the Attorney General or the Deputy Leader or the House Leader of the government to go back and review those introductory remarks of members of the government and members on all sides of the Assembly over the past year or two years. Because I find that the most strange remark I have ever heard from the Attorney General in a group of people who happen to object to a piece of legislation being introduced by the government that he would stand on his feet and object to a group as important as the School Trustees when in fact . . . (interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think the . . . order, order. I believe the Attorney General raised a very good point and it is unfortunate that the member should, I think, attempt to misconstrue what the Attorney General was saying. And I don't intend to say what the Attorney General said but what I gathered from what his point was is that we are allowed to use our own discretion in introducing visitors to the Legislative Assembly. And what the Attorney General, I believe was saying in effect, if we don't use our discretion, soon we will be introducing everybody from everywhere in Saskatchewan as they appear in the galleries . . . Order (interjection) . . . Order! Perhaps the member for Indian Head-Wolseley would like another try at it . . . (interjection) . . . yes, perhaps . . . Order, order! I think that the members of the Assembly must police themselves in the introduction of people in the galleries. And I've heard it from all sides of the House. I have heard introductions where every member in the House at different times was introducing someone who I would not normally say would qualify if they had been using their discretion. And limiting the introduction of guests to people who represent organizations or associations or important visitors from outside of the province or schools from the constituency of a member. And I think it is unfortunate if members cannot use their discretion. I don't know how the members intend for me to police it and say that, interrupt a member in the middle of an introduction and say the person you are introducing is not important, Mr. Member; it is not up to me to police it. I think it is up to the members of the House to each police it and if members refuse to do that, regardless of what side of the House, eventually they will destroy the introduction of guest period in our day's activities. I think it is a very good activity for us to go through every day (to welcome people to this chamber), but it is unfortunate if members do not exercise discretion when they are introducing members. I do not say that it happens more on one side of the House than the other. It happens on all sides of the House and I leave it in your hands. It is up to you to police it.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in view of your comments I wonder if I could invite Mr. Speaker to give us some determination as to who ranks as an important party or person to be introduced. I do not try to be facetious when I say this, but I can remember members opposite getting up and introducing the local reeve or their mothers or their wives. I do not object to that but, surely if they do that, we should be permitted to introduce the members of a very important association in

Saskatchewan. I noticed the Premier, from time to time, will introduce very special guests. I believe the Premier of a province in Australia was here in the last session, but I notice the Premier comes over and says to us. I intend to introduce this man. I think that is perfectly appropriate, that he gives us his indication that he is going to do so; but in view of your comments, and particularly in view of the comments of the Attorney General today, Mr. Speaker, could I ask you to give us, through your good office, some guidelines as Speaker of this House, as to what you feel are the qualifications of people who could be introduced in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: — I will take the matter under consideration. If the members want my views on who is important to introduce in the Legislative Assembly I would be glad to present something a little later on and the members can decide whether they want to adhere to that or not.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly happy with that suggestion. Perhaps another one I might care to make, complimentary, is that we could refer to the Committee on Rules and Procedures. I think your words, Mr. Speaker, are true, that in the end result, regardless of the guidelines, it will depend on the integrity with which we approach this — all of us. I think that is a good idea.

MR. MacDONALD: — One other comment that I would like to make as a suggestion to the Speaker too, if you are going to consider this, is that I would think that the number one priority for introduction in the Legislative Assembly in the province of Saskatchewan should be another level of government in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I will certainly take that under consideration.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 12 — Freight Assistance for Livestock Exhibits

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — moved, seconded by Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to establish freight assistance for livestock exhibits to Canadian Western Agribition on the same basis as for the Toronto Royal Winter Fair; i.e., 75 per cent of the total cost of shipping.

He said:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks to the House and then I would like to move Resolution No. 12.

My concern is the Western Agribition, which we all know is a show held in Regina which, as the member for Kindersley just said, we all know and we all love. I think it is a show we all have respect for. Its national recognition is growing constantly. The people showing at the show appreciate the quality of the animal, the quality of the exhibitor, and the friendly way in which the show is handled. When I say the friendly way, it is a show handled for the benefit of the producer, rather than for the tuxedo-type crowd.

My resolution basically says that this Assembly urge the Canadian government to assist

on freight assistance on livestock exhibits to the Canadian Western Agribition. Some of you may know, some of you may not know that the Canadian government assists on freight to the Toronto Royal. For an example, I will give you four figures in the last four years, I should say, that Saskatchewan has received. In 1974, to ship the Saskatchewan livestock shipment to the Toronto show, we received \$9,000 from the federal government. In 1975, we received \$15,112. In 1976, we received \$16,736. In 1977, we received \$19,984. This is 75 per cent of the cost of sending the shipment of livestock to be displayed at the Toronto Royal. There we in Saskatchewan, and the Alberta shipment, the B.C. shipment, the Manitoba shipment, show the quality of the animal all across Canada at that show. I understand that other legislative assemblies are considering this same motion that I am moving here this evening, that we urge the federal government to assist. I have attended two meetings in Toronto where this subject has been discussed and the producers are very much in favor of this motion. Therefore, without spending too much time explaining the motion . . . (interjection) . . . If the member is seriously asking what it costs, I gave you the figures of what Saskatchewan received in the last four years and the system is all the way through. Each province has always received shares. In fact, I should compliment the provincial government at the same time. Over the same period, the provincial government has contributed almost the identical sums of money to assist the producers in going. I am suggesting that this will assist the people in Eastern Canada, Ontario and Quebec, to come to our Agribition.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move Resolution No. 12, seconded by the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck).

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words to the words of the mover. The mover has made an argument for the government of Canada establishing feed freight assistance for livestock exhibits to Canadian Western Agribition. All of us, I think, have been very encouraged by the growth of the Canadian Western Agribition through its seven-year life. Canadian Western Agribition has really had a spectacular growth, a growth which does a great deal of credit to the organizers of Canadian Western Agribition and to all those associated with that project. Canadian Western Agribition, as honorable members will know, was organized by cattle producers in this province with the substantial assistance of the provincial government. It was organized effectively in 1969-70 and a good deal of credit goes to the government of that day and particularly to the then Premier Ross Thatcher, who gave a great deal of encouragement to the members of the cattle industry.

The first Canadian Western Agribition was held in the fall of 1971, a modest beginning but a very successful one. Over the years the provincial government have given very very large assistance to Canadian Western Agribition not only in grants from the provincial purse and grants from the Horned Cattle Trust Fund, but also in grants to the Regina Exhibition Association to provide facilities primarily for Canadian Western Agribition. There is an Agribition Building which was built primarily for the use of Canadian Western Agribition. The Agridome, which was built with a substantial amount of provincial government funds, has proved to be very useful to the Canadian Western Agribition. During the last year a building which I think is known as the Agriplex, which adjoins the Agribition Building and the Agridome and a number of other buildings there was built with significant federal contributions as well as provincial government contributions. At the beginning it was the objective of Canadian Western Agribition and also of the provincial government to involve other governments. We've had some very modest support from the government of Manitoba and over a period of a couple or three years we began to get some support from the federal government. In the last

couple of years because Canadian Western Agribition is a very, very clear success and is established, the federal government has been more generous in its support. I do not particularly quarrel with the caution of the federal government until Canadian Western Agribition was established as a national show but it is now established as a national show. This, I think is acknowledged by the cattle industry; certainly by our government and I believe by the government of Canada.

It is, accordingly, it seems to me, timely at least to consider the matter of the government of Canada establishing freight assistance to Canadian Western Agribition in the manner that it provides it for the Toronto Royal. I am not personally familiar with the details of the assistance provided to cattle shipments to the Toronto Royal. I suspect that if there a case can be made for providing assistance for the Toronto Royal, it can now reasonably be made for providing it to Canadian Western Agribition, now that our show is established as clearly one of the biggest shows in Canada. I won't at this point get into any argument with the Toronto Royal as to which is the bigger and which is the best show so far as working cattlemen are concerned. But there is no doubt, it is one of the biggest shows in Canada and it is a working cattlemen's cattle show of the first order. It is a leading cattle show in North America. It is one of the four or five (I think I'm being overly generous in listing that many — major cattle shows in North America. Canadian Western Agribition and Denver and two or three others — I think so far as working cattlemen are concerned. I think when you've said Canadian Western Agribition and Denver, you've said it.

I, therefore, think the proposition put forward by the member for Rosthern is a reasonable one. I do want to add another few comments when I've had an opportunity to consider it more fully and, accordingly, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

BILL NO. 02 — An Act to change the name of Bruderthal Church of Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 03 — An Act to change the name of Mennonite Brethren Church of Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

BILL NO. 04 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

SECOND READINGS

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South) moved second reading of Bill 29 — **An Act to provide for an Economic Impact Statement to accompany Government Bills when introduced in the Legislature.**

He said: — Speaker, I can assure you I don't intend to drop it at all. Members will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I introduced a bill of this kind last year, this year I simplify it to

some extent to — well the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland tells me next year he won't be bothered.

I am interested, Mr. Speaker, in his initial comment that we won't be bothered. The bill is, Mr. Speaker, and members on the other side of the House will know and if the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland had taken the time to read it would also know that it's a bill designed to get at the cost of government programs and get at and bring some more discipline into government spending. Now if the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland finds he can't support the bill, given his sort of generous conservative principles why we may to understand even if his constituents don't.

Mr. Speaker, seriously, this bill was designed in the initial instance in which I introduced it, and is designed again to show the members of the House what we have lapsed into is a matter of practice when it comes to government spending. That we have for some reason or another come to accept for ourselves one standard of discipline with respect to spending and accept for government a very different and far more lucrative standard of spending.

