

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

April 18, 1980.

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. D.W. CODY (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure today that I introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly, two groups of students. The first is from Wakaw High School. They're Grades 11 and 12 and they're 55 in number. They have come to Regina to witness the Legislative Assembly proceedings and, of course, have also decided to do other things in the capital city. They are here today with their teachers, Ben Hepner and John Mah. I know that the students will have a good time in Regina and hopefully a safe trip home.

We also have a group of students from Cudworth High School — the Grade 8 students. They number 34. They are here today with their teachers, Connie Poschmann and Cathy Sholter.

As you know, Cudworth and Wakaw are in one of the great areas in the province of Saskatchewan. It's the area that we call PCB country. That's an area where you can go to get a good meal of perogies, cabbage rolls, and borsch. I can assure you the reason I have a problem with weight is because I frequent the communities so often and get that kind of food. I welcome the students here today and hope they have a good time and a very safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, just to add to what the minister has said and particularly on behalf of our member for Maple Creek, Mrs. Joan Duncan, formerly Joan Tratch of Wakaw, I would extend on her behalf her greetings and her wishes for a safe journey home. Unfortunately, she's unable to be in the House today.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I want through you to welcome a group of students to this Assembly from Humboldt Collegiate. There are 93 students accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Douglas Still and Mr. Mike Kosmynka. They are fortunate in being able to be here today and I'm glad that they are. Last fall when the session was on, they attempted to get here but, because of severe weather conditions, had to cancel their trip. I want to extend on behalf of this Assembly to them, our wish that they have an enjoyable visit to this Assembly as well as their visit to the city of Regina and wish them a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to the other members of the House through your Chair, a group of 42 Grade 8 students in the east gallery from Jonas Samson Jr. High School in Meadow Lake. I know you will recognize along with me that this is quite an undertaking considering the distances

involved. This is the second group of three that will be appearing here at the legislature as part of a tour of southern Saskatchewan which has been undertaken by that school as a Celebrate Saskatchewan project. They're accompanied here today by their chaperones, Mr. Bert Brander, Mr. Ernie Sommerfeld, Mrs. Berube and Mrs. Straleski, and their bus driver, Jack Alm. I'm sure everyone here will join with me in wishing them an enjoyable trip to this part of the province, an educational visit here at the legislature and a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SECRETIVE TAPING OF MEMBERS' VOICES IN LEGISLATURE

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, we have seen the refusal to allow television coverage of the legislature and committee meetings and most recently the scrambling of TV signals, as well as plans to Sask Tel to further control communications through Bill 13. Now, we find that you have secretive taping devices which have been monitoring our voice clips since the beginning of this session. What is your reason for the scrutinizing of these voice clips and what further type of communication control can the people of Saskatchewan expect from your government?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, let me say, firstly, that I'm unaware of any decisions made by our government with respect to television in this Chamber or television in any committee of this Chamber. Accordingly, I am unable to respond on behalf of the government. Mr. Speaker, as will be known to you, the rules with respect to the conduct of this Chamber, including those who may report it and how they may report it, are made by the committees of this Chamber. They are not made by the Government of Saskatchewan. I want to point that out to all hon. members. Accordingly, I have nothing to say in that regard.

With respect to taping by some government agency of the clips here, I have no information.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I'd ask the members to be patient. If they have questions, I will try to get them on. If they ask questions, I want to try to have the answers heard by all members, including the member for Moosomin and especially the member for Moosomin.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any arrangements for taping the proceedings of this House to which the hon. member referred. Accordingly, I am unable to help him.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — A supplementary question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, I am rather surprised you are unaware of reports yesterday that information services has reversed its role. Instead of disseminating information, they are dissecting information. In other words, they are monitoring all news broadcasts, open-line shows, etc. in Saskatchewan. Mr. Premier, I think you will agree this is rather a direct contradiction of what the normally accepted function of information services has been. Would the Premier tell this Assembly today exactly who authorized this new role on behalf of information services and its director, Mr. Hinds? Specifically, who gave the authorization for information services to begin this monitoring of press activities?

