

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

May 15, 1978

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

QUESTIONS

Reported Political Involvement - Occupational Health

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, I would address my question to the Premier. In Saturday's paper a reported address by Dr. Clive Dennis, the former director of the occupational health branch of the provincial Department of Labour indicated that it was time for the Department of Labour to back away from political involvement, as it refers and relates to the department of occupational health.

I would ask you, Mr. Premier, whether or not you, in your capacity as head of the government, have started or commenced an investigation into what kind of political involvement Dr. Dennis was referring to and whether or not the department of occupational is in fact involved in the political arena in the province of Saskatchewan?

HON. A.E. MR. BLAKENEY (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, Dr. Dennis's comments are not new. I believe that he has made similar comments in the past. So far as I am aware, Dr. Dennis has not apprised us of the nature of the involvement which he labels as political. Accordingly, it is not possible for us to investigate what he has in mind. So far as we are aware, the occupational health branch of the Department of Labour is not involved in any activities which can fairly or reasonably be called political involvement.

If someone comes forward with some instances which could be the subject of appropriate investigation, we will certainly consider it but so far that has not happened.

MR. COLLVER:— A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that the kind of political involvement of the department through the occupational health branch of the Department of Labour by sending out questionnaires to various employees and employers across the province of Saskatchewan to find out which of the employees are the most popular employees in the particular business firm or organization, and which information is reported back to the Government of Saskatchewan, that a contact is made by the Department of Labour official with the occupational health branch and that information is in turn passed along to the political party in power in Saskatchewan?

SEDCO Loan - Fairview Developments Ltd.

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):— Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SEDCO. As I understand the situation, SEDCO loaned Fairview Developments Limited money on the strength of a mortgage with respect to the Golden Acres Motel and took as additional security certain personal guarantees. Can the minister tell me, in granting the mortgage, Fairview Development Limited waived the provisions of The Limitation of Civil Rights Act?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce):— Mr. Speaker, I don't quite get the question. If you don't mind, can you just rephrase that again for me please?

MR. CAMERON:— Under the provisions of The Limitations of the Civil Rights Act the taking of a final order on foreclosure extinguishes the debt. In the case of grants of money to corporations and grants by mortgages backed by them, they have the option to waive that section of The Limitations of the Civil Rights Act. If in fact in this situation they did not waive it, it would mean that the guarantors are now worthless because the debt would be extinguished. So my question to you is, whether in granting the mortgage to SEDCO Fairview Developments waived The Limitations of the Civil Rights Act.

MR. VICKAR:— Mr. Speaker, I think that would be a question I may have to check with my lawyer. May I take notice of that motion?

MR. CAMERON:— Yes, it taking notice of it, would you also confirm, if you find in fact that The Limitations of the Civil Rights Act provisions were not waived that the guarantors are now in effect off the hook but no further action can be taken because it was a final order for foreclosure?

MR. VICKAR:— Mr. Speaker, I will come forth with the answer for that question as well.

SWIG Program versus YES Program

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of Culture and Youth. You announced earlier a program of students working in government, the SWIG program, which I understand is a new program for this year. Mr. Minister, recognizing that we will probably have a record number of high school and university students unemployed this summer, can you tell this House why you did not go back to the original position of the YES program in which local governments could also make use of employing students under the YES program?

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services):— Mr. Speaker, I perhaps might advise the minister that it would have been useful for him, had he been in the House during the discussion of my department's estimates because we spent about an hour on this very subject. I will try to summarize the conversation by saying that the original program - it was not called the YES program then, I think it was called STEP. The one that the Liberals introduced was a program that was abused by a goodly number of people and was brought into disrepute with the Saskatchewan public. If we could think of a way of introducing such a program that would not be abused by so many people as could bring the whole program into disrepute we would introduce it. In fact we are working on it. But the whole program which was introduced by the Liberals was the subject of a great deal of abuse.

MR. BAILEY:— A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am not too sure that the minister understands my question. I do not particularly care for the inference that you have made against the private sector. What I am referring to is, that you have through the SWIG program employed students in government. Why have you denied local governments from also employing students as we did some three years ago?

MR. SHILLINGTON:— Well, I may not have understood the member's question properly. Local governments now can hire people under the YES program. They can hire them for recreation purposes. That is in fact the program we have now, hired by local governments or charitable institutions for recreational purposes. That is the program we have now. I guess I did not understand the member's question and I still do not

because that is what our present program allows.

MR. BAILEY:— Are we to assume, Mr. Minister, that local governments such as hospital boards, town councils, municipalities, school unit boards and so on, were abusing in the past the YES program, and due to the fact that there will be an emergency would you not consider it now, within the next six weeks, an appropriate measure for your government to take to re-establish its policy or to take a look at the policy we had in the past, not only to the recreational facilities but also to some work programs which local governments can provide. It seems to me, Mr. Minister (and I would like your comment on this), if it is all right for the government to employ university students in government, why is it that local governments can't employ students?

MR. SHILLINGTON:— Well, of course they can. That is the very point of it all. I did not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that hospitals and local governments would abuse the program and I don't really think the member for Rosetown thought I did. What I was suggesting was, the program which was in effect some time ago, was abused by the private sector and that is a matter of record - I think a matter admitted by everyone including those who worked on the program initially. Local governments and hospitals now can employ students; that is the whole point of the YES program, yes, for recreational purposes.

MR. A.N. MCMILLAN (Kindersley):— Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that if you were to take the \$1 million that you will be spending on the SWIG program to create 360 jobs and instead, apply that to the extension of the YES program to include private business without spending any additional money, you could create an additional 1,000 jobs to 2,000 jobs in Saskatchewan for young people?

MR. SHILLINGTON:— Mr. Speaker, the rules that the private sector run by and the rules the public sector run by are somewhat different and I suggest to the hon. member for Kindersley that if a significant number of people abuse a publicly funded program, that brings the whole program into disrepute and that is precisely the experience with the former program.

Buildall Construction

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):— A question to either the minister in charge of SGIO or the hon. Attorney General. I ask those ministers whether lawyers on behalf of any of the defendants in the Buildall case have filed appearances and indicated whether they are going to enter defences? I ask the minister whether he is aware that though there are fairly strict rules, namely that companies or individuals have 15 days in which to file an appearance and six days after that to file a defence, notwithstanding those strict rules, frequently cases are badly delayed. I ask the minister whether he intends to instruct his lawyers to ensure that the 21 day period is in fact complied with as it is intended to be complied with, under the law?

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs):— In answer to the hon. member's question, I believe the first question was, did I know of any of the lawyers acting for us being served. To my knowledge that has not happened and I will take into consideration the comments made during the latter part of the question.

MR. MERCHANT:— I ask the minister (and it may be that this is the kind of question that you would want to consult with the lawyers about), but will you give your commitment to the House over a matter of such importance, to ensure that the law is rigorously applied and that if appearances are not filed within the 15 day period, which will expire

this week, I believe and if the statements of defence are not filed within the six days that follow thereafter, your lawyer will be instructed to note for default and to take default judgment if things aren't handled as expeditiously as possible.

MR. WHELAN:— Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question we've obtained a lawyer to act for us who is thoroughly knowledgeable, who has an excellent reputation and we think that he will do exactly what he considers best. We have our complete trust in him.

MR. MERCHANT:— Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. With respect that doesn't really answer the question. Because I say to the minister, that he may want to consult with the Attorney General, but you'll find that lawyers have a little club going and they give each other vast amounts of time so that one lawyer doesn't embarrass another. The rules of court are very clear and provide specific lengths of time. I ask the minister whether you will not instruct your lawyer to deal with the rules of court in the way that they are intended to be dealt with and in the way they are laid down by the justices of the Court of Queen's Bench which set those rigorous time limits?

MR. WHELAN:— Keeping in mind, Mr. Speaker, the intricate difficulties and the type of case it is, I can assure the hon. member that we will work as fast and instruct our lawyer to work as fast as he can.

Farm Recording Service

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to direct a question with regard to a new policy through your Department of Agriculture to be handled by the regional extension services branch regarding the farm recording service. Now, Mr. Minister, I see by the policy that your government, your department, stated unequivocally that they are not in any way responsible for the accuracy of any recording or any reports provided to a client under this program. Now, at the same time, I see by the report that we have that farm clients must agree to, for instance, 'Give the regions Farm Management Specialists Act access to accounting records the year-end proof of services rendered.' Now, Mr. Minister, do you not believe that such a program, if it's going to work, is going to require responsibility both on behalf of the recorder handled by your department and the client?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):— No, Mr. Speaker, I think not. We are setting up this program in an attempt to get more farmers involved in keeping accurate records on the farm. We are attempting to try to get people who could, either as part time or full time work, undertake to do record keeping for farmers. At the same time we can't guarantee the kinds of people who will undertake this kind of work. They are going to be given instruction in general methods of farm accounting but at the same time it would be very unwise for us to attempt to guarantee that the work they do is accurate work. The client would have to have some confidence in the recorder that the work was being done properly or else he would have to question that recorder. We couldn't, any more than any other accountant that you might hire, guarantee that the work that he turns out is accurate.

MR. BIRKBECK:— Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I just find that there are two things bothering me about it. It seems to me that the whole policy and the service that you are supposedly going to provide for the farmers is more of an information gathering service for your benefit than it is for their benefit. I can understand, Mr. Minister, why

your department would want to renege on its responsibilities in being responsible to this policy, being as it seems so ironic that you should be advising or questioning . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— Order! What is the question?

MR. BIRKBECK:— Very simply, Mr. Speaker, the question is, Mr. Minister, would you not agree that it seems rather hypocritical that your government would be taking on yourselves to advise farmers how to manage their books and their accounting when this government can't and has run three deficit Budgets in a row?

MR. KAEDING:— Mr. Speaker, what are we attempting to do is provide a capacity at the rural level for farmers to set up a bookkeeping service, which will be satisfactory to them. We are not proposing that these people have to be qualified accountants to do that kind of work. We are suggesting that this kind of work can be handled by anyone who has a fair bit of training in book work. We are hoping that after a few years time, after the farmers have had some experience with these fellows, that they will be able to do their own bookkeeping and hoping that that will be the outcome of that program. We think that would be a very desirable outlook.

We certainly do not require that the information, which these recorders pick up, should be turned into the department. There is no requirement for that at all.

Saskatchewan Checkoff Board

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon):— A question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the Saskatchewan Checkoff Board, which is an appointed body, has seen fit to fund the beef information centres, both provincially and nationally which activities fall well within the guidelines of what the checkoff was set off for, will the minister reconsider his decision that he made to cut this funding that was given by this board, by 75 per cent?

MR. KAEDING:— Mr. Speaker, I have not given any direction that they be cut off of funding. I simply suggested that because we were looking at amendments to the act, that we wanted to provide an opportunity for a new board, if a new board was to be appointed, for a new board to be able to look at all of the expenditures under that act, or out of that fund, and so that they would have an opportunity to go through these and determine which one of those they thought should be funded. I never said, at any time, that that was one activity which would be knocked out. I certainly haven't made that commitment.

MR. ANDERSON:— A supplementary. I am sure the minister realizes that the beef information centre does a lot of work at the various fairs - Yorkton, Regina, Weyburn, Agribition, that this budget has to be set on the spring basis. Your decision in cutting back this by 75 per cent you have assured that none of the beef information work that has been done for the last four years will be done at any of the fairs in the province this summer.

In view of this, will the minister reconsider his decision and let the new board make its mind up?

MR. KAEDING:— Mr. Speaker, it was not brought to my attention that this was creating a problem. If it is creating a problem I should be hearing about it from the proper people

and we will see what decision to make on it.