Mr. Speaker, I want to illustrate the point by saying to members opposite and they will understand this, that your Premier by all accounts in his personal life is a man of modest financial expectations and a man of modest financial taste. I said the Premier — the members opposite will understand that. What I ask members there to do to understand the point I make in respect to government spending is to pause and apply their government standard to their Premier's personal life for a moment. Now the Premier, as we know, given his moderate standard of living lives in a home like most of us do of 1,200 square feet to 1,400 square feet. Make the assumption his home is 1,400 square feet, and I presume it is. Now imagine for the time being that the building which the government is constructing over in Wascana Centre, a few hundred yards to the south of us which is reported to cost something in the nature of \$100 to \$110 per square foot. Apply that standard of construction in housing to government to the Premier. His home at that rate would cost \$140,000. Members' homes who live in homes of 1,200 square feet on average, if you applied the government standard of spending to the way in which they housed themselves, to the way in which members housed themselves, we would all be living in homes of \$120,000 by that standard.

What the bill is designed to do, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier is to bring home to members in some more meaningful way why for so long we have accepted for ourselves a relatively prudent and careful standard of money management. We expect all people to assume the same standard for themselves and yet we see consistently in our governments, a very different standard, a standard, which, members to my left, I am sure would stand and agree with me is by all accounts a profligate standard. That is the standard of spending that governments apply to themselves today. Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Qu'Appelle says to me, what happens in Ottawa? I say to him that the standard that applies there is virtually little different from the standard that applies here and it is equally wrong. Members of this party in the federal sense keep making that point and I say to them that I agree with them. And I will continue to make the point here and I hope that he would agree with me that it applies here as well. The standard of fiscal management as a matter of fact, in every home in the province is far superior to the fiscal management that applies in the government of Saskatchewan. I ask members to take a couple of columns and strike a column to the left and apply it to the way in which the average citizen conducts his spending and strike a column to the right which is the way in which government in Saskatchewan and elsewhere spends its money. Look at the ways and how the standard differs. As I said, the standard of housing for

each one of us individually is quite different from the standard we accept and tolerate in our governments. The standard of income that we accept for ourselves and expect everyone else to accept is very different too from the standard of income that we expect or we see our governments taking unto themselves. We see many people in the province, many individual people who face each year with some uncertainty about what their income is going to be. We see farmers that will occasionally, from time to time in years suffer a drop in income. That applies to a lot of people. The question that we ought to ask ourselves is, how long has it been since government had to contend with that problem in respect of its affairs? Government hasn't sustained a drop in income or a serious erosion of the prospect of a drop in its income as long as any of us can remember.

The third area, Mr. Speaker, again trying to demonstrate the different standard we expect the citizen to apply to his affairs as opposed to the standard that we apply to government affairs is in the area of budgeting. And that is what this bill in particular is designed to get at. Anybody in the province who lives on salary or in any other way and sets about to buy something, let's take a car as a best example, will determine how much the car will cost, what will be the trade-in value, what will be the monthly payments, how much can I afford to pay, and how much can I afford to set aside for some other purposes. In other words, in most of the homes of the province, you see that kind of careful, prudent standard apply. Members in the business will understand that because they dealt with those people all the time. And yet when we come to government, how very different standard we tolerate it in. When it has to purchase in these ways it seldom if ever, goes through that same process that each individual citizen has to go through. And when it does, it does it inadequately.

Mr. Speaker, government by and large doesn't have to fit its sail, cut its sail to the cloth because it simply expands the cloth in need with the fit. There are examples upon examples, all kinds of them. And I ask members seriously, why we have got into the habit that we in our own lives and with respect to our own businesses are careful and prudent with respect to money; yet when we get into government, we somehow adopt a very different attitude about the value of money. It is a fact, 42 per cent or 43 per cent, the figure is known to us all currently, of the value of all goods and services in the country is consumed by governments at various levels.

Mr. Speaker, what you find when you talk to people is that they wonder why, increasingly why, they work Monday, Tuesday and into Wednesday not to feed themselves or their families but to feed their governments. It is a problem we are going to have to come to grips with and come to grips with soon. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there has been any exercise in history that has been more innovative and artful and more ingenious than the exercise of government in extracting from its citizens, money for various purposes. We have federal income taxes; we have provincial income taxes. We have federal sales taxes; we have provincial education taxes. We have health taxes, we have amusement taxes. We've got liquor taxes and entertainment taxes and home taxes. There are taxes on our power bills and taxes on our telephone bills and taxes upon taxes. If the ingenuity of any group of people has ever been brought to bear on something, it is to devise new ways and different ways to tax the people and often, in very indirect ways.

Mr. Speaker, all the ingenuity of man to accomplish much of the technological progress we have seen sinks into insignificance occasionally when you see the ingenuity that goes into governments, and that is governments at all levels, to tax and

tax and tax.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer members to a quote from Professor Freedman, from a text, Freedman and Galbraith, 'Curing the British Disease'. He said:

There is no art which one government sooner learns of another than that of draining money from the pockets of the people. It is the highest impertinence and presumptions in kings and minister to pretend to watch over the economy of private people and to restrain their expense either by tax laws or by prohibiting the importation of foreign luxuries. They are themselves, always and without any exception, the greatest spendthrifts in society. Let them look well after their own expenses and they may safely trust private people with theirs. If their own extravagance does not ruin the state, that of their subjects never will.

These are words which somehow we have lost as legislators along the way in the way in which we all view government spending.

Mr. Speaker, a very short time ago we saw given to this House a report by the auditor of the last fiscal year. I challenge 90 per cent of the members in this House to tell me what was in that auditor's report. The attitude has got now so that we don't care about the auditor's report . . . (interjection) . . . The member says 'very little'. I want to tell the member what was there because I venture to guess he is one who didn't bestir himself to concern himself with the waste that was shown in that report. He said, 'FarmStart, the FarmStart Program, lending millions upon millions of dollars to Saskatchewan citizens' and he said this, 'I wouldn't be able to say, looking at their books what repayment schedule is set up and what amounts may be repaid in respect to those loans.' He said that the books aren't in shape to permit him to do that. That's what he said. 'I can't tell how much of this money is going to be repaid because the books aren't set up to let me do it.'

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture, singled out again by the auditor, he said that the Department of Agriculture in the last fiscal year spent — and I appreciate that maybe members say, so what, what's new, and year after year we say the same thing and nobody here seems to give a rot about it — but I say to you the time has come when we have to start. The Department of Agriculture has spent \$355,000 last year without legislative authority. The Minister of Agriculture spent \$355,000 without the authority of this Assembly. He spent it without the authority of the law, Mr. Speaker. He has power to give grants for agricultural purposes and he made grants to organizations that were not agricultural organizations. As I say, that is probably a revelation to most members because they don't concern themselves any more in the way in which they ought to about this kind of waste within government.

The Department of Environment was singled out as another one; \$140,940.16 spent by the Minister of the Environment with no authority in law. Never were those funds voted by this Assembly. There isn't a single statute in Saskatchewan that permitted him to make that expenditure of \$140,940.16, thrown away, spent illegally. What did we do, what did we see in respect of it? We saw a brief blurb in the newspaper on page 26 which was a couple of columns long and that was it; nary a comment by members . . . (interjection) . . . Well, I refer the member to the Department of Finance, your Department of Finance and your Minister of Finance, who ought to know better.

I'll tell you what the Department of Finance did. The Minister of Finance spent

\$381,280 to issuers of motor licences in this province without the authority to do so. Yes, he did. Check your Provincial Auditor's report, check it. He didn't have the authority to spend the money he did. We didn't vote it; the Provincial Auditor says he spent the money in direct contravention of section 55 of The Finance Act — a revelation to all of you because for some reason you have failed in your responsibilities, the most fundamental of all, to pay some attention to what your government is doing and the way in which it's spending its money. Because, Mr. Speaker, for some reason, we have got inured to it, we see it every year. Therefore, we say to ourselves, well it's just \$350,000. Why should I bestir myself?

Why do I look at the Provincial Auditor's report? I'll tell you why. Because all members of the Legislature have lapsed into a lousy habit. The lousy habit is to pay more attention to the benefit side of programs than to the cost side because the cost side is not the politically attractive side. The attractive side is the benefit side of things. When the Minister of Finance spends \$381,280 without statutory authority in breach of the law, there's a ho-hum response from all of us. There is. What I say to the members opposite and some of the backbenchers is they ought to be asking their Minister of Finance because that's there fundamental responsibility, why did you spend that amount of money in contravention of the law?

Government Services is another one. Ask your Minister of Government Services, why he hired an architect at agreed price, then secondly, he re-negotiated the price he was going to pay the architect and increased it. Then when he came to pay the final amount to the architect, he paid a different amount, a third amount. The Provincial Auditor said that he spent \$27,000 more in paying the architect than what he was entitled to do. There was no law that permitted the Minister of Government Services to pay that architect that additional \$27,000. Members say, well, what's \$27,000? And what is \$27,000? Mr. Speaker, \$27,000 is a very important amount of money to everybody in this province except the guys that sit in the government of this province. That's the point . . . \$27,000 is important. Ninety per cent of you didn't know that that was the fact because if you did, you'd ask questions of the minister. Why did you spend \$27,000 more than you were entitled to? Why did you break the law? That's what the Provincial Auditor said.

Tourism and Renewable Resources — and here's another dandy. And the minister's in his seat and I ask him to correct me if I'm wrong. He gave away; he gifted in contravention of the law or authority several grants totally \$29,000 in the last Provincial Auditor's report. You had no authority to do it. There were at least five grants of that kind which totalled almost \$30,000 and you gave it away. You gave it away in breach of the law you gave it away without the authority of this Assembly and you correct me if I'm wrong because that's what the Provincial Auditor says.