AN HON. MEMBER: — I'll bet it was little Al.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I can't tell the hon. member the answer to that question because the monitoring of open-line shows has been going on for many years. It may well have been by information services. It has been going on for many years, yes; that is certainly my information — whether by information services or by somebody else in the Executive Council, I don't know. But certainly the monitoring of open-line shows has been going on for a lengthy period of time. I am now advised that in addition to open-line shows, the morning program of the CBC (I think it is called Saskatchewan Today) has been included. The purpose of this is to give the government information on what the public is saying about the government and its programs. We make no apology for attempting to find out what the public is saying about the government's programs. We don't monitor a great number of programs but we do monitor those where there is a substantial call-in aspect from the public. That includes the open-line shows and also, as I now understand it, Saskatchewan Today.

MR. THATCHER: — New question. Mr. Premier, for someone who started answering this question suggesting he really didn't know and then all of a sudden knew quite a bit about it, I found that a bit of a contradiction. My question to the Premier is this. You know very well, Mr. Premier, that is a new role for information services. Again, I am repeating the question. Who authorized it? Maybe I should answer it for you. Because it is the authorization . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. The member can't place questions and then answer them. He has to allow the members of the Executive Council to answer the questions. Order, order. I just want to get something straight and bring the question period back into order. The members cannot preface their questions by editorials of some type. I just cannot allow that to go on, because the members on the other side of the House will want to make a response of an editorial nature as well. Members cannot place a question before the House and then suggest that they're going to answer it, because the rules are quite clear that you cannot put rhetorical questions before the House.

MR. THATCHER: — A question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, isn't it true that the directive for information services (to begin providing this service for not only your government but, from what also I am told, for the NDP research office) came directly from your office — and I emphasize, from your office. And furthermore, Mr. Premier, would you explain a contradiction which came up yesterday. One of the female employees, upon being questioned by a member of the press who asked her how much of her duties were spent transcribing the material, replied that virtually all of her time was spent transcribing. The head of information services, when Mr. Hind was asked the same question about that employee, said 5 per cent. Mr. Premier, that's quite a discrepancy from two employees — one, a girl just simply doing her job, and what she's told; the other, a director, who accounts to you, Mr. Premier, these are rather sharp discrepancies and I think you, as the minister in charge of this department, should make a full and complete statement in the Assembly.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, let me comment on a few of the comments of the member and let me answer his question. First, he asked why I would say I didn't know anything about the taping of the proceedings of this House and did know something about the taping of open-line shows. The answer is, quite frankly, because I did know something about the taping of open-line shows, and I didn't know, and don't know, anything about anyone taping the proceedings of this House. Mr. Speaker, I'm perfectly

happy to allow all hon. members to read the question the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley asked and my answer. Then we will see whether the answer was responsive.

Now, to speak to the question from the member for Thunder Creek, I am not informed as to what the individual employee to whom he referred said, nor what Mr. Hinds has said. Neither report did I hear. I don't know whether they were reported nor have I been informed. I can find out for the hon. member some additional information to see whether he feels there is an ongoing discrepancy. I will undertake to do that if the hon. member wishes me to do so and report further to the House.

I repeat again what I said about the function of information services — this monitoring of shows that have a substantial citizen content, which, as I say, has gone on for some time and which I think is an entirely appropriate activity for a government that attempts to find out what people are saying about it and attempts to be able to respond to the concerns of citizens about their government.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Premier, isn't this another example where Mr. Hinds is involved in having to be the fall guy for the former minister of finance last year on a budget leak (you made him the fall guy then) and, now that something has been discovered here where the government is monitoring the normal press activities of the electronic media, isn't it true that you're making Mr. Hinds once again the fall guy — and maybe he's dumb enough to be the fall guy for you.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think the short answer to that is no. I will further shock the hon. member by saying that we monitor the print media, and actually run a clipping service and cut things out and assemble them in files. I want to say that it is very common for governments to monitor the media, whether it be the print media or the electronic media and we would be doing something less than our appropriate duty as a government to ignore what the media say and what the media say the public say. We certainly read the letters to the editor column and occasionally cut them out and put them in the file. It would seem to me equally appropriate that we should attempt to find out what people are saying to the radio stations as well as what they write to the newspapers. This we do and some of this work is carried out by Mr. Hinds and I do not regard it as the work of a fall guy but the work of a diligent employee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NEWSPAPER CLIPPINGS

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A question to the Premier. If this is such an insignificant thing and simply an ongoing thing, my question to you is why is it kept in such a secretive manner?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, so far as I am aware, I have not previously announced to the House that we clip portions from newspapers and put them in files. The fact I have not announced it does not mean it is such a secret thing that we're trying to keep it under cover. It would not surprise me, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members opposite actually clipped newspapers and put clippings in their files and did it by employees who were paid out of the public purse. It wouldn't surprise me. I doubt if I called that to their attention they would think it was a particularly secret endeavor. It is the normal operation in their case as an opposition and in ours as a government. No amount of comment suggesting that somehow our recording of what 250,000 people have heard

is somehow an operation which is secret . . . It is not easy to see how one can spy upon (to use a phrase used in this connection) anybody by recording something which has been already heard by 250,000 people or in the case of some of the radio stations, perhaps somewhat less.