Cable Regina

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— A question to the minister responsible for Sask Tel. I understand that there is a problem with the cable hookups in that those people with condominiums or row housing or multi-unit residential housing are not getting cable hooked up because of an internal dispute between Sask Tel, and in one case at least, Cable Regina wherein the cable companies want to hook up the units internally, Sask Tel is insisting on hooking up each individual unit themselves contrary to CRTC policy. Now would you kindly advise when you are going to resolve this dispute that is leaving all people with condominiums or multi-unit residential places without cable and without access to cable?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment):— Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the question.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— . . . Further take notice, Mr. Minister, that this dispute has been going on for some, I believe, two to three months. In that time areas of at least the city of Regina, that have had the cable hooked up, those residents of condominiums or multi-unit residential projects have been deprived of cable television whether it be your network or the conventional cable. This problem has existed for some three months without any resolution of the problem by particularly Sask Tel.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of that question. But just to advise the hon. member, there is not a common situation with respect to the wiring required for cable and CPN. There are some apartments and condominiums that were wired by the owners for one type of service. There are other cases where apartments or condominiums are not wired at all. The hon. member is making a very general and sweeping charge assuming that the situation is identical for all apartments and condominiums in the city of Regina which is simply not the case. Therefore, in order that we can provide an adequate answer for the wide range of possible situations in the general question that he has asked, we would like to take notice so that we can perhaps apprise him in a complete manner of some of the very complex technical problems that are involved. It has nothing to do with any jurisdictional problems that may be around.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order. Final supplementary from the member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

MR. C.P. MACDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):— A few weeks ago the Attorney General gave every assurance to the House that anybody taking Cable Regina wouldn't need a filter to filter out CPN. All my friends have Cable Regina and are enjoying the benefits of CPN. Could the minister tell me whether or not if you have Cable Regina you need a filter to filter out CPN . . .

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

Lanigan Potash Mine

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):— Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of Sask Potash Corporation. The minister announced enthusiastically today that he was shutting down the Lanigan mine for so-called refurbishment. I ask the

minister why, when the changes that are designed to improve the mine in the 1980's, you would choose to shut down now when there is such a massive demand for the product and stop producing and stop serving your customer at a time when it is very difficult to get the product?

HON. E. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):— Mr. Speaker, we will continue to produce and serve our customers from our other mines. As the member may not know, the potash industry traditionally shuts down in July for refurbishment. This is simply starting a little earlier on June 1, and using employees there to bring the mine back to the condition that it should be in.

MR. MERCHANT:— A supplementary, is it not the case that the mine is ordinarily shut down for two weeks and will now be shut down for about eight weeks?

MR. COWLEY:— Well, Mr. Speaker, the mines are traditionally shut down in the province from three to four weeks. The period with respect to Lanigan will be longer.

Advertising Expenditure - 'Warm-up Saskatchewan'

MR. BAILEY:— Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Mr. Minister, when you announced the program which is now being called 'Warm-up Saskatchewan', there was a fear that a great deal of advertising would be done to promote that particular program. Could the minister tell me what funds are available under that particular insulation program for government advertising of the program?

MR. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):— I can't be specific in the exact dollars that are going to be expended but there was careful consideration given to the level of advertising that we felt would be required in order to convey to the populace of Saskatchewan, the benefit of the program. I can take notice of the specific amount and certainly convey that figure to the member, perhaps later today or tomorrow.

MR. BAILEY:— A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister, in doing so, also reassure the House against the fear that the opposition has that a big portion of the money that is being spent would be in advertising, so I ask you this question, do you feel that it is necessary to carry half-page advertisements in the weeklies advertising a program when money will be going into advertising and less into the insulation?

MR. MESSER:— Mr. Speaker, I do believe that a certain level of advertising is required. Otherwise I think the program would certainly be deficient in carrying out its intention because people simply won't be aware of the program. I, as minister responsible, Mr. Speaker, have talked to people who have not yet heard about the program, so that certainly undertakes to convey to this Legislative Assembly that there are people in Saskatchewan who do not know of the program. I think that the advertising is in fact, required.

I can assure the member, Mr. Speaker, that the level of advertising vis a vis the moneys expended in the program will be very, very modest by comparison.

Filing of Orders for Returns to Opposition

MR. MACDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader. I wonder if the minister could tell me whether or not it is the intention of the government

to file with the members of the opposition, some 20 papers, orders for return? I would like to point out that during the 1976-77 session, according to my figures, the government neglected to file 11 returns. During the 1977-78 session, they neglected to file 24 returns and during the current session, they are now 20 behind, for according to my figures, a total of 55.

I was always under the impression, and would the minister not agree that it is your responsibility to file these orders for return? It seems that anything that is embarrassing, the NDP government has a talent for burying and not filing those returns. Can the minister give us this assurance, that by the end of the week you will file those returns?

MR. COWLEY:— Mr. Speaker, I have been filing returns as they come to me from the departments. I will certainly undertake this afternoon to check where they all are and undertake to provide as many as possible to the opposition. I have filed, as far as I am aware, every return that has come into my office that has been compiled. Some of them involve all of the departments, all of the Crown agencies and they take a great deal of time to compile and put together and to check out. But certainly I will try to have them all filed as frankly, from my point of view as being the administrator of filing these things as well as frankly, from a purely political point of view, I would like to have them all filed by the end of this session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. MACDONALD:— Final supplementary. Would the minister when he is doing that check, go back to 1976 and 1977 and see if my statistics are right. I know it takes a long time but three years, don't you think, is a little over-indulgent?

MR. COWLEY:— I think, Mr. Speaker, if there are any here from the 1976-77 session, they would undoubtedly have been passed late in the 1976-77 session, which would be about one year ago, not three years.

Coronach Shut Down

MR. ANDERSON:— Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SPC. In view of the fact that there is a shutdown at Coronach because the construction workers can't drive up the 2.5 miles of gravel road, is the minister making any effort to approach his colleague, the minister in charge of municipal roads, to see if something could be done so the project won't be stopped completely?

MR. MESSER:— I can assure, Mr. Speaker, the member that everything is being done to see that the Coronach project is not in any way delayed.

MR. ANDERSON:— Supplementary. In view of the fact that they have information pickets out that the other unions are honouring, I find it quite facetious for the minister to say that there is no hold back or hold up on the job. Is the minister going to make some effort to either compensate for driving down the road or try to get the road fixed so that there isn't a complete hold up?

MR. MESSER:— Well, Mr. Speaker, I said that everything was being done. I did not say that there was not any interruption or potential interruption in regard to the activity carried on at Coronach. It is a very recent problem, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think that as of Monday afternoon, we should have all of those problems resolved. They may not last

for very long and I am hopeful that there will not be a serious interruption with the activity at the Coronach power project.

MR. ANDERSON:— A final supplementary. Would the minister give me his opinion. With a strike of this sort, which cannot be really the fault of SPC, would it be considered a legal strike, in view of the fact that you yourself are not in charge of the roads?

MR. MESSER:— Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that we have had strikes in certain sectors of the industry which bring about some interference to other sectors of the industry and I am sure that we are going to be able to work out this problem, if it is a significant one, as we have in the past, Mr. Speaker.

Coal Mine Stripping

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):— Mr. Speaker. Question to the minister in charge of SPC. Mr. Minister, the private sector that is mining the coal in the Boundary dam area is performing stripping operations, delivering the coal, selling the coal to SPC under \$3 a ton. It is my understanding that this is costing SPC better than \$3 a ton just to uncover the coal. Would you make a comment on that?

MR. MESSER:— Well, Mr. Speaker, I can take the query that the member makes under advisement. I might want to say though that SPC is just undertaking to establish a mining operation. I do not, therefore, think that it would be unreasonable to see, for a number of years until they acquire the necessary facilities, the training, the expertise, that is required, that the cost might be somewhat higher. I, in no way concede to the figures that the member conveys to this House.

Statement re Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):— Mr. Speaker, as minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, I would like to inform the legislature that the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, today, exercised its right of first refusal to obtain the Inexco share of the Key Lake joint venture and that the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation has, in turn, resold this interest to Eldorado Nuclear Limited, a federal Crown corporation.

Eldorado Nuclear Limited has purchased the entire Inexco interest from Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation and assumes all liabilities in connection therewith. Under the agreement with Eldorado Nuclear, Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation retains the right to repurchase from Eldorado at a later date up to one-half of the Inexco interest, or a further one-sixth in the total joint venture.

The founding members of the Key Lake joint venture were SMDC, Inexco and Uraniers Exploration and Mining Limited of Saskatoon. Each of the three parties held a one-third interest under the joint venture arrangement. Each of the three parties has a right of first refusal when any other member desires to dispose of its interest in the joint venture.

In late March of this year Inexco and Denison Mines Limited of Toronto announced an agreement whereby Denison would purchase the Inexco interest for a \$158.5 million US. The Inexco interest includes in addition to the interest in Key Lake joint venture, certain other undeveloped mining properties in northern Saskatchewan and Alberta.

May 15, 1978

This action on the part of SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) in no way, Mr. Speaker, prejudices the outcome of the Bayda Inquiry, but rather allows the government and our Crown corporation, SMDC, to keep our options open at no cost or no risk to SMDC during the period in which we shall be considering the recommendations of the Bayda inquiry.

We chose to exercise our right of first refusal at this, before the report of the Bayda inquiry, because the time period in which we had to exercise our right, as set out in the joint venture agreement, was rapidly coming to a close.

SMDC and Eldorado Nuclear have for some time, Mr. Speaker, been jointly seeking to arrange a purchase of the Inexco interest conditional upon a decision to proceed with uranium development in Saskatchewan being made. The fact that the report of the Bayda inquiry will not be received and considered prior to the expiration of the first refusal period, dictates this course of action where by the entire Inexco interest is purchased by SMDC and resold to Eldorado Nuclear.

The arrangement with Eldorado has been entered into in and recognition of the fact that since the joint venture is two-thirds foreign owned, federal law will require some or all of the interest of the foreign partners to be transferred to Canadian owners if the project goes into production. According to federal law, Eldorado Nuclear is an eligible Canadian owner.

MR. COLLVER:— Before the minister takes his seat I wonder if he would answer a question on this rather important statement, because he has not provided us with a copy of this statement in any way, shape or form, to examine it and he has gone through a number of various transactions that are going to occur. Would he permit a question before I respond to his statement? Would that be possible.

MR. MESSER:— I will circulate copies, but I don't believe it is within the rules of the House to answer a question.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order.

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, I think it, therefore is - Mr. Speaker, I was still on my feet when you called order.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order! We're talking about two orders of business. The member was asking if he may ask the minister a question. I said no.

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, I was responding to the ministerial statement. I will do so now.

MR. SPEAKER:— The member for Wascana gets the first opportunity to respond to the ministerial statement.

AN HON. MEMBER:— . . . been asleep.

MR. MERCHANT:— What do you mean asleep, I've been standing for the last minute. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can sleep standing.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that the minister is making what he might have thought was

simply an announcement of some factual situation, even himself knew that he had to begin the defence against what he could anticipate would come regarding the Bayda inquiry. I say, Mr. Speaker, that for the minister to suggest to this House that 158.5 million American dollars, almost \$175 million Canadian is being committed by Eldorado Nuclear, that that is being done without some guarantees from the minister about what he thinks will happen with Bayda and without some guarantees from the minister that they will, in fact, ignore Bayda if the Bayda inquiry comes against them. He really says to members of this House that you think we are unbelievably gullible and that you can suck in the people of the public. Mr. Speaker, the minister told this House not long ago that the time to exercise the option did not begin to run until Bayda brought in its decision and now the minister says that this is so urgent that they have to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that it makes good sense to proceed in this manner, to allow Eldorado to move in but we assume from what the minister said today and from what the minister said in an off moment, I gather, at a press club meeting some time ago, that it is the intention of the government to ignore Bayda. I say to this House that the minister is making a mockery of the Bayda inquiry and the mockery of the way the government is dealing with the whole uranium matter.