Have I heard a comment from you? No, I haven't. Have I heard a comment from any member from the other side of the House with respect to that item? The answer is 'no'. I ask you, why? Why did you allow your department to make grants totalling \$30,000 without statutory authority? You gifted it and you gifted it without any authority in the contravention of the law. And I say that that \$22,000 is a matter of importance. And if you don't think it is, I'll tell that there are a lot of citizens out there that think \$22,000 is very important.

Minister of Finance, again, I want to tell you something. The Provincial Auditor said in 1975-'76, that your Minister of Finance over committed expenditures . . . \$3,892,808.69, the very amount. The Provincial Auditor said to him after

1975-'76 that you have no authority to over commit that amount of money. Look, you would be in contravention of section 55 of The Finance Act by committing it. He's the biggest offender of all, Mr. Speaker, \$3.9 million that his department and he authorized the over commitment of. So the Provincial Auditor, a year ago, said to him, you can't do it. So what did he do, when he got his knuckles rapped? What did he do in the subsequent year which is the last year under review? All members look perplexed. I say to you, take the auditor's report and look at it. As your Minister of Finance, why, in the year following the time he got his knuckles rapped, what did he do? Did he go out and clean up his act? No, he didn't; he went out and did worse last year because he over committed not \$3.9 million as he did the year before, he over committed \$4.2 million. Mr. Speaker, \$4.2 million, he committed illegally without the authority of this House, without the authority of the law and he did it, having been told the year before by the Provincial Auditor that he was wrong in doing it. Now I ask you guys over there to go to him and ask him about that because it's time all of us began to spend more attention to what government is costing. Well, say to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, you go look at the provincial auditor's report which I would guess you did not look at and you ask the guy that sits right ahead of you who has the prime responsibility for administering this provinces finances and you ask him why he over committed in contravention of the law \$4.5 million, having been told the year before that he was wrong in doing that. Again, the thing that's wrong is none of us seem to care very much about it and I ask you why? Why don't we care? I don't say that that's an attitude that's peculiar to you people. It isn't. It's an attitude that's peculiar to all governments at every level, municipal, provincial and federal. That's what's happening. I don't blame you people particularly personally. You are caught up in the same attitude about spending that every other government is. It's because you see these as relatively small amounts viewed in the total in which you spend, but nobody else sees \$25,000 or \$150,000 or \$4 million as small amounts. These are major breaches of the law, major breaches of the function of this Legislature and year in and year out they happen and nobody over there seems to 'give a damn' about it. That's the attitude that we have to get at. That's why I said earlier, why do you, why do we all, apply one standard with the way in which we spend our money and the way in which we expect our fellows to spend their money and yet accept for our government such a very different one and with a shrug of a shoulder.

Mr. Speaker, there are all sorts of examples of this kind in the auditor's reports if one looks at them, all kinds of them. And what a disease in respect to them is a disease in Legislatures that are not looking at these things in detail, are not concerned about them, are not asking in the case of the backbenchers the ministers why they continue to do it; and most of all why we are not bestirring ourselves to cure these things. The people are expecting us to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude as I say is one of almost complete and utter indifference. I remember last year when I spoke to this bill that there was an item that the Department of Agriculture in conjunction with the Department of Co-ops had voted. It was a \$50,000 grant to a land processing plant in Alberta and the plant went belly up; \$50,000 went down the chute. Well, nobody cared, not that the Premier didn't know about it, the Minister of Agriculture shrugged, the Minister of Co-operatives said well he deferred to the Minister of Agriculture. He didn't know what it was all about. Fifty thousand dollars, you know the attitude was so what, so what — that's the kind of thing which people are questioning and they are questioning, wondering about how long they are going to tolerate governments being so indifferent about the way in which they spend public money. That's why they are seen as so wasteful. That's why I say to the members opposite, when are they going to bestir themselves? What does it take to

shock you about spending when your Minister of Finance spends illegally having been warned the year before not to do it, \$4 million? What does it take before you get up to him and say you better stop that. Because it doesn't get a lot of publicity, that's no reason why you shouldn't act. You have the obligation to do it. The members will know that their first function historically lies in the notion 'no taxation without representation'. Our history traces back to government spending, what to spend, and what to tax is the purpose of spending without representation. That's where our function derives. How long we have come from that basic notion of years ago. There is only a faint vestige of that remains in any of us. That's no longer our function somehow. We are busy devising programs and passing programs, not spending any amount of time really concerning ourselves with what they cost now and today and into the future, because we are all caught up in the benefit side of things and never looking at the cost side and we wonder occasionally why costs get out of hand in respective governments.

When I say, Mr. Speaker, in all of this without belaboring the point, is that we have to devise mechanisms and seriously we do and this applies to all levels of government, devise mechanisms by which we can bring more discipline to the way in which governments and politicians spend the public's money and the way in which we oversee the expenditure. This bill is one little modest start in one area and if it does nothing else I hope it will shape some attitude about the seriousness of the problem that we have to get at. All it says is this — it's so elementary you think we have had it for years because it happens in every home, it happens in every school unit office, it happens in local government level and when you set about to devise a program whether it is a private one or a local one you are going to spend some money, what do you do? You say how much do we have? How much is this thing going to cost? What are the alternatives? Who is going to pay the shot and who is going to benefit? Can we afford it? What's the cost going to be five years from now? What is the interest rate? What are the monthly payments . . . all questions which we ask all the time. How is it something as elementary as that is not done by our provincial government? How is it you can see, time after time again, programs which are introduced in the House, and there always are, and the ministers get up and explain the value of the program in terms of its benefit. Do we ever debate the cost? Is there a requirement that before we vote on a program there should be a cost analysis put before us? No, there isn't. There is no requirement that the minister file a statement showing to us what is the start-up cost of the program, what is the ongoing cost, who benefits, who pays, what are the alternatives. No, what we all do is we lapse into debating the benefits, the merits or demerits of the program because that's the popular political sign. Too little do we debate the cost of things.

What this bill would do, in very simple, elementary terms, is make it a simple requirement of the law of Saskatchewan that when the government introduces a program by way of legislation in the House, that it be accompanied by an economic impact statement which would show the members, by obligation of law, what the program would cost now and into the future, five years at least, who benefits, who pays and what the alternatives are. Something that is so elementary you think we would have had years ago. Last year, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced the bill, I included as well regulations and Orders in Council with respect to government spending. That drew some strenuous opposition from the Attorney General because he said we would have to have 100 additional civil servants to police it. Every time you had an Order in Council spending money you would have to go through this process, and that makes some sense. It makes some sense and it may be that it was overly ambitious. What I have done this year is I have brought before members a more modest proposal. The bill would apply only to bills; it wouldn't apply to statutory instruments. It doesn't apply to Orders

in Council, it doesn't apply to regulations. All it says in very simple terms by way of the beginning is that when a program is put before us there is an obligation in law by the government to put before us an economic impact statement or a financial analysis.

I ask members to look at the bill seriously. It is carefully drafted. Let's see whether we couldn't begin in this way to bring some better discipline in the way in which we spend money.

The other side of this coin is this and that is the way in which we control the expenditures of government. All of us now have been here long enough to know that the answer to the question if we ask it sincerely — do we have a real input, a meaningful one, in the way in which government is now spending its money? The answer is no, we don't. If you look at the way in which we review the government expenditures, we are dealing with Public Accounts which are two years old. We have about 3 weeks, a couple of hours a morning, 3 days in those 3 weeks and we look at the expenditure of a billion dollars. Well it is ludicrous to suppose that any of us can get our heads around the expenditure of a billion dollars, sitting for 3 weeks, for 2 1/2 or 3 hours a morning for 3 days. It's nonsense; we can't. We've lost control in that respect.

Let's take current government spending, the Estimates. We have an opportunity, a better opportunity in Public Accounts to look at those but even the way in which those are presented is not good. Our Estimate debates at the moment tend to go off on a review of some of the decisions made by government in the past year. The Estimates aren't presented to us in the kind of detail that would be required for us to really do a thorough examination in terms of spending. Secondly, we don't have the time. We are sitting three and four months per year; we no longer have the time to deal with over a billion dollars of expenditures. Now, if we were honest with ourselves we would have to concede, as members, that we no longer police government in the way in which we are supposed to do theoretically. We don't police it in the initial instance when a program is introduced; we can't, by reason of the functioning of the system and the large size of government, police its past expenditures and we can't adequately deal with its forward expenditures.

I don't know what the answer to that is, Mr. Speaker, except that we should be looking for the answers to it because we are clearly failing, by reason principally of the institution in failing to do that. In a very real sense our original function, in respect of our original function, we're cuckold, I mean we are impotent. That used to be 90 per cent of the function of members. Well, I thought the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) would agree with me on every comment I have made, when I invite him to, he says so far I agree with everything you say. I thought he would be in sympathy with that. You understand, I am sure, that we are not fulfilling the function of members in respect to government spending the way in which we should do it.

The intention of the bill, which is a rather simple measure, is to begin the process of bringing some better discipline to this whole area. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that people are demanding it and we, as members, should be responding to them.

Mr. Speaker, I want therefore, to urge members to consider it and to engage in the debate in respect of it. I ask them to challenge the points I have made in a serious way about the way in which we are now not fulfilling the function that we are elected to do and that is on the cost side of our government. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, in terms of the statement of the problem and in terms of laying out the factual data that the member who has just spoken has, I agree with him 100 per cent. In terms of solution, I think it is a little thin.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to support, in principle, a bill of this nature at any time if I felt that the member who brought it in brought it in sincerely. I think that what we have witnessed here tonight is the absolute height of hypocrisy. Now, I want to remind hon. members of this House that this member who just spoke was employed by the Trudeau government as an executive assistant to one of the ministers whom we all know so well, too well.