FILING OF RADIO CLIPS

MR. ANDREW: — My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Attorney General. As a significant member of the rules committee, why was it that you were the member who insisted that the media file with the rules committee radio clips taken from logs taken from question period when you had your own secretive devices to put that information on your desk every morning? You were the guy and you say it's not secret.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kindersley, too, was the guy in the rules committee who insisted that be done. He too was a member of the rules committee who agreed to that. The hon. member for Kindersley was the person who voted for this in the committee unanimously, this secretive approach of monitoring the press. I say that the hon. member for Kindersley has tried to make an issue out of absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, we do the clipping of newspapers as the Premier has outlined. I'm sure the opposition does the same thing. I have never heard anything more ludicrous in the world than asking about spying on something which is being reported throughout the province of Saskatchewan. The only thing I differ with the Premier on is that I don't think the CBC has 250,000 listeners in the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. ANDREW: — Question to the Attorney General on the same thing. Why did you not, as a member of the rules committee, bring this to the attention of the rules committee?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I did not bring it to the attention of the rules committee because I did not know it was being done. If I knew that it was being done, I wouldn't have brought it to the attention of the rules committee because it's not relevant to the rules committee. I don't know what is or isn't being taped. In fact, I don't even see how the line of questioning is relevant to the rules committee. But I want to ask the hon. member, why is it that he got up and voted and supported this monitoring . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I'm afraid you can't ask the hon. member.

MR. ANDREW: — I'll advise the Attorney General that I did not — that would broach on party lines but we won't get into that. I say to you on April 10 in Hansard, page 1594 and I quote from you statement:

I find, accordingly, that the development of the introduction of the private members bill today, unilaterally, by the member for Wilkie, betrays

somewhat — I don't want to overstate that — the trust of the committee.

I ask the Attorney General if what, in fact, transpired in that committee has now seriously put a betrayal of trust on that committee. I question the jeopardy of that whole thing.

MR. SPEAKER: — Before I get the Attorney General's answer. I want to try to get the question into perspective here because I understand the member for Kindersley is asking a supplementary, and I think we're getting astray from the question period if we're talking about the rules committee, because that's another committee and we'll have another opportunity to discuss the items in there.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I point out to the House that a subcommittee of the rules committee was struck composed of Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Rosemont, and the hon. Member for Kindersley, which subcommittee met with the press gallery to work out the rules of tabling of the question period, questions and answers. I was not a party of that. The rules, which were tendered by the member for Kindersley and the Speaker and the member for Rosemont on the taping of the rules, were done by that committee and brought to the entire committee for recommendation and approval, which was done subsequently unanimously. I repeat again, that if there's any lack of trust, it was the hon. member for Kindersley, who negotiated the rules of the press, brought it to the committee for support by the committee, who now seeks to misportray the fact that somehow it was done by the Attorney General, and I wasn't even a party to the whole operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESS GALLERY AWARE OF HOUSE RULES

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, question to the Attorney General. I understand last Friday you had a little indoctrination meeting with members of the press gallery. Are you satisfied that as a result of that meeting the press gallery is now aware of the rules as they relate to media in this House, and in committees of this House, at least as you interpret them?

MR. ROMANOW: — We had an off-the-record, informal meeting in my office as I'm sure has been the case with the Leader of the Opposition from time to time. I am surprised and disappointed that it now is evident the meeting was not indeed off-the-record, that the meeting and the discussion were portrayed to the Leader of the Opposition. Well, I guess that's the name of the game, that's the name of the game.