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see that the member for Regina Wascana has such a depth of knowledge that without the document in front of him he could discern the juxtaposition of one-third interest here, there and everywhere, that the minister was talking about today in his press statement. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not possible for anyone to make comments on something as complicated as this matter prior to the = to make a judgment on such a thing as complicated as this one. It indicates again why the Government of Saskatchewan is involving itself in these private sector business involvements and is merely going against totally the basic principles of good economic sense. The fact is that we, as legislators, in trying to come to grips with this kind of thing just quite simply can't do so and the member for Regina Wascana quite clearly showed that in some detail today. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that all of these complicated business transactions between the federal government and the provincial government, juggling of interest one with the other and ignoring the Bayda inquiry, is quite simply, Mr. Speaker, without any sort of economic foundation. At such time as we feel we've examined the minister's statement and we have examined what is being proposed - all of the so-called laughter across the way won't change anything - at such point in time as we examine this in some detail and depth, at that time we will make some response.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Introduction of New Page

MR. SPEAKER:— Before the orders of the day, I beg to inform the Assembly that Helen Turanich, who has just left the room, will be a page during the present session.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. A.N. MCMILLAN (Kindersley):— Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, you had your verbal running shoes on today and slipped quite unnoticed passed me on introductions. I would like to, with leave of the House, introduce some students.

From the Stewart Valley School on behalf of the member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) these are 24 grade seven and eight students, accompanied by Mr. Larry Pool and Mrs.

May 15, 1978

Frances Moen. They are here to tour the building and to take in the proceedings this afternoon. I hope all members join with me on behalf of the member for Morse in welcoming them. I would like to say I will be meeting with this a little later to answer any questions that they might have about the proceedings that they have seen here.

HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:— The fact that the member for Kindersley is a late starter should not be interpreted as the Speaker wanting to overlook important guests from Morse.

SECOND READINGS

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue) moved second reading of Bill No. 27 - **An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, just a few brief remarks with respect to this particular bill in second reading. The bill actually amends The Education and Health Tax Act to provide legislative sanction to those portions of tax changes which occurred in the budget presented by my colleague, Mr. Smishek, the Minister of Finance on March 8, last.

One of the specific changes provides for exemption from education and health tax for all individual sales of 25 cents or less. While this change may not seem too significant because there are a few taxable items left to retail at that value, the change should reduce the workload of those businesses which sell small single items. This tax decrease is retroactive, of course, to March 8 last. This bill also provides a rebate of one half of the education and health tax paid by a person who purchases a mobile home for residential purposes. The mobile home tax rebate will provide assistance to families who want to purchase homes in that medium price range. This rebate program is also retroactive to midnight on budget day.

The major tax change contemplated by this bill is the increase in the education and health tax on beer, wine and spirits from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. As in the case of the tax rate increase on tobacco recently passed by this House, this government makes no apology for increasing taxes on liquor. As I have mentioned before, liquor and tobacco cannot be considered to be necessities of life. Both of these items are injurious to health and thus contribute to escalating cost of providing medical care to our citizens. The misuse of alcohol is a major factor in highway accidents and is responsible for absenteeism which creates very large losses in all sectors of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the government does not pretend that tax increases on liquor and tobacco will lead to massive shifts away from the consumption of these products. But we do hope that some people will moderate their consumption as a result of increased cost. We make no apology for choosing these particular areas to increase the revenues of the province.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, section 5 of the bill is designed to bring Saskatchewan law into line with other taxing jurisdictions by requiring payment of taxes in dispute prior to judicial hearing with a full refund, including accumulated interest, if any appeal is upheld by the courts. This provision simply prevents the use of appeal procedures to inordinately delay the payment of taxes officially owed to the province. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving second reading of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, (No, the Assembly is not ready for the question) the point on a number of issues made by the Minister of Revenue in his introduction of this rather, or seemingly side bill that is just cleaning up House business, there are several points in this that need to have further study and debate, one of which certainly is the removing of the right of appeal of an organization for taxes assessed by a government. (That is what the minister just responded.) We want a chance to have our legal advisors check into that particular provision and make sure, if the tax is inappropriately levied by the Government of Saskatchewan, that no business organization loses its right of appeal. I have a great deal more to say on this and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Byers that **Bill No. 54 - An Act to amend The Liquor Act** be now read a second time.

MR. C.P. MACDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):— Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a very few minutes - unfortunately, the Leader of the Liberal Party is not feeling well and he has brought up several very important points in relation to The Liquor Act. Therefore, today I just want to make a few comments, then move an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the one great problem with this particular amendment to The Liquor Act, of course, is that it zeros in specifically on one group of people in the province of Saskatchewan - I refer to the conventional cable television operators. It is designed originally with one intent in mind, and that is, to make darn sure that the cable television operator does not have an opportunity to use liquor advertising in his thing. I don't think any of us really object to the idea of not having liquor advertising on cable television, except that there is a great technical difficulty. Of course the cable television operators have tried to project this and put it forth before the government, have asked for some consideration and leniency in this regard and they have been ignored.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the cities of Weyburn and Estevan have had cable television for many, many years. This was not a problem in those two urban centres in Saskatchewan. I am not sure if the rise, all of a sudden, of the battle between conventional cable in Saskatchewan and CPN, the offspring or what we could call the illegitimate child of the NDP, has in fact generated this particular amendment to The Liquor Act. Mr. Speaker, therefore I really want to say that if the Government of Saskatchewan is really sincere about prohibiting liquor advertising, I think we should have a look at all liquor advertising. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to move this amendment:

That all words after 'Liquor Act' be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

Be not now read a second time but that the subject matter be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers and

May 15, 1978

that the committee consider methods by which all advertising of beer, wine and spirits by print, radio or TV be prohibited within the province of Saskatchewan and that such prohibition include advertising by agencies or departments of the Government of Saskatchewan as to the availability of beer, wine and spirits within the province.

Mr. Speaker, I so move, seconded by the member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan).

I hope everybody will take a very serious look at this one. I am sure that all of us realize the technical difficulty with the conventional cable operators is a difficult one. I think they would be most happy to comply with the regulations of the government if it could be done in a reasonable way. I think also that there are other . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— Order. The member has moved a motion.

MR. MACDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say any more about it. I think the amendment is self-explanatory . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— Order. The member has concluded his remarks by moving the motion.

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, I think we need to see what is going on here. I think, while we certainly do not object in any way to the hon. member suggesting that there be other ways to limit liquor advertising and that these might well be considered, I think the substance of what he is saying ought to be carefully kept in mind by all hon. members.

The issue before the House is whether or not we should attempt to prohibit anyone making use of any electronical device or equipment within the province for relaying, publishing or distributing any advertisement or form of advertisement concerning liquor. In my view, the answer should be yes. In the view of the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) it should be no, since he wishes to ask this House not to real this bill a second time but that some study be conducted. Certainly no one objects to a study being conducted but the issue is what happens in the meantime. Certainly we can conduct a study as to whether or not there are ways to further limit liquor advertising but the facts are fairly clear. With respect to conventional radio and conventional television there has not been liquor advertising and the issue is whether or not that rule, which has applied to conventional radio and conventional television for years, should apply to cable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— It seems to me the answer is yes. It seems to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, and I take it his party, that the answer is no and that cable television should be somehow treated differently than conventional radio and conventional television; that somehow to make them adhere to the same rules, which have been adhered to by conventional radio and conventional television is unfair. To delete the advertisements which have been deleted in conventional television for years, unsuccessfully, to require this to be done on cable television is somehow unfair.

I say that he is wrong. I say that the cable television operators should live by the same rules that the conventional television operators and the conventional radio operators have lived with for years.

I say that rule is reasonable and fair and that the suggestion that we ought not now to pass this, is a suggestion that we, once again, give to the cable operators a benefit, a preference, a preferred treatment, which is not enjoyed by anyone else in this province, at least, as far as the province of Saskatchewan can legislate. I think it ought not to be given. I know of no reason why this special preference should be given.

Since that is my position I will be opposing the amendment. I will, most assuredly, be opposing the amendment because I believe this should be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that other people will want to study this amendment to see its full implications and, accordingly, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney that **Bill No. 46 - An Act to establish a Heritage Fund for Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about The Heritage Act which is before this House. I may say that it gives me pride to speak in this debate on behalf of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

We have always used money from our non-renewable resources to help pay for current expenses such as health care, education, highways and revenue sharing. The money for this purpose has always been unpredictable, however. This new fund will provide a degree of stability so that from year to year we will be able to predict what amount of revenue from non-renewable resources will be available for current expenses.

This bill will also greatly strengthen legislative control over revenue from non-renewable resources. It will require that the Legislative Assembly approve the budget for the expenditures and for the long-term investment. We have, from time to time, in the last year or two, heard members object, saying that the money from the Energy and Resource Development Fund was being spent and that the legislature didn't have an opportunity to debate the expenditure. It will give some merit to that. In order to meet that objection we are legislating to provide that under the Heritage Fund there will be an opportunity for the legislature to determine the use of that money.

Most important of all, Mr. Speaker, the Heritage Fund will make sure that future generations of Saskatchewan citizens, at a time when our non-renewable resources will have been depleted or at least partly depleted, will still be able to enjoy benefits from the revenue we have collected.

This bill is an act of faith by which we keep faith with generations of Saskatchewan people who are yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is a fortunate province. We have substantial reserves of oil and natural gas; we have some of the richest uranium in the world. Clearly, we do not know what yield this will give to us in economic terms, because we do not know the future development, the future pattern for development of uranium, but that the uranium is in the ground is now established. We have a supply of high grade potash, which will last for hundreds of years. We are fortunate also, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in having a government which is committed to the people of this province, committed to

May 15, 1978

the principle that the benefits accruing from these rich resources, belong in no small part to the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— As we all know, Mr. Speaker, when the world price of oil started escalating rapidly in the autumn of 1973, mainly as a result of decisions by major oil companies and by oil exporting countries, certain decisions were required to be made.

Canada is also an oil exporting country and it is only logical that we should obtain the same price for our oil in the export market that other countries obtain for their oil on the export market. It seems reasonable. I am sure we all agree with what I have said, but where we disagree is in the disposition of the extra money, this major increase which came about. We have seen a very large part of that money being taken off by federal export taxes. We have seen provinces attempt to get part of that windfall profit, not only the province of Saskatchewan, but also the province of Alberta and the province of British Columbia. But we know, Mr. Speaker, where the money would have gone had members opposite sat on the Treasury benches. Because they have made clear what they would have done each of them in debates previously in this House has said what they would have done had they been on the Treasury benches when the international price of oil went up. We passed Bill 42. The Liberal Party is very clear that we should not have passed Bill 42 and we should not have passed any similar legislation, but we should have allowed the regular royalties to apply.

The Conservative Party is equally clear. They have said we should have enacted a royalty structure such as that which exists in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to have a table . . .

MR. COLLVER:— Where is the table?