When he talks about government spending, he says, for example, here in the province, to apply the Premier's standard of spending to the government. He talks about the outrageous costs, for example, of the provincial government building. Well, he is quite right but if this government is a squanderer of money, then the party with which he hopes to be associated with and which he aspires to become a member of, has honed the art of wasting money — has honed that waste to a fine art. I say he, very carefully, Mr. Speaker, . . . (interjection — inaudible) . . . Oh, the member — he talks about the provincial building. He has obviously never been to Hull, Quebec, Mr. Speaker. In Hull, Quebec, the lavish new offices, because of a last minute change in programs by the federal government, while spaces stand empty on the Ottawa side, they did not have the foresight to change their programs around in time and they thought it would be politically expedient to open up some new offices in Ottawa.

I noticed that there was a careful avoidance of flying federal ministers to the tune of \$8,000 a crack to football games. There was no mention of . . . (interjection — inaudible) — \$8,000! You heard me! \$8,000 a crack, to the tune of over three quarters of a million dollars.

Of course the flying does not end there. There is flying of nannies around the place. This flying of nannies, Mr. Speaker, has to be the most odious and reprehensible kind of situation. Here was a federal minister making the good buck — over \$40,000 a year, and when caught trying to slip this little old Scot nanny on board one of the government aircraft, would not even pay the full flight back, by way of commercial flight, offered to pay half. Now I just wonder why the — Send her back by freight, says one of the members; and the member just, very carefully, avoided talking about a government that loses millions of dollars in the Atomic Energy Corporation, much of it paid, Mr. Speaker, in bribes overseas. He did not mention that. He did not mention, for example, the federal Auditor General saying to the people of Canada — He is concerned of course. He says we have not read, carefully, the auditor's report for the province; we have not read it; we are not concerned.

Well, I wonder how concerned he was when he read the federal auditor's report, which states, uncategorically, that the federal government under Trudeau leadership has lost control of the purse strings. He did not mention, for example, Mr. Speaker, the participation of the Trudeau Liberals in the Olympics, to the tune of millions and millions of dollars. He did not mention the Olympic Village that is still sitting idle, that has never been opened up to the public. He did not mention that.

He did not mention, for example, Mr. Speaker, Mirabel Airport, hundreds of millions of dollars, unwanted by the airlines, unwanted by the travelling, flying public, unwanted

by Montrealers, unwanted by the farmers whose land was expropriated, unwanted, in short, by anyone with an ounce of sense.

He did not mention, Mr. Speaker, a government that bought and brought in the Bonaventure, scrapped within months after it had been recommissioned.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker? Can you imagine? I do not blame him for faulting this government for some of its extravagances and some of its wastes. I agree that, in principle, every government at every level has to look carefully at its expenditures and attempt to do something to control the expenditures.

Now if this member is sincere, that is the first if, and if he should happen to be elected and if, in his election, he manages to get enough Liberals elected across Canada, which in the whole realm of it, puts me into the scenario of absurdity, it would be very much, Mr. Speaker, like the little boy with his cub scout pants on and his policeman suspenders, putting a hole in the dike that is about to burst through. That is what he would look like if he went to Ottawa to help out the federal Liberals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our members have a great deal more to say about this bill, the principles in it, and some more to say about this member. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Adjournment of debate negated on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 7

Collver
Larter
Birkbeck

Lane (Sa-Su)
Wipf

Thatcher
Katzman

NAYS — 9

Malone
Wiebe
MacDonald

Cameron
Anderson
Stodalka

McMillan
Nelson (As-Gr)
Clifford

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, over the past few years, Prime Minister Trudeau and his Cabinet have proven themselves time and time again totally incapable of running this country. Incompetence and total disrespect for the laws of Canada have characterized the style of Liberal administration which many now describe as sleazy. Now, I want to list some topics that I'd like to deal with since the members didn't wish to grant leave to adjourn debate. I'd like to list some topics in terms of the Trudeau government of Canada; just the ones I want to deal with, number 25. I want to deal with anti-dumping tribunal, AECL reactor sales, the Air Canada investigation, Auditor General's reports black-list parliamentary opposition. I want to deal with car rental concessions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. What's the point of order?

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I understand the bill deals solely with

provincial spending and I think it would be wise to call the speaker to that attention.

MR. SPEAKER: — The bill we are discussing, just so all members are clear, is Bill No. 29 — An Act to provide for an Economic Impact Statement to accompany Government Bills when introduced in the Legislature. I would assume that the member is going to relate his comments to the bill.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that under our parliamentary system there are three major safeguards for ensuring honest, open government: ministerial responsibility, conflict of interest regulations and freedom of access to government information. Well, we'll get to the list; we've only heightened and brought, Mr. Speaker, to the attention of this House some activities of the federal government that would relate to this particular bill and I think it's cogent to the discussion at hand right now. Of course a person could spend an hour alone on the \$11.4 million deficit, billion dollar deficit, pardon me. Those big numbers just escape me. I'm going to try to get back at that after while.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the anti-dumping tribunal one J.P. Gauthier was appointed by the Liberal Government as chairman of the federal anti-dumping tribunal 1972. Since becoming chairman, Gauthier has been involved in a series of business dealings, such as attempting to sell a gun sight to the armed forces, and selling fish roe from Manitoba to Europe as caviar. Gauthier resigned from his position as chairman two weeks before he was due to retire.

I want to talk about another thing here, Mr. Speaker, the AECL reactor sales. It was revealed in 1976, that the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, a Federal Crown corporation, had negotiated sales of Candu Reactors to Argentina and South Korea, and had paid sales agents . . .

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, this deals with provincial government spending, not Crown corporations spending, not ministers' peccadillos and the market. I would request you keep the member on the subject, so that we can proceed with the business at hand.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! On the original presentation by the member for Regina South, I allowed the debate to range quite widely and the member spent a considerable amount of time talking about the report of the Auditor, and I would assume that he was tying that into the economic impact, the necessity . . . Order! order . . . I assume that the member for Regina South was tying that into the need for an economic impact statement that accompany bills, and I assume the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, until he proves otherwise, intends to tie this into the need for economic impact. I hesitate to interrupt him at this time, until he proves beyond a doubt, that he is not on the subject.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I like to relate the topic which I bring because I think that, as a matter of fact, we can rebut information which the member for Regina South has brought. Now, in terms of specifics, Mr. Speaker, I want to relate this matter of the AECL reactor sales federally, and show the kind of situation which I hope the member who has just spoken, wants to get at — wants to grapple with and wants to stop these kind of situations. Again, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that 1976 the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, and I might mention that this is a federal crown corporation, negotiated sales of Candu reactors to Argentina and South Korea, and paid sales agents almost \$20 million in commissions' for which there was no adequate

documentation. AECL ended up losing over \$150 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . \$150 million in sales of these reactors. I hope that legislation has been framed, which the member for Regina South (the sometime member for Regina South — the sometime federal aspirant), I hope that Public Accounts . . . Mr. Chairman, in the Federal counterpart of what our public accounts committee is, they investigated the questionable accounting practices, improper payment procedures and other activities of the AECL. The president of the Crown corporation, John Foster, was subsequently fired amid heavy criticism of J. Lorne Grey, the retired chairman, and the present chairman, Ross Campbell.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in bringing in this kind of bill, the member for Regina South is sincere. I hope that when he gets to the federal level, whichever direction he does get there — whether it be by appointment some day down the road, or whether he should be elected this time or some other time, (I doubt he will be elected this time but I wish him all the best), we hope he brings this kind of pompous, sanctimonious sincerity to his federal buddies, the Trudeau buddies, and we hope that he lets the Trudeau Liberals know that out west, there are a lot of people who sincerely believe that it is time to curb government waste.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk briefly about something which relates to this whole matter that has been raised by the member for Regina (sometime member for Regina South). There was an Air Canada investigation. One Elmer MacKay revealed irregularity arrangements between Yves Menard, former Air Canada Vice President for Marketing, and the McGregor Travel Agency of Montreal, in return for influencing Middle Eastern and Latin American governments for Air Canada's benefit. The Agency was paid \$100,000 in advance, in three separate installments . . . well, we all remember that and we hope that our counterpart over here when he makes his mark on the federal scene, be it by appointment or election, he then . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You see, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that will cling to power like a Liberal. They kind of get their fingers into it, they get their toe nails into it, their whisker hairs — and we hope that somebody comes along and snips their finger nails and their toe nails and their whisker hair, and you know, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing in this world, nothing, that will talk as much about high ideals and high principles and strike low blows, as a Liberal who wants to get elected, or is afraid that he was about to be tossed out of office because after all, Mr. Speaker, to take power away from a Liberal is like defrocking a priest, they have the divine right to rule. That is why they fight so hard.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one other thing here. I want to mention the Auditor General's report. I mentioned it briefly but since they didn't want me to adjourn this debate I want to take the opportunity to get into a little detail on this.

In November of 1976, Canada's Auditor General, J.J. Macdonnel, tabled his annual report, in which he indicted the government for losing control over its spending. He considered the situation so serious that if continued he would be unable to approve the accounts of Canada. Further, he found that the government had overstated its financial position by over \$7 billion, through a series of questionable accounting practices which included uncollectible loans to Crown corporations in foreign nations. The government rejected the immediate implementation of his recommendations in favor of a royal commission to study government financial procedures. There was no member for Regina South to bring a bill there to question government costing and isn't that too bad. There were no members on the Liberal side who said, let us talk about government cost and government waste. Oh, for the day when we have a member of the federal Liberal party elected who will have this kind of enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker, this

kind of zeal . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I noticed when the member for Regina South was introducing the bill, I happened to notice the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland sat very quietly and listened to the presentation. That is quite right. I think the member should listen to the presentation. But I am now having trouble hearing the presentation the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland is making. I know that the members will be willing to pass on anything of interest to me, however, I would like to make that decision myself whether it is interesting. Therefore, I would like to hear the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland directly.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, we hope . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Start that one again because Mr. Speaker missed it because of the yelling in here.