I was asked on Friday, off-the-record before being interviewed on the Lane affair by a number of reporters, what the difference was between privilege and points of order. It was consistent in the questioning which I received. I suggested to the media if they wanted to come to my office, informally, I would offer my interpretation for whatever it's worth about the differences between privilege and rules as House Leader. Some reporters chose to come; some reporters chose not to come. It was a discussion based on that operation. It's not my job to express satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The press is here to do a job. They do their job. I don't agree, frequently, with what they do. I'm sure they don't agree frequently with what I do. But that is the nature of the game. We fully respect each other's rights to do that. I say for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to suggest that it is unwise or improper (and it may be, in light of the fact that the so-called meeting is now public) is, again, making a mountain out of a molehill. Surely, Mr.

Speaker, of all the issues this province and country face the taping of television programs which are aired publicly should be the very last issue for a responsible legislator to be debating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the Attorney General is in fact trying to take over the role of Mr. Speaker, as it relates to interpreting the rules. But my question to the Attorney General is, do you intend in any form to punish those members of the press who chose not to go to your meeting?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe that this is a serious question period, but I assume that it is. I don't know how any Attorney General could punish; I don't know why any Attorney General would punish. The fact of the matter is the punishment that was exhibited by this House on members of this House, was taken by this House — not by the Attorney General or anybody for contravention of rules. I intend to continue the relationship I have with the press, one of love-hate or perhaps a total hate relationship. I intend to continue to meet informally with them, if they see fit to do it, as background information on issues related to rules as I see them or on issues related to policy of government as I see it. I intend to respect those informal meetings; I intend to respect on-the-record formal meetings. They do that. The Leader of the Opposition does it; Mr. Grant Devine does it; the Conservatives meet with them informally and for him to deny it otherwise would be an absolute and blatant misleading of the House, and I'm sure the hon. member is not suggesting that.

EXTENT OF INFORMATION GATHERING

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. I have some concern as to just how broad this intelligence gathering service you have is. Since we now know the information service has this secretive taping equipment and since photographic . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I would prefer to hear the member's question because I have to make a judgment on whether it is in order or not. I'm having some difficulty hearing the question. I wonder if the members could allow the member to put his question?

MR. BERNTSON: — Since information services and photographic arts are under the same department head, I wonder if the Premier is prepared to give this House the assurance that photographic arts doesn't also have sophisticated photographic equipment used for his intelligence gathering service?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, there are in this province probably 100,000 recorders, little pieces of recording equipment that people may well use to tape radio shows if they like. There are probably several thousand videotape recorders, or perhaps several hundred anyway, that people use to tape television programs and play them back at different times. To hear all this equipment characterized as sophisticated and near-subversive equipment that is used somehow to gather information is surely a denial of the electronic era. Members opposite may well in their policies represent the horse-and-buggy era but they should acknowledge that with respect to news gathering and storage the electronic era is here. It is here with respect to attempting to gather information as we would with a newspaper.

Some hon. members may feel that anyone who records a video show and watches

Charlie's Angels at a later hour is somehow controlling the content of Charlie's Angels, but it seems to me to be a very difficult argument to put, and one the logic of which has not been made clear to me. With respect particularly to the question of the member for Souris-Cannington, we have photographic equipment. We use it to take pictures and in that regard we may be recording and storing information; but to put any sinister light on this is not warranted by the facts and nothing we do by way of taking pictures in any way is inappropriate with respect to the proper activities of a government.

INFORMATION GATHERED BY INFORMATION SERVICES

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in light of your answer are you prepared to assure this Assembly today that the tapes or the information being gathered by information services and the voice clips, etc., being gathered by information services is not being provided on a regular basis to the NDP caucus research people?

MR. BLAKENEY: — As far as I am aware it is not. I am certainly unaware of any provision on an ongoing basis of information to either of the caucuses. No doubt it would be entirely appropriate for the caucuses to record this information and I would see nothing inappropriate for that since surely the caucuses are also interested in what the public is saying about governmental programs and about the constructive alternative proposals steadily put forward by the opposition as alternative programs for the province. I know the caucuses may well gather this information; so far as I am aware it is not being provided.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would dearly love to have the question period extended but the rules prevent me and I must move to ministerial statements.

POINT OF ORDER — LENGTH OF QUESTION PERIOD

MR. R. KATZMAN: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Today question period started at 10:06 and 22 seconds by that clock. You continued, on points of order and so forth, to come into the debate taking up almost two minutes of time. You called question period at 10:30 and 40 seconds, therefore depriving the opposition of the full allotment of time. This has been the habit. I have been timing question period over the last few weeks and this has been normal.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order.