MR. BLAKENEY:— I have a table which indicates what was received between January 1, 1974 and March 31, 1978 under a New Democratic government, from our oil revenue except those in bonus bids. The details of this are set out here. I have estimated what would have been received under the Progressive Conservative policy of applying Alberta royalties. I have estimated what the receipts would have been under the Liberal policy of applying regular royalties. The figures, Mr. Speaker, are this. Under the New Democratic Party up to March 31st, 1978 we received \$779 million; estimated receipts under the Progressive Conservative policy \$338 million; estimated receipts under the Liberal policy \$233 million. A loss under the Progressive Conservative policy of \$440 million and a loss under the Liberal policy of \$545 million.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative estimate is based upon an application of the Alberta system to Saskatchewan as advocated by PC policy. If the Alberta system provided for drilling incentives similar to Saskatchewan a further \$64 million would have been lost and, accordingly, when I state that they would have received under their Conservative policy \$338 million, I may well be overstating it by the extent of \$64 million. There is, I think, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that their policy is one of give-away. It is that policy which would have meant that we would not be debating The Heritage Fund Act, there would have been no money for a heritage fund at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan citizens would not have control over their own destiny . . .

MR. COLLVER:— . . . afraid to table it?

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, may I table the table I just read from. Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite are suggesting that they need copies of that. I will try to see that before we rise at 5:00 o'clock all hon. members will have a copy of it. I believe that they should have had that information whether in that form or not before this, since it is a policy which they are most assuredly urging upon the people of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan people would not have had control over what the oil companies did with this extra money. Sometimes members opposite argue that this money should have flowed to the oil companies and then it would have been invested in development and in this way there would have been a great deal of economic activity. I say to them that they have no way of seeing that this money goes into the ground in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— They have no way of seeing that, if invested in developed at all, it is not development in Indonesia or not development in the North Sea or not development in the Arctic Islands. Desirable as that may be it does not create any economic activity in Saskatchewan. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when we have provided as we have more than \$64 million in drilling and incentive credits, it was provided on the basis of that money being spent in Saskatchewan and it has been spent in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— The fruits of that policy are now being clear to see. Recently in an oil sale we received in bonus bids more than \$12 million, far and away the largest sum of money ever received in this province in bonus bids. Far and away the largest sum; nothing like it in the years from 1964 to 1971; nothing like it! The previous high was in 1976 - 1977 now when we got about \$7 or \$8 million; the previous high in that was in 1976 when we got about \$5.6 million; and in the 25 years prior to 1976 when we have been receiving bonus bids only once have we exceeded \$4 million. I say in 25 years only once exceeding \$4 million and that was in 1957 and now we have more than \$12.5 million last week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— All this, Mr. Speaker, amid the comments that somehow the oil industry is leaving this province. Well, they are leaving a lot of money in the course of their travels.

I noted that the Kindersley Clarion is carrying stories indicating that drilling in the Kindersley area is likely to be more vigorous than for many, many years in this year of 1978. I compliment the Kindersley Clarion for giving a few of the facts. I recommend to the member for Kindersley that he relay some of those facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, if they had their way this money would not be flowing into a heritage fund; we wouldn't even be talking about a heritage fund. It would have

been flowing into the coffers of the multinational corporations. Or most of it would have been flowing across the border into the United States because, as they well know, more than 95 per cent of the oil industry of this province is owned outside this country; perhaps not of this province but of Canada is owned outside this country. I would say this, that the more money that flows out under policies advocated by members opposite the more difficulty we have with our balance of payments and the more the Canadian dollar is put under pressure and the more the Canadian economy suffers.

Mr. Speaker, our position, the position of the New Democratic Party is clear and consistent. We have always believed that the people of Saskatchewan should be the major beneficiaries of any increase in the world price of oil. We faced a great deal of opposition and much of it encouraged by members opposite. Our legislation has been challenged in the courts. The federal government has consistently opposed our attempts to exercise the right over our resources that were granted us in 1930. Despite these obstacles, Mr. Speaker, despite the determined opposition of the Liberal and Conservative parties and the Liberal government in Ottawa, we are determined to see that the people of Saskatchewan get a fair return for those resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, that is the story of our oil revenues. It is a story we have heard many times before but it well worthwhile repeating because it is a story unique in Canadian history. It is a story that has not happened where members of the Liberal Party have been in power and where members of the Conservative Party have been in power. The principle is the same in our treatment of all other non-renewable resources, though the specific circumstances differ in each case. Our objective is always to permit the private sector to earn a reasonable profit on its investment for risk taking. And before hon. members say that the oil industry hasn't made a reasonable profit, I would like them to look at some of the statements of companies which have major holdings in Saskatchewan. I do not know what their profit in Saskatchewan is. I happened to pick up the operating statement of the annual report of Pan Canadian the other day and I looked at their record. I know that they have extensive holdings in Saskatchewan and I noted that they, in the last three or four years, have increased their profits per share and their profits as a company, by more than four times - more than 400 per cent.

MR. COLLVER:— Nonsense!

MR. BLAKENEY:— The hon. member says this is nonsense. I have got a few tidy shares in Pan Canadian; I have been watching their progress and I tell you, it's the truth and I'll . . .

MR. COLLVER:— I have a few shares . . .

MR. BLAKENEY:— Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has some shares in the holding company that owns a majority in Pan Canadian. My holdings are very, very modest, very minor. All I know is that this company has increased its profits four times.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member of the opposition is raising the issue of whether this is before tax or after tax and I am saying to this House that over the last five or six years, I can't remember the precise period, the after-tax profit of Pan Canadian has gone up over four times.

Mr. Speaker, our revenue from oil totalled in 1973-74, the first year when the price started going up, about \$45 million. Some of that was in the last three months when we began to pick up a little bit of the royalty surcharge. In 1978-79 the figure was not \$45 million but approximately \$350 million. That is an increase of 670 per cent and a large part of that, Mr. Speaker, is money which would not have come into the coffers of Saskatchewan, had either the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party been the government of the day. It means that we in this province can do things which we wouldn't otherwise have been able to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we don't use all of that money for current revenue or current expenses. It would have been nice for us to be able to do it. We could have introduced this money into the Consolidated Fund and we never would have had a deficit of any kind. Our projected deficit this year would not be \$44 million but rather, our surplus would be \$70 or \$75 million. Alternative - we could have made even more generous tax cuts than we made. But, Mr. Speaker, neither alternative would have been truly responsible.

It would have been politically expedient in the short run and what government doesn't like to cut taxes? It is always tempting to come in with big tax cuts but if we are to be responsible, we have to face two facts about oil revenues. The first is that the money will not continue at the present rates forever. There is only a certain amount of conventional oil available to us. Certainly we will produce significant amounts of heavy oil but there is no suggestion that the profit margin in heavy oil is anything like the profit margin in conventional oil on percentage terms, and accordingly, the windfall profits will not be there to the same extent. If we grow to depend upon this windfall money from conventional oil and use it for current expenses and all of it for current expenses, we will find some years down the road when the oil money begins to diminish, that we will face major increases in taxes or major cut backs in government services. We think in fairness to the next generation, 10 or 15 years from now, we ought not to do that.

This money is not just a lucky jackpot for this generation, it all has been there for tens of millions of years and it doesn't all belong to us in the 1970s; some of it belongs to the people who are going to come here in the year 2030. We have an obligation to invest in such a way that future generations will enjoy some of that benefit. Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Resource Development Fund was created in 1974 in order to do just that, to allow us to set aside a major part of the increased oil revenues for the benefit of those future generations. A large part of the money used was used to buy equity in the potash industry; we provided money for Saskoil. I am not sure all that technically came out of the Energy and Resource Development Fund but that money allowed us to invest in Saskoil, allowed us to provide drilling and incentive credits. It allowed us to invest in potash. It allowed us to invest in development of hard rock minerals in northern Saskatchewan. I think that future generations will be grateful to us for having taken that step. Money from the fund has allowed us to do all of those things.

This fund we are discussing today, the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund, extends the principle we applied to oil, through the Energy and Resource Development Fund to all non-renewable resource revenue. Money from potash, uranium, oil, sodium sulphate, other non-renewable resources will be funnelled into the Heritage Fund. The Heritage Fund will be repositorial of this non-renewable resource revenue; then we will pay it out, pay it out broadly speaking in four ways.

A Heritage Fund dividend will be paid each year to the Consolidated Fund to help

finance the ongoing programs of government - universities, schools, hospitals, highway programs, all the rest. We will not identify what service it is to pay for; it will be voted for the Consolidated Fund. The dividend will be restricted, i.e., the bill prohibits us from moving all of the money, all of any year's earnings of the Heritage Fund over into the Consolidated Fund. In this way our operating expenses will not expand beyond a level which we hope any government will be able to maintain. So there will be money moving out for current expenses.

Secondly, the moneys will be used to provide exploration incentive, grants and loans for the development, the use and the conservation of our energy resources and our other mineral resources. So the fund, therefore, will be able to spend money in order to encourage production and to encourage conservation so that we will have further funds either in the short run if it encourages production or in the longer run if it encourages conservation.

Thirdly, the fund will be used to pay for capital expenditures which have a lasting economic and social value but which may not earn a return on their investment in a strict sense. A highway does not earn a return on its investment in a strict sense, in the sense that we can calculate it. But we know it earns money for us. There are similar economic and social benefits which we believe can be financed out of this fund. This year, as you will note in the estimates, we are providing about \$15 million for that type of investment.

Finally, the fund will be used for long term investments which will yield a financial return, investments such as the kind I talked about in the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation or potash or as the case may be. Loan investments will be made to Crown corporations and equity investments will be made in Crown corporations. Thus, we will have long term investments which will be equity and which will not bear a fixed rate of return and we will have loan money from the Heritage Fund which will bear a fixed rate of return. For example, we will, it is anticipated provide in this year, a loan to the Potash corporation to help finance its expansion. That would bear a fixed rate of return. There are other investments which as I say are in the nature of equity investments.

In essence, these equity and loan investments will convert all revenue which we believe are with us for only 10, 15 or 20 years, in large amounts; convert them into an investment which will yield not for 10, 15 or 20 years, but with luck, for 50 or 100 or 200 years. Investments in potash, for example, will yield returns for, we predict, at least 100 years. Other investments in mineral development will generate an ever increasing cash flow.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth category - the investments made by the Heritage Fund in capital assets which will produce in the future, is a very key in essence of this Heritage Fund bill. Because of statutory limits and ordinary management prudence, the amount of money which will be drawn off from the heritage Fund for non-investment purposes, will have a limit.

This will mean that year after year, and every year, the Heritage Fund will grow. And year after year, and every year, Saskatchewan people can look to that fund and say, yes, it will continue to earn for me and my children and my children's children.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— That, I think, is why we call it a Heritage Fund. In time the revenue from investments may exceed royalties and other taxes accruing to the fund.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, we can expect oil revenues, currently the largest single source of revenue from non-renewable resources, to decline in the decades to come, but the Heritage Fund will have invested some of this oil revenue and assets which will yield continuing returns. In this way we will have preserved for future generations a good portion of the income generating capacity of today's oil. We can truthfully say that the economic benefits from our oil resources will continue in perpetuity, long after the resources themselves have been depleted. We will have preserved a heritage for our future generations.

Mr. Speaker, the Heritage Fund is at the heart of the policy of our government. It puts principle before short-term political considerations, but I say that without sacrificing the present, it makes a commitment to the future. More importantly, it secures for the people of Saskatchewan, now and in the future, the rewards from their resources.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this bill will meet with the support of all members on this side of the House. I suspect it will be opposed by members opposite, who still believe, notwithstanding what they say, that it is immoral for governments to collect resource revenues, those revenues belong to the resource companies.