MR. LANE: — Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I will just briefly recap this. What had happened was that in 1976 the Auditor General considering the situation so serious as to recommend that he could no longer, if the situation continued, approve the accounts of Canada and who stated that the federal government had overspent, or over estimated its position by roughly \$7 billion through a series of questionable accounting practices, made certain recommendations which were rejected and unfortunately — now, Mr. Speaker, I want to be sincere about this bill that the member has brought — and I hope that he is sincere, I believe he was. We have to take the member's word. I think that he has brought this bill sincerely and we want to look at it. We are hoping that this is the kind of thing that that bill, if accepted by the hon. members, will occur.

Now, here is another example, Mr. Speaker. We are wondering about this kind of situation. There is the matter of car rental concessions through tendering. After giving a commitment to revise government policy on tendering procedures for car rental concessions at the Ministry of Transport airports to give Canadian companies a better deal, Otto Lang ignored his own policy and favored Avis, an American company over Canadian owned firms. Tilden launched a \$10 million suit against MOT but dropped it after Lang backed down. However, other car rental companies had been financially hurt by the government's actions and have also instituted legal action against MOT. The lawsuits because of this government's incompetence totalled \$19 million.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't been able to look at all the details and study carefully all the ramifications but I hope that the member's bill covers the kind of situation which we found in the Hamilton Harbor dredging scandal. Three former Hamilton Harbor commissioners, one of whom was a former campaign manager for the Labour Minister, John Munroe, pleaded guilty in February of 1975 to charges concerning price fixing and financial kickbacks over dredging operations in the Hamilton Harbor. At the time John Munroe tendered his resignation from the Cabinet but old shrug refused to accept it. The Hamilton Harbor issue is still before the courts and there is still a cloud hanging over the country as a result of this. I hope that provincially, with the introduction of this kind of a bill, we can tighten up the purse strings and we can catch that kind of waste that comes through.

Now we could talk about censorship of the press and income tax files confidentiality; I don't think that particularly relates to this particular . . . oh, well then I will give you something that does relate. Let's talk about the Indian Affairs Economic Development

Program. Here is a federal program that was initiated in 1970 to fund small but viable projects undertaken by Indian businessmen. Since 1970 almost \$150 million was spent without any proper fiscal guidelines, policy or accountability. Independent consultants hired to investigate the program said the departmental officials knowingly made wrong decisions in response to political pressures and that there were no controls of any kind. One example is the La Pas, Manitoba shopping centre which was approved as a \$1 million project but because of interference from civil servants within the department it ended up costing over \$8 million — from \$1 million to over \$8 million.

Mr. Speaker, by the Trudeau Liberals who now hope to save this nation for a third time, I tell you, we can't afford to be saved any more. That man has saved us three times and this member who now proposed the bill wishes to introduce a bill in the House and he wants to help Trudeau save the nation for a fourth time.

If this bill coped with the kind of thing (maybe it's not directly a cost of money) but I want to refer briefly to the judges' affair. Consumer and Corporation Affairs Minister Andre Ouellet was found guilty of contempt of court in 1976 over derogatory comments he made about a judge who acquitted three sugar refineries facing charges of pricing. It was revealed that former Public Works Minister Bud Drury had attempted to intervene with the judge on Ouellet's behalf. It was further revealed that federal cabinet ministers had on three occasions talked to Quebec judges about the cases before them. Ouellet resigned from the Cabinet and was subsequently reappointed.

Now Mr. Speaker, the way in which I intend to relate it is this. Maybe that doesn't directly have an effect on the cost of government, but I say, Mr. Speaker, unequivocally that that kind of attitude exhibited by the Trudeau Liberals and their fuddlebucks, that kind of attitude, is going to cost this nation dearly if left . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about the Diefenbuck?

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Well, the Diefendollar, the Diefenbuck, Mr. Speaker, since it was brought up — 92 cents; now we are down to 87 cents; but there is still 87 cents left and we can look forward to it dwindling away in totality.

Let's talk about the Lockheed Aircraft contract. The Minister of National Defence announced on November, 1975 that Argus Patrol aircraft were going to be replaced by a new one, the Lockheed Long-range Patrol aircraft at a total cost of \$953 million. Work began on the plane immediately though a contract was never signed. The Minister of Supply and Services, Pierre Boyer had authorized work to begin on the basis of a verbal agreement, that Lockheed, in financial difficulties at the time, denied ever having made. In May of 1976 the project collapsed leaving the government liable for work that had taken place. The government renegotiated with Lockheed and the contract was finally signed in July of 1976. The net result of this government incompetence (and we hope that the same enthusiasm and zeal is exhibited in the federal Trudeau Liberals) because that cost, \$1,031,700 approximately . . . pardon me, \$1 billion I'm wrong again . . . these big numbers keep getting away on me . . . we are dealing on the provincial scene so it is tough, an aircraft not as well equipped as the one initially negotiated and a year's delay in the delivery schedule.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a minute about Nannygate. The federal Minister of Transport, Otto Lang attempted to use (that's his boss, the gentleman who just spoke) attempted to use Defence Department aircraft to send his children's nanny back to Scotland and when she was untimely ripped from the flight Lang offered to pay half of the cost to send her home aboard a commercial aircraft. That's really liberal! Here is the hon. federal minister making \$53,600 a year and paying his nanny a measly \$200 a month. Can you believe it?

Now we mentioned briefly the federal minister's family. He took his Department of Transport seriously.

In response to questions from PC Tom Cossit, it was revealed that Otto Lang had spent more than \$750,000 flying around the country on government aircraft over a three year period. Many of the 133 trips were to his home constituency in Saskatoon. And you know the only thing different now, Mr. Speaker, is when that jet star comes screaming down the tarmac, there is another one right behind it with his old buddy, Jack Horner. They are absolutely great buddies, Mr. Speaker, but they just like to use separate aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, Lang even flew to the 1975 Grey Cup game at the taxpayers' expense, over \$8,000, that little goody for you. And after the controversy broke, Lang sent a memo to all Liberal and senators stating — this is the arrogance I was talking about before — that he did not apologize for his use of government aircraft and will continue to travel as much as before. Unbelievable, that kind of attitude, but you know there is nothing in this world, Mr. Speaker, that will fight as hard against wage and price controls in a federal election and be the first to bring it in. We can add another one. There is nothing that will remove provincial sales tax by 2 per cent for enough time to get them elected. I tell the people of Saskatchewan that if the wage and price control issue is any example, we can expect a 12 per cent sales tax after this new government is in power. If it is a Liberal government, if it is a Trudeau government, after it has been in power for about three months, we can expect a 12 per cent sales tax.

Now, I hope that this bill that the hon. member brings, and he is an hon. member, I hope that he brings that kind of sincerity to his federal counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the PanArctic Oils junket. In August of 1976, Energy Minister Gillespie, Public Works Minister Bud Drury, NEB Chairman, Marshall Crowe and members of their staff and families spent five days in the North fishing for Arctic char, Mr. Speaker, with officials of the PanArctic Oils and Polar Gas officials. At that time these two companies were preparing an application for a \$5 billion pipeline from the Arctic Islands and what do they do? Just like so many bees around the honey pot, they are fishing for Arctic char.

This group went at the expense of PanArctic through Gillespie and he later indicated that he would pay \$1,000 towards the costs. Mr. Speaker, this is the government that the hon. member would wish to join, and Mr. Speaker, I repeat (I don't wish to make this redundant but I repeat) that I hope that he brings that kind of zeal to his counterparts before he brings this great country to its knees.

I want to talk for a minute about the Polysar kick backs. In November, 1976 the Auditor General's report revealed that a federal Crown corporation had made financial rebates in the form of kick backs to some of its customers to aid them in evading taxes and laws

in their own countries. The Prime Minister had been advised of the practice three years previously by the former Auditor General, Max Henderson. The Prime Minister indicated that he had asked another Cabinet minister, Bud Drury to investigate the matter but no investigation ever took place. The government considered . . . Where did he go? Out, Mr. Speaker. This grieves me. In my heart I wish that the member . . .

(inaudible interjection)

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Oh, he's going to get a better view. O.K. I'm sorry; I thought he had left the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister indicated that he had asked another Cabinet minister, Brad Drury, to investigate the matter but no investigation ever took place. The government considered illegalities of this nature as an acceptable business practice — kick backs to the tune of many, many dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about patronage. We hope that if this bill comes forward that we can in some way, amend the bill or make the bill broad enough in its scope to cover this whole issue of patronage.

Let's take a look at the federal scene for example, by way of enlightenment to hon. members. Since 1968 the Liberal Cabinet has given high paying jobs to over 200 former Liberal candidates from federal and provincial elections. As well, the statistics demonstrate that more government funds in terms of DREE grants and make work programs go to Liberal held ridings than to other parts of the country. This is over and above the decentralization patronage already identified.

Mr. Speaker, if I got one tenth, just one tenth of the federal mortgage grease that is put through the law office in Saskatoon, I would be wealthy. I could retire in a year. The patronage, the pork barrel, the stepping up blatantly to the trough is unsurpassed. The federal Trudeau Liberals have honed patronage to a fine art. Now, I hope that bill is wide enough so that that kind of cost of government can be reduced so that after the next federal election (just in case the federal Liberals are re-appointed) — I hope they have a counterpart to this bill because I wouldn't like to see any defeated Liberal candidates from Regina put onto the Bench — I still make my living practising law, and after this speech I don't want to appear before anyone ..is appointed to the Bench. Until now we have had a very, very superior Bench.