The member for Rosthern is only allowed to raise points of order with regard to this question period. He is out of order if he refers to a previous question period.

MR. R. KATZMAN: — On this question period, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that you cut the question period off early and I would recommend to you that you be more careful in cutting off the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I appreciate the problem the member for Rosthern has raised. Perhaps if we could get the attention of the member for Moosomin, because the reason I interrupted the question period at least once was because the member for Moosomin kept interrupting the members who were on their feet, including the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Government . . . Now, that's one of the reasons I interrupted the question period.

I am not raising point of order during the question period. I am dealing with keeping the question period in order and there is a subtle difference between those two. I find that several times I have to rise during the question period. I have to cut members off because they are making a speech. I have to try and restore order because members are making too much noise and I can't hear what the question is. It is not important that all members hear the question, but it's important that the person the question is directed hear it and that the Speaker hear it. Those are two people who it is essential hear what the question is. If I have to restore order to try and hear the question, that's unfortunate but I think that's the way it has to be in the question period. I find it unfortunate and I am sorry the members are offended because a certain amount of the question period time is taken up restoring order.

Question period is bracketed in a certain area. The oral question period shall begin not later than five minutes after the commencement of the sitting, and shall conclude not later than 30 minutes after the commencement of the sitting.

MR. R. KATZMAN: — On the point of order, I understand . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I think I have dealt with the point of order. If you have a new one, I'll take it.

MR. R. KATZMAN: — My understanding of the House is that you allow the members (except when the radio is on) sufficient time to introduce guests and so forth. You then give the next 25 minutes for question period. If that is correct, then I suggest today we were cut short by almost two minutes. That is the point of order, and I would ask the Speaker to keep track of it a little more closely, please.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would apologize to the House if I didn't get the exact time the question period started. I assumed it was a minute or a minute and one-half after it normally starts, and it ran at least a minute and one-half over the half-past mark. I will try to keep closer track of it. I want to give members a full 25 minutes of question period. Many days they get more than that because I let it run over. If I'm unsure as to when it started exactly I will run it over a minute or so, and sometimes the members get in a question or two before the question period normally would be expected to start.

MR. THATCHER: — A point of order, Mr. Speaker — more of a question, I suppose. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley led off the question period with a question to the Premier. I came forward with a supplementary on that question. As I got up to ask my second supplementary on it, before I was able to say anything on it, you said final.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I think you were anticipating my question, which I think was very inappropriate because at that moment I hadn't decided what it was. But, Mr. Speaker, my point is that I think in this particular case you were anticipating. I put this forward for your good judgment, but I had asked one question and it was inappropriate, I think, to designate the next one as final after only one supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: — That, in a lighter vein, shows you how perceptive the Speaker is. Just to put the thing in its proper perspective, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley asked a question. He then asked a supplementary. The member for . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I would have to check the records, but I have on here that there were two supplementaries. Normally I allow two. I am not mandated to allow two; I can allow three or I can allow one, or fewer. And it is unfortunate that sometimes when members get up, it is hard to tell whether they are going to ask a supplementary or a question —

they don't declare themselves, they begin to ask the question. I realize that happens from time to time. If the member stands up and says, question, I'll look upon it as a new question, and if there happens to be two standing, I'll take the one who stood up first.

If the member is standing up and wants to ask a supplementary, all he has to do is say supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and I will recognize it as a supplementary, and if it is in order he can proceed.

I'm sorry that happened, but I had no intention of cutting the member off . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, I'll take you after the member for Kindersley.

POINT OF ORDER — EXPULSION OF MR. LANE

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A point of order, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the expulsion of Mr. Lane from the House (and it was for a period of five days), for the record, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether the day in question — which was last Friday when he was expelled from the House by the motion advanced by the Attorney General — was for five days; not for the balance of the day and five additional days, but for five days. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the analogy to a court situation would be that the day in court is classed as a day of the sentence. I would just ask for clarification on this particular point, as to whether or not the five days included last Friday, at which time . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I take it the member for Kindersley is serious about this, and I would like to hear him again, please. I want to hear his argument very carefully.