Mr. Speaker, the lines are drawn. We disagree with them. We agree with the idea that we should take these resources into the public domain; we agree that they should be set aside for future generations. That is why we have set up the Heritage Fund. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER:— Oh, I hear we are going to start out in talking about policy and we are going to hear the magic words again from the members opposite, even before I start to speak. So we will look forward to their magic words of, what about Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba? Those are the three magic words used. Then there is Management Associates, Buildall and Switzerland. Those are the other three. So we will wait for those six magic words to be fired across, as quickly as possible, during the course of my speech.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it would have surprised me more if the Premier had said he wasn't going to support a fund which he is going to control the destinies of all the people of the province of Saskatchewan ad infinitum, forever. The fact is that the Heritage Fund in the province of Saskatchewan is no more really than a change in name. It is merely a change of name from a fund that nobody could get any information on before, that we chose to buy a potash mine but nobody could find out how much was in it or how much was going in it. The reporting on the fund was a minimum of 18 months behind to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker. No one on this side of the House could find out anything about the greedy fund into which the so-called oil revenues went.

Now the point is, with reference to the Heritage Fund, it is not preserving a heritage of natural resources for the people in the province of Saskatchewan. It is going to preserve our heritage of slavery, enslavement to the Premier of Saskatchewan. That's what this government wants. But I say to the government opposite, I say to all the members over there who have supported for the last seven years the increase in power

May 15, 1978

of the Treasury benches, the increase in power of the Saskatchewan Premier and I ask you to ask yourselves one question only, just one. Would you accept in that chair with that power, Dick Collver? Because that's the question you have to ask yourself. Would you accept in that chair, with that power, Si Halyk? Cy MacDonald, I'm sorry, a slip of the tongue, Cy MacDonald.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:— A little Freudian there.

MR. COLLVER:— Well, there is a lot of Freudian in all of us, Al. Some of the Freudian, in you, for example, and Freud had a great saying or a great expression when he was introducing psychology to the modern world and he said that people had a tendency to be schizophrenic. That was Freud's introduction to the modern world psychology and boy, I can tell you this presentation that you have made today in presenting so-called Conservative policy and so-called Liberal policy - give me back that piece of paper whoever took it, it was sitting right here - so-called Liberal policy and so-called Conservative policy to this Assembly is schizophrenic, two-faced, on the first one.

First of all, I'm going to make a few comments on this statement that the Premier promised to table six months ago and has been afraid to table ever since. The point is, he says that from the period January 1st, 1974 to March 31st, 1978, the Government of Saskatchewan has collected \$779,130,364 under its oil revenue policy, under its oil revenue policy. Under that revenue that was collected did the Premier talk about or mention the fact that they lost during that same period of time millions and millions of dollars in income taxes and in corporate income taxes that they would have collected in that same period? The answer is no; he didn't bother mentioning it. He didn't adjust his figures to allow for income taxes. Secondly, what about the interest that is presently before the Supreme Court? He didn't deduct that off the \$779 million that the Premier knows he is going to have to repay. He knows that. Then, did he deduct the legal fees for the court cases that he embroiled the people of Saskatchewan in with reference to his oil policy? The answer is no. Did he include in a deduction from his oil revenues the reduced income taxes that the government of the province of Saskatchewan has received on payrolls of oil industry that have pulled out of Saskatchewan and moved into other jurisdictions that are more rational and more reasonable in their approach. Furthermore, the Premier attempts in this so-called document that he has tabled to spell out with is PC policy. Now I am not going to bother to say what Liberal policy is because they, I'm sure, can speak for themselves. We, however, are going to speak to the Premier about what Progressive Conservative policy is, not what he would imagine it to be from this document - and I know that we are going to see NDP ads in the next election campaign. You can see it all now: Oil revenue received under NDP government, estimated under PC policy. Of course he has not bothered to say where he found this PC policy. He has not bothered to say it, oh no! Where did he find the PC policy, Mr. Premier? Is it in the policy brochure? No it is not. We have tabled, Mr. Speaker, on three occasions in this legislature, a booklet which is the Progressive Conservative policy of Saskatchewan.

MR. ROMANOW:— You have not tabled it.

MR. COLLVER:— Oh yes we have! Oh yes we have. We have tabled it. We have tabled it. Was it three times or twice? . . . Twice, sorry. We have tabled, twice in this legislature, our policy booklet.

It is unfortunate that the Premier cannot read or refuses to read what the policy is.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, even with what the Premier says is the PC policy, which is as was announced at the time of the introduction of the oil legislation last fall, the oil-mineral income tax legislation which was collecting the NDP's goofs on Bill No. 42 - when they introduced that act we said that if the Premier of Saskatchewan had introduced legislation instead of Bill No. 42, similar to . . . check Hansard. Mr. Premier, see if you can say 'exactly like'. Similar to . . .

MR. BLAKENEY:— Oh.

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, he says oh. He says oh, but I suggest that the Premier who holds himself out to be Mr. Smooth, who holds himself out to be Mr. Clean, who every time something rotten happens in this House happens to find himself in Vancouver or Ottawa or Toronto or the Bahamas - whom does he leave the message up to, Mr. Speaker, but the member, his desk mate, poor old Attorney General desk mate, same old thing. For example, here is this Mr. Smooth, Mr. Nice Guy sort of father figure whose responsibility is the electoral office in Saskatchewan and here he is. He hands over the introduction of the amendments, for his own responsibility, to the Attorney General. Why? Why would he do that? He is responsible for the Chief Electoral Officer. He is responsible for elections in Saskatchewan but does he run them? Oh, he might possibly have some bad publicity then. Well he is going to get some bad publicity over this one because he is trying to hold himself out to the people of Saskatchewan as being truthful and he is not in reference to this document.

We are pleased that he has finally tabled this document because, Mr. Speaker, we did not know the exact number . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Now that they are finished with their magic words I suppose we can go back to discussing the issue.

We did not know, Mr. Speaker, that the oil collection revenues were \$779 million. That, we had to wait for the Premier to tell us. But now that he has told us, I tell him that he can calculate that we have in fact sent our documents over to the province of Alberta. We have asked them to present to us what the revenue would have been in Saskatchewan under a similar kind of program but allowing for the lower Saskatchewan production from one to 15 barrels, a similar kind of program . . . Oh, says the Premier. That is exactly what we said last fall and I tell the Premier right now exactly what we would have collected, knowing now that it is \$779 million, we have been informed by our experts that under our policy of adopting legislation similar to the province of Alberta, we would receive 91.3 per cent of whatever oil revenues were received in Saskatchewan; 91.3! Now, Mr. Speaker, that allows for an adjustment off of the \$779 million of some \$71.1 million. We admit that if the Government of Saskatchewan had introduced legislation back in 1974 instead of Bill 42, but legislation similar to that of the province of Alberta with the same kind of constitutional base, with the same kind of constitutional expertise that the Alberta government adopted in adopting that legislation; we admit that over the course of those years, the people of Saskatchewan under that tax would receive some \$71 million less. That's my guess, we agree with that - under the mineral tax alone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the Premier what extra the people of the province of Saskatchewan would have had if the Premier and the government members opposite, instead of developing confiscatory legislation, had adopted the policy, a similar kind of policy to that of Alberta, to try and work out with the industry the best possible level of taxation given the increase in revenues.

May 15, 1978

Here is what they would have had. First of all the oil industry in Saskatchewan would have continued to search for oil. Instead of dropping down significantly in terms of looking for oil, it would have continued on or gone up because we are energy short. The Premier knows that and everyone else knows that. Increased activity in the oil sector, in the private sector, that is what he would have had. \$71.1 million less on the one side in revenues under the mineral tax but many, many millions more in payrolls, in workers, in organizations that continue to pay tax in Saskatchewan.

What else could we have had without it? We might have had new development in the private sector. Because, Mr. Speaker, what happened with Bill 42 and the confiscatory policies of the NDP, what happened was that they turned off the climate of confidence that should have been in the private sector as a result of all those resources that Saskatchewan has. There is the Minister of Industry and Commerce up there and he knows that if he wants to be an investor in the private sector that there has got to be a confidence in that investor to want to invest. If the investor believes that a government is going to act in a confiscatory manner, in an autocratic manner, as did the Government of Saskatchewan, the NDP, under that Premier, then the private investment sector is going to dry up. It is not only going to dry up, Mr. Speaker, in the oil industry, it is going to dry up in every other potential industry of Saskatchewan, every other one in Saskatchewan.

What else could we have had if we didn't have this NDP policy of attempting to attack organizations and legitimate organizations and people in our community.

MR. CAMERON:— You supported Bill 47.

MR. COLLVER:— Well, the member for Regina South suggests that we supported Bill 47. That was merely a correction bill of Bill 42. The point is that at that point in time the mistake had been made by the previous government. The trouble is that the mistakes made by the government that my friend to the right is attempting to join, in terms of oil policy for Canada and the export tax, he will know full well what they tried to do to our country and to our oil industry. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that what we could have had, as a result, was a calm situation as it related to investment in other industry; we could have had new investment in the oil industry, as did the province of Alberta. And we could have had today, Mr. Speaker, more than one rig which is what we have drilling for oil in Saskatchewan today, as compared to the hundreds in Alberta . . . Well, that may be so. I sat in here during the debate, as a matter of fact, with the Minister of Industry who admitted there was only one rig in Saskatchewan, the minister responsible for Sask Power.

We have the same kind of situation, Mr. Speaker, with reference to this policy whereby the Government of Saskatchewan sits on capped wells on the western border of Saskatchewan, while it is paying two and three times as much as they could get out of those capped gas wells, to the Government of Alberta and the oil industry in Alberta, for gas to be used by Sask Power. That is the kind of nonsense that the Premier is attempting to foist on the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to read this document into the record. This is from the Premier of Saskatchewan.

The money received under the NDP does not include more than \$64 million collected and paid out as drilling credits. (This may or may not be true.)

The PC estimate is based on an application of the Alberta system to Saskatchewan (and I quote) as advocated by PC policy.

Mr. Speaker, if the Premier wanted to be known as a truthful fellow, if the Premier wants to be known as true along the province, I challenge him to state where that is in PC policy and I challenge him to find in Hansard, any place in Hansard, where I or any member of my party suggested that this is our policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier thinks he can get away with this. He thinks that the big lie is reasonable, that this big propaganda machine can go out and print this document - oh, he will have it in every newspaper - PC policy. Maybe the press will be fairer than that and maybe they will come to you and say, show us where that is PC policy. Please do! We are waiting, Mr. Speaker, for this to be accepted. I challenge either the Attorney General or the Premier, but most especially the Premier, who has brought this into the House, to indicate where this is PC policy. Whether it is in our statement of policy, whether it is in a statement that I made, I wait for it with eager enthusiasm.

Now, let's talk about the Heritage Fund and what it is for. The Heritage Fund is nothing more than a collection of revenues that are going to be decided on by the Premier as to what goes into this fund and what doesn't. A collection of revenues that the Government of Saskatchewan is going to try to say, somehow in its report to the people, that the total amount received from Saskatchewan Crown corporations, the government's nationalized industries, is going to somehow be profitable.

The Heritage Fund will be nothing more than a juxtaposition of the books. The Heritage Fund, I predict, will be nothing more than an attempt by the NDP government to hide the truth from the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

I know that the Premier is going to say, or the Attorney General when he gets up on his feet, he is going to say, haven't they got a Heritage Fund in Alberta? And isn't the Heritage Fund in Alberta under the total domination and control of the Alberta cabinet as compared to this Heritage Fund which is going to have some input from the legislature? I say, Mr. Speaker, that those comments will be correct.

The fact is that there is a Heritage Fund in Alberta and the fact is that the Alberta cabinet does directly control the Heritage Fund with receipts of over \$1 billion a year.

The member for Lloydminster (Mr. Kwasnica) says shame and I add my shame to that, absolutely! To control that kind of money that the Alberta government is doing from the cabinet down means that freedom of individuals and freedom of action in the province of Alberta must diminish over the next and coming years, must diminish. It is a no better idea in the province of Alberta than it is in the province of Saskatchewan. The only difference between the Government of Alberta and the Government of Saskatchewan in this area is this. The Government of Alberta, as Alberta, does not have a tradition over the last seven years of producing phoney-baloney information in its budget, proven last year, proven!