Mr. Speaker, we want to talk about security services. Over the last few months it has been revealed that elements of our national security services have been engaged in various illegal activities including breaking and entering, arson, theft and opening of mail. The entire Cabinet including the Prime Minister has professed ignorance of these activities and has refused to take any responsibility for them. The former Solicitor General Fox has stated many times, that only isolated instances were being revealed, though he he has had to back down from his statement. There is now a Royal Commission, the MacDonald Inquiry . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I have been following the member and in some instances I have been able to relate what he is saying to what is before the House, but if it is an Economic Impact Study related to government programs, then I think it is in order but if it is just discussion about some indiscretions of some minister or someone else, I think that is not necessarily in order. I would ask the member to relate to the bill, i.e. or to the subject, i.e. impact studies on bills.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, thank you. I will take heed of your words.

Mr. Speaker, before I look into federal programs which would reveal the need for the kind of legislation which the hon. member proposes both here and there, I want to say that I hope that any legislation that comes forward in this House is designed in such a fashion that the intent of the act cannot be defeated. Mr. Speaker, we have the situation in the province of Saskatchewan today in the province of Saskatchewan, today, where we see federal members campaigning - and I won't name names. I don't think that would be fair.

We have a new piece of federal legislation which prohibits the spending of in excess of certain funds during the period. Now the intent of that act is particularly clear. Do all people campaigning in the province of Saskatchewan deal with that act in terms of the spirit of the intent of the act? Well, sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I see three, four and five colored ads that were carefully produced at great expense, trucking across my television screen, much to my dismay.

Now we want this act if the hon. members accept it, we want this act to have the kind of truth in it so that the intent and the spirit of the act cannot be fraudulently gotten around. Oh, the hon. member brings up Pelly, and isn't that a nice thing to bring up? I would like to speak about that, briefly, Mr. Speaker, and then I will return to my speech.

There we had a Liberal Party, who because it felt that it was out of the purview of charges in the court, thought it would attack other parties. This kind of attitude, we broke the law and we admitted it. We see it happen in the federal counterparts, too. They are learning from their federal counterparts. We broke the law and we are admitting it and, therefore, no, Mr. Speaker, I can't accept that kind of thing. So let me return to my speech.

Let me talk for a minute about the kind of thing that I hope this act will deal with. We all know of the word "Sky Shops". Sky Shops Limited was a company that held the lease at Dorval airport from which it operated a duty free shop. Its MOT-granted lease was due to expire at the end of 1975 at which time competitive bids would normally be sought. However, Sky Shops was able to get its Senator Louis Giguere, Trudeau's first senate appointment — Oh, I forgot to mention this — he obtained 5,000 shares in the company for \$5,000 prior to the lease extension and subsequently he was charged with conspiracy and influence peddling in connection with the lease extension.

We hope that this bill that the hon. members brings has the kind of teeth in it that will prevent that kind of influence peddling . . . You bet I am, because I tell you what. I don't care if our federal leader had 800 warts on his face, he would be better than that fuddle duck that you have leading the party right now, who has brought this country to its knees. I tell you that under Pierre Trudeau, who said he was going to bring the just society — is this the just society? Scandal after scandal after scandal. I'll tell you justice who for. Justice for all those people who don't have their nose in the federal trap on the basis of patronage. He was the man who was going to unite Canada and when he was first elected there was no problem with the unity problem in Canada with the separatists, but under his leadership . . . well, I tell you, Joe Clark, united a party that was ordinarily divided and your man, fuddle duck, divided the country that is ordinarily united. I tell you that you are going to have to pay for that.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have a tutor nanny to teach me the other language and so I can't pronounce the name of this next scandal, so I will skip it. There are lots more.

Let's talk about the uranium cartel. In the fall of 1977 an American congressional investigation into uranium price fixing revealed that the Canadian government had actively participated in an international uranium cartel to inflate the price of uranium, producers to participate in the arrangement. Although Cabinet ministers stated that domestic prices had not been effected by the cartel, it did, in fact, result in higher cost to Canadian consumers as well.

We hope that the kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, which this hon. member brings to the House is the kind of thing that his federal buddies will attack with zeal and bring it to the federal House.

Mr. Speaker, the government had forced Canadian uranium producers to participate in the this arrangement. Although Cabinet ministers stated that domestic prices had not been affected by the cartel, it did, in fact, result in higher cost to Canadian consumers as well. After the American revelations the Cabinet passed an Order in Council making it illegal to discuss - they didn't make Sky Shops illegal, they didn't make all the harbor dredging scandals, they didn't make that illegal. They didn't make any of these matters illegal, they made it illegal to discuss the issue in Canada or reveal any documents related to the charges.

The PC Party challenged that Order in Council in the courts and the court overturned it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to sum up in this way. We have here a bill brought by a member, and it is fair. Of course, there is some waste in this government. Perhaps more than in some others. Perhaps there is waste in all levels of government, but in the same way that I don't like the hypocrisy of seeing a member in his bid to get elected at some other level circumvent, and I ask the hon. member to deny it if he will, to spend as much money as he can now before the writ is dropped so he won't be caught by the spirit and the intent of the act later. I ask the member if he is sincere in bringing this legislation today in bringing this bill, we hope that he brings it with the kind of sincerity in order to demonstrate to us that the bill will manifestly have the teeth in it to prevent all future governments of Saskatchewan from obvious and blatant waste by government.

Now let me review just briefly, Mr. Speaker, we hope that this bill will in the Saskatchewan scene prevent the kind of scandal which took place in the AECL reactor sales. We hope it would prevent the kind of thing that happened in the Air Canada investigation. We hope that the Auditor's Report in Saskatchewan never gets to be as serious as his federal counterpart when talking about how the federal government has lost control of spending. Perhaps this kind of legislation will do something to prevent that situation.

Mr. Speaker, let me digress for a few moments because I have thought of something else that is current to this topic of discussion . . . (interjection) . . . Well, let me tell you something, Sir, in a country that is crawling obviously with communist spies that to boot out another thirteen . . . Who gets disciplined? The person who brings up the issue and tells who they are . . . (interjection) . . . Well, our federal counterpart warned you about some of these people.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think the member is off the topic.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Well, I'm just going to wait until our man in parliament points them out, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that your guys do something about it. We hope that your government does something about it besides punish the gentleman who points it out. We hope that this kind of legislation that the hon. member brings will put the kind of teeth into the federal scene where the car rental concession tendering scandal can't be repeated in the province of Saskatchewan or on the \$19 million that was lost by the federal government in terms of lawsuits because of its incompetence and its sloppiness.

We hope, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know about this but I would like to relate this particular thing and I'll try to tie it in as best I can, Mr. Speaker. In 1977 an edition of the Canadian Magazine and two daily newspapers in Saskatoon and Regina had an article about the hon. Otto Lang. Saskatchewan of course is his home province. After a threatened defamation suit by Lang two newspapers withheld distribution of the magazine although it was distributed to the rest of the country. The same day a Liberal MP, Serge Joyal, charged that the federal government was trying to harness and domesticate the Canadian press because the government was unable to control it. Now, Mr. Speaker . . . (interjection) . . . I don't for a minute want that yellow rag known as the Leader Post to be my friend because I want to win in this province not because of my relationship to that particular newspaper . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yellow rag?

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — . . . and I haven't yet seen carefully tonight's press but I hope that that paper gives the kind of coverage to something that happened today that they did to the ongoing day to day reports from the court room that they did before. Now we hope that this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I'm not able to relate what the member is saying to the bill before us, namely, an economic impact statement to accompany Government Bills when introduced in the Legislature. I just don't get the relationship. I would ask the member to make it as hastily as possible.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, we hope that the Hamilton harbor dredging scandal or an equivalent kind of scandal will not be able to happen in Saskatchewan and if it is necessary to support this kind of legislation to ensure that that does not happen in the province of Saskatchewan I would be the first member to vote in favor of that kind of legislation. . . . (interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, there is a very sensitive lot sitting to my right so I want to tell them that I am with them on this bill. . . . (interjection) . . . Don't you dare bug my room.

Mr. Speaker, we want to support any legislation and if it comes from that caucus, we are never against legislation which will improve the control of the purse strings in the province of Saskatchewan or the government of Canada or anywhere else. I don't want to happen in Saskatchewan the kind of \$1 million fiasco that happened in the Indian Affairs Economic Development Program scandal. We hope, that after we have had a good look at this legislation — well, we want to study it in detail. We want to look at it clause by clause. We hope that that kind of thing can't happen here because there a \$1 million project ended up costing the people of Saskatchewan \$8 million. Could I remind hon. members, when it was requested by the Auditor General to investigate the program and table the report in the House, there was no co-operation from the federal Liberal government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to review just a few more things before I take my seat . . . Well, I could speak for hours on that but I wonder if the Speaker could tie that into the present topic at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the point that I have made tonight is that when a member brings this kind of a bill, I think it is absolutely and totally unfair of that member, and it displays an odious and reprehensible kind of hypocrisy on his part, to not single out where his party has fallen a little short of the mark . . . Well, the member wants me to find bugs and commies. I don't know, we are trying to keep them all out of our party but maybe you could give us some advice about the kinds of bugs and commies that you have inside your party.

Mr. Speaker, there was a careful avoidance of a number of topics. I wish to bring back to the attention of this House one more matter. If the member is sincere in the bill that he brings, then this legislation, in terms of the acid test, will be able to control the kind of thing that happened in the Lockheed Aircraft contract. I didn't deal with that in enough detail before and I would like to go back to it.

The Minister of National Defence announced in November 1975, . . . no, I haven't been over this one at all. The Argus patrol aircraft are going to be replaced by new ones, the Lockheed long range patrol aircraft at the total cost of \$953 million. We hope that we can send out all kinds of copies of this . . . at a total cost of \$953 million. Work began on the plane immediately although the contract was never signed. The Minister of Supply and Services, Mr. Goyer, had authorized work to begin on the basis of a verbal agreement that Lockheed could arrange initial financing, an agreement that Lockheed in financial difficulties at the time, denied ever having made. In May 1976, the project collapsed leaving the government liable for work that had taken place. The government renegotiated the contract . . . we are not against anyone. We even hope that you, at some point in time, recognize the silliness of your ways and join with us to bring the better kind of government to this province and to this country that it so rightfully deserves.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I would like to move the following amendment, seconded by the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver)

That all words after the words 'Bill No. 29, be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

'not now be read a second time but that the substance of the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.'