MR. SMISHEK:— Where?

MR. COLLVER:— Well, the Minister of Finance says where. We all remember the press report. He will remember what was stated in the press and all his bribery accusations.

May 15, 1978

He did not get around it. He did not get around it and he had to finally admit that his budget speech was wrong.

In every single department of government, in every single Crown corporation, we find what? First of all, juggling of year-ends, from this year-end to that year-end, taking 18 months so that touchy areas skip over the one-year period so that we cannot investigate them until next year and will be 18 months behind. We raised that in the legislature already.

Suggestions, for example, Mr. Speaker, by many employees of the Crown corporations, which we have raised before in this Assembly on many, many occasions, and suggestions by the Provincial Auditor and his staff that the Government of Saskatchewan does not have a handle on expenditures of the government and does not have a handle on any of the organizations of government. Suggestions today, suggestions that there is political involvement of the Department of Labour through the occupational health department, political involvement. The Premier refused to answer that question. Political involvement! Refused to answer that - a department of government accused by its former director of political involvement and the Premier says he cannot even answer that question.

It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that no one in Saskatchewan is going to believe that. No one is going to believe that, Mr. Speaker. \$71 million less in oil taxes yes; half a billion less in borrowings for potash mines, yes; another billion in borrowings for Sask Power and Sask Tel less, yes - few separate deficit budgets, Mr. Speaker. Would we have those? No, no.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that this government's fiscal and financial mismanagement of the affairs of the people of Saskatchewan . . . and now we are going to get more of the magic words . . . and we did, from that wonderful member that no one's ashamed of, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes).

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the people of the province of Saskatchewan are sick to death of government control in their day to day lives. They are sick to death of the power of the Premier of Saskatchewan. It is too bad that the members opposite do not really believe in the people of the province or do not really believe that they should have a say or, Mr. Speaker, they would accept our suggestion with reference to the potash mines and with reference to Saskoil, and turn them into a company which every voter owns, directly and votes for the board of directors themselves, directly. That is what we have suggested, Mr. Speaker. We have suggested that these people, these individuals, every vote in the province, is entitled to a direct share in these organizations.

What the Premier is suggesting with the Heritage Fund is to create more shares in the hands of the cabinet - direction in the hands of the cabinet. What we have suggested is to broaden the base and give them to the voters and let the voters vote directly for the directors, not you appoint them. Then we will see - that's going to be the issue in the coming years; that's going to be the issue in the next election. Are you prepared to put your money where your mouth is? The answer is no. Are you prepared to give up some of this difficultly acquired power? The answer is no. Are you prepared to go along with real distribution of power amongst the people? The answer is no.

Oh, of course, sure. We'll give away 30 per cent; we'll give away 40 per cent - we want control, says the Premier. In every single act, in every single bill - we want control. No dispersion of power. Direct control by the Premier of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we refuse to accept this kind of direction and control by the Premier.

I've got a great deal more to say on this and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member takes his seat, will he permit a question?

MR. COLLVER:— No.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow, that **Bill No. 70 - An Act to amend The Election Act, 1971** be now read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW:— We believe that legislation along the lines of Alberta, after negotiations . . . (inaudible) . . . the vast majority . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— Order!

MR. COLLVER:— Well, along the lines - I'm glad you quoted that. Quote another one.

MR. SPEAKER:— Is the member for Nipawin through on Bill 70?

MR. COLLVER:— Not a bit. I want to talk about The Election Act and the Attorney General was just electioneering. I thought you would permit that. He was trying to electioneer and I wanted to talk about The Election Act.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order! The member for Nipawin has an obligation to proceed with Bill No. 70. The Attorney General has no obligation here at this time.

MR. COLLVER:— That's right.

MR. SPEAKER:— Now, the member for Nipawin should proceed or be out of order.

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, I'm making a few comments about The Election Act in the province that are going to ensue as a result of the amendments that have been directed by the Government of Saskatchewan. I would just like to make one comment first of all.

One section is now going to take the instructions off the great big sheets that are going to appear in the voting stations and throughout the polling stations in Saskatchewan and they are going to put them on a little ballot about that size and they are going to print the instructions on the ballot. Now, this is one of the suggestions in this Election Act. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the line-ups that are going to occur at the polling stations with every person trying to read these instructions written on the ballot in very fine print? Everybody is going to say, I'm not going to put my name on there until I read it and they are all going to walk from there to the voting station, from there to the voting booth and try to read these new instructions that are on the ballot, specifically designed by the Attorney General to confuse the issue.

Now, I mentioned earlier and I notice that the Premier has now run out of here because

he doesn't want to talk about The Election Act. It is his responsibility. It's his department. Normally, the person responsible for the Chief Electoral Office would introduce amendments to The Election Act. Why isn't that happening here today? Why didn't it happen here the other day? Why didn't the Premier introduce the changes to The Election Act? Well the question quite simply answered is this. He didn't want to tie himself with any of these changes or any of these suggested changes. Because even though his employee, his direct employee, the Chief Electoral Officer, is going to be responsible under the new act for the administration of this Election Act, the Premier wouldn't want to introduce the act and the changes because then it might seem to the people of Saskatchewan that the Premier somehow is not there. Not reasonable, not super smooth, not Mr. Nice Guy.

Let's talk about some of these amendments that have been introduced in this new act. Supposedly, the Attorney General said in his discussions, we are now going to introduce an independent audit. Independent audit. This is designed to ensure that any of the problems that might have happened out in Pelly don't occur again. Did the Premier or the Attorney General approach the Institute of Chartered Accountants for the province of Saskatchewan and ask for their opinion as to whether or not an audit of the parties could be performed under the aegis of the act? The answer is no. Did the Attorney General have that suggestion before he introduced the bill? The answer is yes. Did he go to any accountant in Saskatchewan and ask any accountant in Saskatchewan whether or not any accountant could comply with this act and give a certificate to the party? The answer is no. He went to a group of lawyers. They designed a legal act that has nothing to do with accounting; that has nothing to do with presentation of figures. Yet come the next election time there is going to have to be independent accountants brought in according to this act. They are going to have to examine the expenditures of political parties.

This act, Mr. Speaker, first of all, as an example, spells out in terms of expenses and I would like to suggest this to you throughout the act, expenses are referred to cash, cash. So if I go in, so if the Attorney General, cash expenses, if the Attorney General has gone out in the previous election or four elections that he has been in and has purchased 5,000 signs and he has these in an inventory, the Attorney General gets to use those signs at no cost required to be recorded under the act. If the person who is running against the Attorney General, who is new to the field, tries to get signs, anything that they spend in cash is required to be recorded under the act. Was the Attorney General alerted to this problem; was the Attorney General informed that it would be better to have an accrual statement which is the only kind of statement that any auditor can possibly audit fully and give what they call a clear certificate to. The only kind of statement that is possible to give a clear, clean certificate to is an accrual statement. That means you determine how much inventory you have; that means you determine how much cash you have on hand; that means you determine what your accounts payable are, what your accounts receivable are, both at the beginning and at the end. And if you have that kind of a statement, Mr. Speaker, then the amount that is expended in between those two dates is a meaningful number. It is a meaningful number and applies correctly to what, in fact, was spent.

Unfortunately the Attorney General refused to accept that. He wanted to introduce an act by his lawyers that was 'cash money', 'cash money'. How did they get that information? Well, they got it from the federal Election Act which is identically at fault for the same reason. The federal Election Act that's where they got that information. They were going to tighten up on expenditures and they were going to say, well, we will just copy, we won't take any time and even though the Attorney General brings it to me

for my comments, and even though we look at it and we comment and we say, look, if you bring it in for an accrual statement it will be able to be audited; it will really be clean; everybody will be cleaned by the act and it will be a meaningful statement presented. And the Attorney General said no, after consideration he is convinced that the system set out in the amendment is the most effective way to control the election expenses. No report from the accountants; no report from the auditors even though it was suggested.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also suggest that there are a couple of other minor areas in the bill. The major areas that we are concerned about . . . the major one, is the fact that the Attorney General or the Government of Saskatchewan, I say the Premier, has decided not really to come to grips with election expenses in Saskatchewan. Let's leave the biggest possible loopholes you can. I am going to spell out a loophole for the benefit of the Attorney General . . . Yes, it is covered off in the assets, he says. I don't happen to agree with him and neither do our legal advisors. According to our legal advisors it is not covered off.

Here is a nice little game that is played. The Liberal Party has a bunch of land, let's say. I don't know whether they have or haven't. I have been told that they have. That is beside the point. I don't know that. They have a bunch of ground, a bunch of dirt owned by the Liberal Party. Do they have to record the donations? Yes, they do, under this bill. But comes the next election and let's say they have this land that was purchased in previous years, let's say. Now we are going to sell it off or better yet we are going to mortgage it. We will borrow against it. Does that have to be recorded under this act? No, sir, it does not. Was the Attorney General alerted to that problem? Well, according to our advice . . . that is what I am told. But why, and I am also informed that this is true, why would this happen now? Why would the act be brought in for debate now, prior to . . .

MR. ROMANOW:— We always do . . .

MR. COLLVER:— Yes, you are the one who sets the order of business. Maybe you should introduce the bills right to start with before you introduce bills like this that are designed specifically to develop debate.

MR. ROMANOW:— No fun.

MR. COLLVER:— Yes, no fun, isn't that right and waste the people of Saskatchewan's money.

Mr. Speaker, the only other item I would like to mention is this. I noticed that throughout the earlier debate we still heard the magic words from the members opposite. So when I presented the facts to the Attorney General about the new bill having the first name or the Christian name first and the surname last, I would like to read his reply. I just want to mention this reply so that they will know how they answer on the other side. Here it is:

The way the amended bill is drafted, the surname will appear last on the ballot.

Now we were concerned about that because two people named Pete, running for an election would have Pete and Pete in the same place on the ballot and it might be confusing and we felt that the last name or surname should be first and the Christian name last.

That is what he thought. And this is the rest of the answer:

A quick survey shows that Alberta, Nova Scotia, Ontario and perhaps other provinces have the surname last on the ballot. The present Saskatchewan ballot has the surname last and I should also point out that the surname will appear in block capital letters.

Now, when it serves their purpose, they say the words Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba, terrible, awful places. When it serves their purpose to spell out why their way is better, Alberta, Nova Scotia and Ontario are very positive things. The other comments I would like to make - the banding together of committees, we don't think that the section on the metro area is tight enough and it is going to cause some confusion in some rural areas.

We do intend to move two or three minor amendments to this bill, Mr. Speaker. But the major ones are the major loopholes that occur in the bill as a result of the Attorney General's insistence on a cash basis rather than an accrual basis and the way that the Government of Saskatchewan, primarily, can juggle the numbers to suit their convenience by the use of this cash statement. Therefore, this bill has not answered the real problems raised in the Pelly by-election.

MR. MACDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, that is a hard act to follow. I couldn't understand it myself, but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak too long. I think it best that this bill be dealt with in Committee of the Whole. But there are two or three very important fundamental areas that should be mentioned in second reading.

I'm going to start with what I think is by far the most important. If you propose an act and the act is incapable or the responsibility for abiding by the act is not possible by the people whom the onus is put on, then certainly that has got to be a bad piece of legislation. And what I'm referring to is number one, the 203AA where under the rules, the advertising of a registered political party is limited to \$50,000 in the aggregate to a year. I want to say you might call that a particular section put in, it might have been directed to certain individuals or the kind of going on that certain individuals may have taken the liberty.