Debate continues on the amendment.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of Conservative Opposition): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a great pleasure for me to second this motion, emotionally on Bill 29.

Mr. Speaker, I think it has been interesting for all in the Assembly to listen to . . . no, no, not about communists, to listen to a catalogue . . . Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Regina South had an opportunity to present his case on behalf of Bill 29 and what he thought was going to be the kind of results from Bill 29. He very legitimately catalogued complaints about the fact that government has increased in size, dramatically. He said, 'Government has become so vast that as a matter of fact, we as legislators have lost control.' Mr. Speaker, we couldn't agree more. Government has become so vast and so

huge that legislators have lost control. There is no question about it. The member for Regina South suggests that there is only one solution and that is to make government bigger. Have more government to watch the already burgeoning government, that is what he is suggesting. He is suggesting let's have watchdogs to watch the watchdogs who will watch the watchdogs to present impact studies to the government of Saskatchewan and to the members of the Legislature so that we in the Legislative Chamber can watch the costs of government continue to skyrocket even further.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another solution that the member for Regina South has failed to mention and that is, perhaps government should become smaller. Perhaps government — central government, centralized bureaucracies have become overly dominant in Saskatchewan, have become overly dominant in Canada. I noticed that the Liberal members to my right were most concerned and most noisy as they currently are, as the member for Regina South currently is, when a catalogue of the transgressions of the present Liberal government in Ottawa were listed. Facts that have been presented to the Canadian people, facts that are aware to members of the press and members opposite, well aware to the members to my right, a catalogue of the kind of government inefficiency mentioned by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. They were very noisy about that. The member for Regina South especially was most concerned that a listing should be presented to the people of Saskatchewan and to this Legislature of the gross mismanagement of the Canadian economy by the present government in Ottawa. As a matter of fact, what the members to my right attempted to do tonight is fairly typical; one of them suggested that because our member used an analogy that there was somehow some religious fervor to what he was saying, that he suggested in this Assembly, he said because our member for Saskatoon-Sutherland compared one thing to the defrocking of a priest that that was somehow anti-religious. Sure, anti-religious, says the member for Indian Head-Wolseley. Of all the nonsense, I have ever heard in my life. They are afraid, Mr. Speaker, to have a catalogue of government extravagance listed before them about the very government that the member for Regina South wishes so fervently to join. And for the sake of the people of Saskatchewan, I might say to you, as far as the government of Saskatchewan is concerned, would that he were successful. Because, Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine anyone in this Assembly less qualified to bring in a bill critical of government spending than the member for Regina South who was an executive assistant to Cabinet and to a Cabinet minister in Ottawa for some years and is now aspiring to join the very same government that created an \$11.4 billion deficit this year and that's only the one, Mr. Speaker, that's predicted. That's not the one that actually occurs. The member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) would try to suggest to this Assembly that he who has worked hand in glove with the perpetrator, as the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has suggested, with the perpetrator of nannygate, with the perpetrator of three-quarter of a million dollar expenditure for flitting around the province in taking people's bands from one city to another for nominating meetings. This same member that hand in glove for many years was working with that same minister and as a matter of fact who has on several occasions stood up for the rights of that minister to fly around the country. I remember when this entire . . .

MR. KOSKIE: — Move for adjournment, I will support you. I'm sick of listening to you.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, I'm glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that I would be more than happy with the Attorney General to adjourn debate in the House but he wouldn't do this, you see. He wouldn't adjourn the House at all tonight because the fellows to my right would want to get in and raise issues that were secondary to the issue that's on us today. Because the issue that is on us today, Mr. Speaker, is very, very

clear. A bill to the saving of money in Saskatchewan. Now, he very rightly so catalogued and listed the extravagance of government in Saskatchewan. He failed to draw the analogy, Mr. Speaker, that's why I think this is important tonight; he failed to draw the analogy between the extravagances of government spending in Saskatchewan and the extravagances of government spending with the Liberal Government in Ottawa to which he ascribes to join. He didn't draw that analogy. Now the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland very succinctly brought to the attention of this House and to the people of Saskatchewan a catalogue of the kind of extravagances that have occurred in Ottawa by the government that the member for Regina South aspires to belong to. But, Mr. Speaker, he didn't say in his talk tonight, and I listened very attentively, which he has refused to do so far. . . . (interjection) . . . My goodness gracious, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley just doesn't pick up the paper anytime I guess. Never, never. Mr. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley, how can an economic impact statement prepared by the very same people who are presumably preparing the Public Accounts going to save the people of Saskatchewan any money? . . . (interjection) . . . I can't either.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina South says, we don't have any information in Crown Corporations and he is right. The information that supposedly comes before Crown Corporations is nonsense. We don't get it, it's a year and a half or two years late and when it does get there half the time we can't get answers to our questions, documents won't be tabled. The member for Regina South is quite correct in that assessment of the Public Accounts Committee. He is quite correct in his assessment of the Crown Corporations Committee. The same. The information that we get is always late, it's never all there, we can never piece together the entire story because certain segments of it are kept from us by government. Exactly the same people only more of them because they'll still have to do the Public Accounts. They will still have to do Crown Corporations. They will still have to do the preparation of the financial statement. There will still have to be a Provincial Auditor. There will still have to be outside auditors paid by the government of Saskatchewan. But the member for Regina South suggests that an economic impact study can be prepared by these people. Now first of all he is suggesting that they have the expertise to begin with. Now I suggest to the people of Saskatchewan, I suggest to the members opposite and I think the government would say this themselves, that there are very, very few individuals that presently work with the government of Saskatchewan that could do a comprehensive, economic impact study of a piece of legislation without spending literally hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Let me take an example of that, just an example, the new Education Act. The economic impact in the province of Saskatchewan of the new Education Act is monumental and I think everyone who is a responsible member of this Legislature agrees. It is monumental! The economic implications, think about it. I don't think the member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) has thought about it. I know that the members of the Treasury Benches have. Certainly they have. No responsible Cabinet minister would possibly sit around and design a bill that is 150 or 160 pages long, that deals with local government, that deal with the power of taxation, that deals with the powers of central government, that deals with the creation of education for children that are going to be coming on the economic stream in the future, can possibly ignore — thinking about at least — what economic impact is that bill going to have.

The member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) suggests that some kind of task force, in the provincial government, can prepare a comprehensive economic impact study of the impact of that legislation that is going to be meaningful either to the people of

Saskatchewan or to the members of the Opposition. That kind of preparation, in the first place, is going to cost many, many, many hundreds of thousands of dollars over and above what is being spent. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know how many members of the government benches, or the members of the Liberal Party today really have any understanding of economics or understand that economics is an art; economic studies are an art. For every economist, for every economist in Canada, Mr. Speaker, there is a different suggested solution. For every economist in Canada there is a different interpretation of the facts that are at the disposal of that economist. I think the Minister responsible for Sask Power, I think, he has undoubtedly in the course of his relationship with the Cabinet, been in contact with economists throughout Saskatchewan and, in fact, in Canada. I am sure he will find in discussion with those economists that they will come to different conclusions out of the same set of facts.

The study is not a science, Mr. Speaker, for example, as an example, the impact of unemployment statistics. The statistical data themselves may be faulty. As a result of the statistical data being faulty the conclusions that can be drawn by an economist examining those statistics with all of the other statistics calculation statistics and data, trend analysis and data - at his disposal will cause him to come to a different conclusion than another economist. For example, an economist in one publication, as an example, Newsweek, presents two economist reports every week, Samuelson and Freedman. They have the same set of facts at their disposal. They have the same set of statistics at their disposal, yet consistently week after week, after week, they come to diametrically opposite conclusions . . . Well, that may be so, but they are nevertheless economists of consider repute. For the province of Saskatchewan to obtain the services of such economists would be prohibitively expensive. The studies necessary would be prohibitively expensive. Yet the member for Regina South suggests that somehow that is going to save the people of Saskatchewan money. We can bring in these two economists to study the same set of data in our province and they would come to different conclusions. Which economic impact study would the member for Regina South suggest be presented to this Assembly? Which one? Freedman's, Samuelson or someone else?

The point is, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the kind of economic drivel being perpetrated on the people of Canada by the present Trudeau government. The solution to government expenses, the solution to high government costs, say the Liberals and, in fact, the members of the government side of the House, the solution is more government. Now, how in the name of goodness, can anyone suggest in this Assembly - the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) how can he possibly suggest that the solution to more government is more government. That the solution to high taxes is more taxes. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll tell that to my wife who is a Catholic, she will undoubtedly pass that along to the kids. I think that kind of politics went out 40 years go which is where you people are still living.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are with reference to this bill that the way it is presently worded by trying to bring into this Assembly or by trying to bring into the government the suggestion that more government and more costs — the Minister of Finance I notice is smiling about this — to bring in these economic impact studies. Who are the economists? Which economist will we have? Now then, Mr. Speaker, let's go on to the suggestions in this act about the economic impact statement. What constitutes an economic impact statement? Let's read the bill. 'The estimated initial and ongoing cost of the action contemplated.' Is there anyone in this Assembly or outside this Assembly who could possibly estimate with any degree of accuracy whatsoever the estimated initial — yes, and ongoing cost of unemployment insurance in Canada? The answer is,

No. It is impossible because there are too many economic factors that are involved. There are too many governments that are involved. There are too many individual business firms that are involved, too many. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that no one could possibly assess that kind of situation with any degree of accuracy.