Let me give you an example. Suppose the NDP Party nominates 10 candidates and those 10 candidates decide that they are going to put on an advertising program in Saskatchewan. They go ahead and go to their newspapers; they go to their local television station in Prince Albert; they go to their local radio station in Yorkton; they go to their local radio station in Swift Current. There is not any law in the Dominion of Canada that states they have to report that they are a registered political party. In other words, a candidate for the NDP in Prince Albert does not have to come and tell the NDP Party, provincial party that he is going to spend \$3,000 on advertising. All of a sudden those 10 candidates spend an average of \$3,000; that's \$30,000. But in the meantime, the provincial executive of the NDP Party has decided to balance out according to this act, the advertising for the year in a budget. So, in the Commonwealth, on the radio and on television and in the newspaper, they balance out \$50,000 for the year. But all of a sudden, now according to this act, they have spent \$80,000. And the NDP Party has absolutely no control over the candidate. In Yorkton, for example, my two colleagues here have been investing money in what they considered was an advertising program prior to the writ in the federal election because

Mr. Benjamin, for example, on behalf of Mr. Cameron has a secretary; he has free phone calls; he has free mailouts; he has had that for four years. In order to get voter identification, in order to try to catch up with him, they have gone out and their supporters have raised money to spend. But I want to tell you something, the national party, the Liberal Party in Canada has no control of how much they spend. They don't know any. They have no moral obligation to report it. The national Liberal Party of Canada has no moral obligation to find out. I'm just telling you, Mr. Minister, that is impossible to abide by. Once again we are going to have exactly the same situation as Pelly. We are going to have political parties in contravention of the act and they will not even have any knowledge of it. And I want to repeat, you say in here that in the aggregate a provincial party cannot spend more than \$50,000 in a year on advertising. Go and ask my friend from Quill Lakes. He's a liar. What legal responsibility for example does any NDP candidate have to report it to the provincial executive. Let's take another example. Supposing 50 candidates, and the Conservative Party now has over 50 candidates, decide to spend \$1,000 a year and that is only maybe advertising their political meetings, a couple of ads in the newspaper relating to their annual meeting, maybe a small radio program, \$1,000 worth of advertising in this day and age is literally nothing. It has nothing to do with the provincial executive, nothing to do with the provincial party and all of a sudden then, if the provincial party goes out and spends \$4,000 or \$5,000 on their own advertising program, the NDP Party is in contravention of this act, and once again the political party is in real serious trouble, as an example, Pelly.

I would like to suggest to the minister that I hope he would have a legitimate explanation for the reason for 203(AA) and he can please try to explain to us how a provincial political party can control an independent candidate, they can tell him how they can control an independent constituency. For example, in my own constituency I have eight to ten independent associations. I have local Liberal organizations in Indian Head, in Wolseley, in Grenfell. I have absolutely no knowledge of whether or not they are going to advertise in the Grenfell Sun for a public meeting. I have no idea what they are going to do on an advertising program. I don't control them and certainly neither does Ted Malone or the president of the Liberal Party.

So once again I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, I expect the Attorney General will get on his feet and explain, because what he is doing now, is creating a situation and an atmosphere that could come up and end up exactly like Pelly. I think that is very bad.

I want to say to the Leader of the Conservative Party who said, I heard that those Liberals had some land. You know, that's the kind of innuendo that I particularly don't like.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— What innuendo? If you don't have land you can deny it.

MR. MACDONALD:— No. We do have some land. We happen to have a building on the land. We have a little piece of property in the city of Regina and I think the NDP has a little piece of property in the city of Regina for provincial headquarters, and if you don't, that's unfortunate. That's unfortunate. But when you say they own some land, you suggest that it is in a real estate kind of a proposition and I suggest to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland with his yap, yap, yap the way he always does when he starts talking about that, I am suggesting to him that it is none of the business of the Leader of the Conservative Party about the land. All you need to do is put into that act that any time for election expenses you must declare revenues for loans or mortgages or anything else, but you don't have to come and pry into our business and that's the second thing.

The second part of the act that I think is a little difficult. What are the assets, the cash, the bonds, the securities, the totality of the resources of a political party in Saskatchewan? For example, what is the NDP going to do with Service Printers? Are you going to have someone come in and evaluate the machinery and the equipment and the building and the assets? Are you going to turn around and in every local constituency going to send in a report on the assets? Why don't you merely put in the law that, as far as revenues are concerned, they will include all revenues, statement of cash to being with, because I think when you start off with an act you have to have a statement of cash. But to turn around and try and do the land and the value and so forth, it's just impossible. I think and I would hope the Attorney General would come up with an explanation in that regard. I would hope that you would limit it to the actual cash or bonds or whatever it may be that a political party has. To try to figure out the value of land, every desk, every chair and everything else, I think is impractical.

The third major weakness that I am going to bring up to the Attorney General and certainly we are going to bring this up in third reading, that is this one once again, where this act does not have to consider, as revenue, services provided by individuals. Of course, what we are doing is we are once again, generating a Pelly all over again. Where executive assistants and special assistants can go up and take a month and let's just take ten special executive assistants, go to Pelly. I would say that the average that each executive assistant is making in salary is \$1,500 per month. All right, all of a sudden you take ten of them and if you count their services that is \$15,000 of expenses. The federal Election Expenses Act demands that services be reported. This one clearly eliminates the services of individuals. I suggest that is a legitimate expense, for example, if a trade union wants to come in here and send in five or ten organizers from across the country and the trade union pays them as their contribution to the NDP; then they come and zero in on a provincial election campaign and because the union itself has decided that that is their method of contribution the NDP doesn't have to report it. I say that they should because that is a legitimate expense. If you don't, what it does is really saying we are giving the advantage to the government. I asked the minister in charge of public service how many executive assistants there were in the government and how many special assistants. We have been taking bets on this side of the House; some of us say it will be 60 when the list comes over, some say it will be 80. I don't know what it will be but I know when the Liberals were the government we had five executive assistants . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right; maybe they didn't. Is that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes)? The last time I remember when we got talking about election expenses, you made some kind of a stupid accusation from the seat of your trousers and we had a very unpleasant situation in the House . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You know, Mr. Minister, you are another one of those. You sit there and all you want is a piece of election machinery to be put in, an Election Expenses Act to perpetuate your own existence. That's all you want, Mr. Minister. That is the major weakness in this act, the fact that this particular act refuses to count services and when you don't count services you are giving a deliberate advantage to the government, a deliberately designed advantage to the government and of course it makes it very, very unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to repeat those three general comments that I made. Number one, I wish the Attorney General when he gets up to finish third reading will address himself to the problem of the \$50,000 advertising in aggregate and the responsibility in relation to individual candidates to report that. Number two, the reporting of the totality of the assets or the value of a political party and how you determine that and how any provincial party can determine that. Number three, the failure to count

services of individuals as revenue in an election campaign. If you do that then I think we can get into a very interesting discussion in third reading. There are many small minor points in this act that I think should be discussed and I am sure we can bring in several amendments that perhaps will improve the understanding of the act, the application of the act, because I think most people are generally supporting the principle of this particular act, if we can get it so that it once again meets the approval of everyone. I regret very much again, that the Attorney General has taken it on his shoulders and the government's shoulders to draw The Election Expenses Act on their own without the input of . . .

MR. ROMANOW:— I offered to give you . . .

MR. MACDONALD:— You offered to give us - what you did, you offered to give us a copy of the finished product and as the member for Nipawin said, you never responded to one suggestion. You offered to give us that act when it was finished in its completion. Then what did you want to do? You wanted to tie our hands . . . you say, but I gave you the opportunity to speak to it - no, Mr. Minister, we want an opportunity where all parties in the Assembly sit down together and figure out the rules and procedures that govern the election because it isn't your prerogative and it isn't the prerogative of the NDP. In Ottawa and in every other fair-minded jurisdiction that is exactly what happens. And that is what should happen in this particular one. Instead of that you want to set the rules yourself and you want to set them I suggest, that they are for the advantage of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, I have other things to say on this bill. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 24 - An Act to amend The Court of Appeal Act

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 65 - An Act respecting the Establishment of a Provincial Court in Saskatchewan

Section 1

MR. THATCHER:— Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Attorney General, for the benefit of us laymen who are fortunate enough not to belong to his profession, could very briefly summarize what this bill is attempting to accomplish.

MR. ROMANOW:— Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we had a fairly good discussion this in second reading and the essence of this bill, I don't mind repeating it again, the essence of this bill is in effect to confirm, I use that word advisedly of the independence and the importance of the present magistrates' courts. This is a kind of conversion of the magistrate's court into which we think is a higher level or a higher prestige kind of court known as the provincial court of the province of Saskatchewan. It will make this court a court of record which means that its judgments can be cited in the other courts and taken as such simply by reference to the case. It would give power to cite the magistrates on a contempt of court proceeding in these if this should be required under some circumstances. It furthermore sets up a mechanism for giving independence to

the magistrates, the judges, by setting up what we call a Judicial Council. The Judicial Council will be made up of the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal, the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, Chief Judge of the court and a couple of lay representatives, so that you can't discipline or fire or change the judge without the consent of the Judicial Council. It gives it a tremendous amount more of independence, in fact really makes it a truly independent court. And then there are some additional nitty gritty things like pension improvement more akin to the pension benefits that the present federal court judges get. Now what this is, is an attempt to improve the provincial court, the magistrates, make it into a truly independent, important, well recognized and in financial and other terms recognizing the fact that this is the court where 90 per cent of the court business of the province of Saskatchewan takes place. I think that's in the most concise terms that I can make it.

MR. THATCHER:— Would the Attorney General indicate whether he, perhaps you alluded to this, however I am not completely clear, but does this bill bring about any streamlining of our present system which did appear to put it very mildly was clogged and I am not asking for the Attorney General's speech about how many courts we had compared to 1971, etc., etc. Perhaps the Attorney General could briefly answer what streamlining procedures are involved, if any.

MR. ROMANOW:— Mr. Chairman, I don't think this bill itself will assist, particularly in any direct fashion in that problem. I think the issue of the clogging can be more directly dealt with in estimates., not that we are trying to shy away from it, but I have to tell you candidly, the bill will not immediately give any benefits that way, other than it may attract more judges of higher calibre - I think we have a pretty high calibre now, but more judges to the court and thereby give more court facilities and speed up the mechanism that way.

I would simply close by saying, that in Saskatchewan, we have reduced the court time lag quite substantially. It used to be seven months, I think, in Regina and now it is down to about three months. One might say that is too much. I agree, ideally, it is but in terms of any other yardstick of other provinces, it is going along fairly well. Again, that is a little bit off the topic of this bill because there are so many other factors that are involved in it - caseloads, clerks of the court, Bail Reform Act, which is contributing to the clogging and so forth.

MR. THATCHER:— Mr. Attorney General, are you presently having a problem in attracting judges? I think you indicated that in your comments and I find this highly surprising. Not attempting to hold anything up, would you briefly elaborate on that problem?

MR. ROMANOW:— Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the problems that the provincial court has always had is attracting senior lawyers as judges. The difficulty really comes, I think, from an historical, an historical problem namely, it was always thought that a magistrate's court appointment was somehow not the aspiration of most lawyers. They wanted something that a federal court appointed would give them, a district Court of Queen's Bench, it is a kind of a psychological thing. Again, and I don't want to be political, but for a period there we felt very much in arrears on pay comparisons between the district court and the magistrates' courts. We have made some considerable strides in the last few years catching up. So there has been a judicial problem.

We have overcome that, to a large extent. I think, putting it candidly, I would prefer to

see a few more interested people, with more seniority at the bar, rather than the present situation where we have some very competent, capable people, but with less seniority at the bar, who sit in the judges operations.