The member for Regina South may suggest that what we should have is this: A bill is the solution, he says, to the increasing costs of government. All I have to do says the member for Regina South to get elected in a federal election campaign is to show deep and abiding concern about the increasing cost of government. Why? Because the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Regina are concerned about the increasing cost of government. He knows it is an issue, it is a big issue. Do you gain the support of the people of Saskatchewan because you say government costs are going up and all the press will report is that a bill was presented, to maybe come to grips with it? Never mind digging into whether it will work; never mind trying to find out, Mr. Speaker, if any of the comments made in the bill with any kind of depth at all will have any possible effect on the ever-burgeoning cost of government in the province of Saskatchewan. The answer is, yes we will. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina South knows that a federal election will be on us and he wants to take to the people a bill that he presented to prevent costs from going up and he is going to present to the people of this area the bill that he presented again to prevent the costs from going up by adding either nothing statements, nothing economic statements by people who can't possibly know or a tremendous increase in the cost of government to come anything near what is absolutely necessary to control the government spending.

Let's look at the second part, Mr. Speaker. 'An analysis of the various alternatives to achieve the same purpose at lowest cost.' Think about that. What kind of study and what kind of economist could we get in here to examine, and I quote: (an independent assessment he wants) 'An analysis of the various alternatives to achieve the same purpose at the lowest cost.' Now, the members of the Treasury Benches are supposed to examine this from their position as politicians. They are supposed to examine it as trustees of the public purse. We in the opposition are supposed to examine it as representatives of our constituents and as opposition to the government, but what the member for Regina South is suggesting is not only that we are supposed to examine it from our position of common sense, but, Mr. Speaker, what he wants to determine is that he can now make impact studies that will show an analysis of the various alternatives to achieve the same purpose at the lowest cost. So you are going to stick two or three economists, all of whom think differently, all of whom present their case differently, all of whom come to different conclusions, and you are going to put them out in the field and you are going to have them come up with three separate alternatives — various alternatives to achieve the same purpose at a lower cost. What is going to happen Mr. Speaker? The auditor who has already reported on it, the comptrollers who have already reported on it, the government members and the managers who have already reported on it, the Treasury Benches have already studied it in great depth — now he wants another study. The answer really, that the member for Regina South is looking for is this. He says that government costs are skyrocketing and what we need with this is another study! What we need is another examination — not an examination by anyone who is duly elected — Oh no, never! Never have someone at the local government level study and examine the potential — from the member for Regina South. Never, never let local government and local people examine the expenditures of government in any real and meaningful way. No, no — let's have another department — an Economic Impact Study Department to create economic impact statements for 150 bills a year presented by the government offices in the last three years. The cost of that

to the government of Saskatchewan would be staggering.

I recall the remarks last year, of the government members to this bill and what they said was that the cost would be excessive. That was all. Well, I say to the members, Mr. Speaker, and to the government Treasury Benches opposite, that that word 'excessive' is the understatement of the year — it is the understatement of the year. The cost of this kind of program would be literally staggering — it boggles the imagination if it is to be meaningful, and if it is not to be meaningful it will be like every other study that is done for the government of Saskatchewan by people, by organizations, by whatever means, that is not looked at; that is shelved, and there are literally hundreds of those and I have heard the member for Indian Head-Wolseley talk about them.

I have heard him talk about studies that were ordered and paid for and stuck up on the shelf and never used and what this bill means, in its essence, in the way it is, is that another study group would be added to the already overburdening cost of government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest for the benefit of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley especially and I am sorry that the member for Regina South isn't here, because the member for Regina South has included in his bill a query that is used by economists and that is used by accountants but which I'm awfully sorry is not really understood at all usually by lawyers . . . (interjection) . . . Well, I think that's perfectly all right. I've been talking about Bill 29 and the cost of it to the government.

We have attempted to show, Mr. Speaker, tonight — although we would have presented this at another occasion had the members to my right gone along with what is traditional practice and allowed the debate to be adjourned but, oh, no, we had to have the members have their little show of strength tonight which they've had and which is the last strength they'll show in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, they've shown their little strength tonight and now they are hearing what's wrong with this kind of bill and what's wrong with this kind of approach to government and what's wrong with the kind of approach to politics. Out of one side of your mouth comes a statement, we're for the little guy and local government, and from the other side of your mouth comes a bill that will increase the size of government by staggering proportions, if it is going to be meaningful. If it's not to be meaningful then it's a total and utter waste of money. If they can't get proper impact — I was going to talk to the member for Regina South, who is a lawyer and who doesn't quite understand the term, cost benefit. Now I want to explain something to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley so he would be able to try to understand this. In the study of economics there is no measuring device for the benefit side of that increase. There is no known measuring stick, no yardstick. Now I want to ask the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, who supports the member for Regina South in bringing forward this wonderful bill to improve the cost of government, how do you measure the benefit side of a cost benefit analysis?

Listen to this: 'A comparison of the cost benefit contained therein as opposed to circumstances where such action was not taken.' Now, in other words what the bill says is this, should we go ahead with it or not and they want an economist to examine whether or not it's a good idea for the people of Saskatchewan for a particular bill or whether it's a bad idea for the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a cost benefit analysis done on Bill 29, because, Mr. Speaker, the benefits are nil, are zero, but the cost is staggering. There is no measuring device of benefit for the information of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley. So because you can't measure it, you can't possibly gain an economic impact study — big words, wonderful words — economic impact statement of the cost benefit of a particular program. Now, you could

get a list or an examination of what are the benefits of a program, and what are the costs of a program. But, Mr. Speaker, for goodness sakes, surely that is the job of the members of this Legislature and the members of the opposition. Surely, if they want to estimate the costs — and we can differ on the estimated costs and do every day in estimates.

I know the members opposite have often said that the assessment or the estimate made by the member for Nipawin is wrong. Well, the estimate made by the members of the Treasury Benches are equally wrong as many times, maybe more so. The fact of the matter is that we, in opposition and the members on the government side, can make our best possible value judgment of what a particular program is going to cost, our best possible. They can get the possible advice they can from their officials, but you superimpose a piece of legislation that says that some economist must examine every single bill and prepare an economic impact statement for that bill, it is staggering to the imagination.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go on to item (d), that an economic impact statement shall include. It says: 'a conclusion, with respect to the economic impact on any persons affected by the action.'

Now, think about this for one minute. We have just had The Education Act introduced in Saskatchewan. The Education Act in Saskatchewan will affect every single citizen in our province. I think everyone will agree with that — 930,000 or whatever number you want to agree on this year, in terms of what the government suggests is our population. But it will have an effect on every single citizen and an economic effect at that and a serious economic effect. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, suggesting that any group or organization can come up with a conclusion - listen to this - 'a conclusion with respect to the economic impact on any persons affected by the action' on any person. That is 930,000 people. What is the economic impact on any person, on every single one of the 931,000 people in Saskatchewan? Now, Mr. Speaker, surely the member for Regina South is jesting. Surely he is jesting when he suggests that the introduction of this bill has attached to it any sincerity whatsoever. Surely he is jesting when he suggests . . . no, you can't do that . . . I don't want to do that. Mr. Speaker, every person in Saskatchewan would have to be studied in order to get a conclusion. Now, who is going to do the study? Remember again, you are going to have one, two, three or four — you are going to have Freedman or Samuelson, examining every person in Saskatchewan to determine the economic impact. The study itself, Mr. Speaker, would take up this entire Chamber. Now then, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be able as legislators to examine this economic impact study that is going to develop a conclusion with respect to the economic impact on any person. That is what it says, any persons affected by the action. Listen to this, including an analysis of persons who will bear the costs. Well, 400,000 people in the province of Saskatchewan who pay taxes approximately I guess, 250,000 of them pay income taxes. There are taxes of all kinds and descriptions. There are property taxes, the whole range myriad of taxes. But each and every bill, The Education Act, the act for The Economic Impact Statement, all of these acts, Mr. Speaker, would have to be examined according to this bill and they are going to have to develop an analysis of the economic impact on the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

What in the name of anything does the member for Regina South think that the Legislature is for, if not an examination of the economic impact on the taxpayers of Saskatchewan from a commonsense point of view? But no, Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina South would want to add more experts and have more bureaucrats. He

would want to have more civil servants examining this already over-burgeoning civil service that would cost the people of Saskatchewan more money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the kinds of solutions that might be applied to the ever-burgeoning costs of government? Let me give the member for Regina South a little bit of a suggestion as to the kinds of things that could save the people of Saskatchewan money in the operation of the government in Saskatchewan. Number one, the government of Saskatchewan could take seriously, the position of Provincial Auditor — that's in the first place — take it seriously. Give the Provincial Auditor enough staff and allow the Provincial Auditor the scope to examine in detail when he is doing his audit anyway, cost saving measures. Mr. Speaker, that quite simply, it is so simple for the member for Regina South. That is a suggestion that has too much common sense.

(inaudible interjection)

MR. COLLVER: — Are you going to do that? Mr. Speaker, . . . well, I . . . Pardon me?

MR. CAMERON: — Before you sit down, tell us how you are going to vote.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say this. In so far as this bill is concerned, of an economic impact statement to accompany government bills when introduced in the Legislature, we believe very strongly that this should be studied by the Standing Committee on Law Amendments. I have a great deal more . . .

MR. CAMERON: — (inaudible)

MR. COLLVER: — Well, that's a committee of the Legislature as the member for Regina South will well know.

Mr. Speaker, I have some more to say on this bill at a future session of the Legislature and therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: — Before accepting the Attorney General's motion to adjourn the House, I would ask the Assembly if they would permit me to go back in the agenda to Adjourned Debates, page 6. I have made an error and I wish to go back to item No. 11 on page 6.

The error is that the Attorney General rose to adjourn debate on that matter and the issues were moving along so fast that I didn't get my paper out and I find that the Attorney General already has an adjournment, therefore, I cannot accept his adjournment and it is out of order.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.