If we are dealing directly with the aspects of the pension bill, I think it will be designed to attract more senior people to come to the bench, rather than the present situation where we find younger people interested in the bench.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2, 3 and 4 agreed to.

Item 5 as amended agreed to.

Items 6 and 7 agreed to.

Item 8 as amended agreed to.

Items 9 to 24 agreed to.

Section 25 as amended agreed.

Sections 26 to 29 agreed.

Section 30 as amended agreed.

Section 31 agreed.

Section 32 as amended agreed.

Section 33 as amended agreed.

Section 34 as amended agreed.

Section 35 agreed.

Section 36 as amended agreed.

Sections 37 to 41 agreed.

Section 42 as amended agreed.

Section 43 agreed.

Section 44 as amended agreed.

Section 45 agreed.

Section 46 as amended agreed.

Sections 47 to 50 agreed.

May 15, 1978

Sections 50 and 51 repealed, agreed.

Section 52 as amended agreed.

Section 53 agreed.

Section 54 as amended agreed.

Section 55 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 64 - An Act to amend The Interpretation Act

Section 1, revised statute, chapter 1, section 21 amended agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 68 - An Act to amend The Statute Law

Sections 1, 2, 3 agreed.

Section 4 deleted.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 47 - An Act to amend The Senior Citizens Home Repair Assistance Act, 1973

Section 1 amended agreed.

Section 2

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— I wonder if I could revert to clause 1 for one question, Mr. Minister? It seems to me that restricting the act to senior citizens receiving the supplement is becoming too restrictive. There are many senior citizens who - you know the supplement is now very, very marginal and I would urge you to extend the limit to a higher income limit. I realize that there has to be a 'needs', I am not objecting to that but I think it should be higher. Perhaps the minister would consider that.

MR. SMISHEK:— That is precisely what is going to be done in case of single persons and, if you recall, during the budget speech I also announced that in case of single persons the eligibility criterion is going to be up to \$7,000; in case of a couple, up to \$11,000. So the former rules of eligibility are no longer applied. The ceiling is lifted. September 1 is when this goes into effect . . . The regulations? Not yet.

Section 1 agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 48 - An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation Act, 1973

Section 1

MR. MCMILLAN (Kindersley):— Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister which two programs are referred to. I assume one is going to be the changes which will allow the purchase of existing homes under the rural residential housing program and if that is correct I would like you to confirm that. I would also like to ask you what the other program was, that the changes were necessary for.

MR. SMISHEK:— Mr. Chairman, for the information of the hon. member, while that may be permissible in buying existing housing and providing the guarantees, really at this stage no decision has been made in that respect. It is really in case of new housing that is under construction, providing the guarantees.

MR. MCMILLAN:— Well, what are the new programs then - the two new programs?

MR. SMISHEK:— Mr. Chairman, I presume the hon. member is referring to when I spoke in second reading and made reference to the possible two programs that the guarantees would apply to. One is (and no decision has been made in this respect that would be permissible) buy-back guarantees. That is - Now, the small contractor who would build a house - it could be purchased as part of inventory and then resold. Really, the main intent of this, providing the guarantees, is interim financing for small builders, to provide the guarantees as interim financing. As the hon. member may recall, during second reading I addressed myself to this. In case of small contractors, they do have problems of arranging for interim financing. They might build very few homes and in order to get financing they have to pay more money to the bank or they are unable to get it at all.

MR. MCMILLAN:— Would you say that this problem of getting interim finances by the small builders would have resulted in that sort of indiscreet loan from the one building corporation to the general manager? Do you hope to correct this problem with the steps you are taking here?

MR. SMISHEK:— Certainly.

MR. MCMILLAN:— Well, is it the intention of your loan guarantee to provide contractors with the funds to operate, as construction, house builders in Saskatchewan? Are those the reasons for the guarantee? The interim financing is for the contractor, is it not?

MR. SMISHEK:— That is correct.

MR. MCMILLAN:— Can we assume that it is, in fact, a prepayment or money up front on work to be done, or is it a separate entity where the line of credit is extended by Sask Housing Corporation or a guarantee on the line of credit to allow these people to operate as contractors?

MR. SMISHEK:— No, it is really a line of credit. Mr. Chairman, this will not be money provided directly by the housing corporation. It is intended to use the current financial institutions, credit unions and banks. We will, once the legislation is passed, enter into discussions and negotiations with the financial institutions and we will provide the guarantee on loans that they would provide to the small house builders.

MR. MCMILLAN:— Well, maybe there is no other way to do it, but you realize the problem. If someone goes to you and says, a non-profit housing organization, and says we want to build these houses and we can't get funding from the bank. They won't touch

us, those of us who are involved have poor credit rating and we have no experience in the housing construction business. We can't get funded. What Sask Housing is saying, is O.K. you go back to the bank and reapply and we will put our credit behind you. So what you are in is the financing end of the business and I am not sure that couldn't be better done through another department. Maybe your people have the expertise to run credit checks, etc. Maybe you don't worry whatsoever about losing the money you might be guaranteeing. I don't know, but it is sort of strange to find this here, where Sask Housing is in the financing business and out of houses themselves, out of the purchase of a house. But you're financing construction companies in Saskatchewan, not construction companies but new construction companies. Companies with virtually no experience and no technical ability to operate as construction companies and I say, maybe, there is no other way to do it but it looks like pretty risky business.

MR. SMISHEK:— Mr. Chairman, first of all, the guarantees that we're talking about here are not intended to be used for non-profit housing groups. It is intended for small builders. We've run into this problem in case of small builders when the market gets a little flat, that for them to keep building, they have the problem of ongoing financing. We believe that this would be a route that would assist the small builders. Neither is it intended . . . now it may be subject to their credibility as a new builder. Really we have found because we certainly don't want to be sort of starting up, all kind of new companies that may not be bale to make a go of it and create difficulties. It is by the large intended for current small builders exclusive of non-profit groups. We have had the presentation that there is a need for this. We'll see how it works but certainly we will be keeping a very close eye to ensure that the guarantees that are provided are provided to credible, small house builders.

MR. MCMILLAN:— Well, are the guarantees only in conjunction with those small builders that are doing work for Sask Housing Corporation? Or is it for any small builders in Saskatchewan?

MR. SMISHEK:— Mr. Chairman, this is not purely restricted to housing built for Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. It may be any small builder that is maybe building on spec to be able to sell the house that he has built. If he finds that he has problems with the line of credit, we will see that the housing is needed and we could provide a guarantee for some interim financing.

MR. MCMILLAN:— I don't know what prompted you to get into this field. My brother is a carpenter, an apprentice carpenter. He's a small builder about 165 lbs. What's to stop him from applying to you people to build houses, one after another, one at a time and just resell them. O.K., that's the business he's in. You're saying that you're in a position to extend to him a line of credit if he can't get it somewhere else, provided that in your estimation that the house that he's building is needed. Is that the terms of your guarantee?

MR. SMISHEK:— That's right. First of all, there has to be a need. We think that time will only tell as to how effective this will be. At the present time under the terms of legislation, it is not possible for us to provide this guarantee. As I've already indicated to the hon. member that the existing financial institutions will be used for the purpose of providing the funds. All that we would do is provide the guarantee but in each case, the application would have to be made on each project.

MR. MCMILLAN:— I know that you don't want to get into the financing business of construction companies, whether they be large builders or small builders. That's not

your business. That's Industry and Commerce business. What specifically prompted you, what specific case or series of situations have arise in Sask Housing which would put you in a position where you wanted to extend some form of financing to these people who were in the process of building housing and couldn't do that? You didn't pull this one out of the blue . . . that's Industry and Commerce work. What prompts you to get into this position?

MR. SMISHEK:— Mr. Chairman, what prompted us was really the representation we have had from the industry. I think the hon. member will agree that it is important for us to have the housing industry with capacity, you know, to produce. The member may recall, without getting political, that in the early '70s we faced a problem and when we established the housing corporation, for us to be able to get started in building houses, we had the problem with the capacity to produce because we didn't have the people, we didn't have the management skills. Small builders are a very important facet of the house building construction industry particularly in smaller communities. They do have at times the problem of a line of credit, if they put up two or three homes, they've got their money tied up and at a particular time they are not able to sell the house in order to buy the lumber, to pay their work force. Now, we know that there is going to be a market for those homes. It doesn't also mean that we will provide a line of credit for the total cost of the house. It may be only a partial cost that will be provided.

MR. MCMILLAN:— Well, for your own information, I don't intend to drag the ball any further. I hope it works out but I tell you, you're in the wrong business. That's not your job at all, that's the responsibility of the Department of Industry and Commerce. If there are businessmen in Saskatchewan who are having trouble, whether they be large contractors or small contractors, it has always been the responsibility of the Department of Industry and Commerce to meet their needs within a certain set of restrictions. I must say I'm completely baffled as to why Sask Housing would do it. If your concern is that we maintain a certain level of construction in the housing field, if you feel there is a problem with private contractors not being able to continue as a result of shortage of credit, why don't you build incentives into the industry, if that's your concern? But to get into the financing business, I say that's strange at the very best at this time. I'm willing to give you the opportunity to see if it works out but I must say I have some reservations about the whole idea.

MR. SMISHEK:— Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be in the financing business.

MR. MCMILLAN:— What's the guarantee?

MR. SMISHEK:— There is a difference between providing a guarantee - rather than providing cash directly, we are going to use the existing financial institution to provide the money.

MR. MCMILLAN:— I'll tell you there are a couple of members of this House who are going to find out that there is really no difference between supplying a guarantee and actually putting up the money and you may end up being the third in the next couple of years.

Item 1 agreed.

Item 2 deleted.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 61 - An Act to provide for the Celebration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the
Establishment of the Province of Saskatchewan**

Section 1 agreed

Section 2

MR. CHAIRMAN:— Section 2 - Interpretation, Board, Corporation, Member, Minister and we have an amendment to section 2 of the printed bill by the Hon. Mr. Shillington that we amend section 2 of the printed bill by striking out 'the' where it appears for the second time in the first line of clause (a). Is the amendment agreed?

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister. You were going to supply some information as to how much you are allocating and how it is to be allocated.

MR. SHILLINGTON:— Mr. Chairman, I probably should begin by introducing the officials who are here with me. The House might be interested in them.

MR. CHAIRMAN:— I beg your pardon?

MR. SHILLINGTON:— I probably should begin by introducing my officials as the House may be interested in their names. This is Jim Benning who is the acting deputy minister of Youth and Culture. The members met him the other night. Sitting behind Jim is Yars Lozowchuk who was very recently appointed executive director of the 1980 celebrations. Yars is just getting his feet wet. He is from Hafford. Just getting his feet wet.

Mr. Chairman, I can't supply the member with a list of projects. I want it clearly understood that this is a very preliminary list. None of these items are committed projects. It was a list of ideas which we put together and I just want that understood that this is just simply a very preliminary list and none of these projects are committed projects. If you want an idea as to how we arrived at the figure that was put in the budget the other night, this is it. If I could get one of the pages, I could deliver this to the member for Qu'Appelle.

Section 2 agreed.

Section 3 agreed.

Section 4 agreed.

Section 5

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):— Where will this head office be. Will it be in Duck Lake?

MR. SHILLINGTON:— The head office is yet to be determined. Certainly Duck Lake would be one prime candidate. I don't know that we would want to finalize the decision here and now, though the other members may have an idea that it should be at Fort Qu'Appelle.

Section 5 agreed.

Sections 6 - 19 agreed.

Section 20 agreed.

**BILL NO. 61 — An Act to provide for the Celebration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the
Establishment of the Province of Saskatchewan.**

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

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