MR. ANDREW: — The argument, Mr. Speaker, is basically this. Mr. Lane was expelled last Friday and after his expulsion he was not allowed to sit in the House. Therefore he missed part of that day after the ruling and then he has been excluded for, I take it, today as well, which I submit would be six days, not five days. And should it have been six days, if that was the intention, I suggest the Attorney General's motion would have been for the balance of the day and five additional days. That was not the case. I want an interpretation as to what that motion would mean and whether or not Mr. Lane is allowed back into the House today or will be excluded until Monday. The analogy I wanted to draw with regard to the court situation (which I think is relevant) is that when a person is sentenced, let's say to five days imprisonment, the day that he is sentenced from court (he has freedom up until the time he is sentenced), is considered one of his days of sentencing.

MR. SPEAKER: — Are there any more comments on that point of order before I make a decision? I've taken the trouble to review this because this has troubled me in the past when we've had suspensions from the House. Suspensions in themselves trouble me but the fact that there might be some dispute about how long the suspension is supposed to last is a matter of concern. In the recent past in the history of Saskatchewan we have had two suspensions of a similar nature that I'm aware of. Two members were suspended in 1977 for five days each. That, at that time, was invoked as five full days plus the day on which they received their suspension. That is the term the members were suspended from the service of this House. Now I assume that the same application is being made to this particular case the member for Kindersley is referring to now. I've checked the parliamentary precedents for this. Members, if they had looked at Erskine May's parliamentary Practice which comes from the mother of parliaments would see in edition 19, page 442 if I can extract the pertinent words from that citation:

... suspension continues ... until the ... day on which the House sits after the day on which the Member was suspended.

And that is the parliamentary precedent I'm citing at this time. The British House of Commons takes a much stronger view with regard to suspension of members. They may be suspended for a period of time. The second suspension is considerably larger — a greater amount of time and is mandatory. The third suspension could be until the conclusion of the session, automatically.

I have applied another test to the suspension of members to decide if the member has been suspended for five days and it is the test with regard to remuneration or expenses that the member receives. In this particular case the member was suspended on Friday. There would be no deduction on Friday because he had been in the House that particular day. There would have been a deduction for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and this Friday which would make five days suspension as far as the remuneration is concerned. Now, if in fact, the member was allowed back in the House today, then he would have four days suspension as it relates to the remuneration.

However, the principal point I wish to make at this time is that the precedent in this House has been five days (and in all cases it was five days, the ones I'm referring to) plus the day on which the member was suspended. The British House of Commons is quite clear that the suspension begins after the day on which the member was suspended, checking the time.

MR. ANDREW: — Speaking with regard to that ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I just seek clarification . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I've made my — Order, order! — ruling and Beauchesne is quite clear that I cannot discuss or debate the ruling with the members of the Assembly after I've made it. Order, order! I asked the members, before I made my ruling, if there was anyone else who wished to speak to the ruling. I gave an interval of time to allow all members including the member for Thunder Creek to rise to his feet in support of the particular point of order raised by the member for Kindersley, seriously. The member for Thunder Creek didn't avail himself of that opportunity, nor did any other member. So I assumed there would be no more comment on it. I've made my ruling and that's it.

WHAT CONSTITUTES A POINT OF ORDER

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — . . . point of order, Mr. Speaker. I note today that we had a half-hour question period and 15 minutes afterwards we discussed the question period. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a question has to be raised as to what is a valid point of order. It seems to me a valid point of order is when a member rises when he sees some rule being abridged in this House. I suggest the points of order raised by the hon. member for Rosthern are not valid points of order and should not be heard in the sense that they do not deal with rules of the House being abridged but rather question the judgment of the Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order! The continuous disrespectful show by the member for Moosomin is beneath the contempt of this House. The member shows by his continued interruption of members on points of order that he has no respect for the rules and I'm sorry about that. I'm sorry for all of us because all members in this House

should have respect for the rules. If he'll allow the member for Regina Rosemont to make his point of order, I'll decide on it.

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, as you mentioned and ruled earlier, you cannot raise other points of order relating to other days in the House but I would ask Mr. Speaker if it would be possible for you to look at the questions of points of order and make a ruling at sometime on what is a valid point of order in regard to the question period my point being that it is not a valid point of order to question the judgement of the Chair. If some rule has been abridged, it certainly is a valid point of order.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the point of order. The argument he's advancing is that in order for a point of order to be valid, it has to be raised as the result of the abridging of some rule of the House. I accept that. Mr. Speaker, has brought in several such statements pointing out what a point of order is. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, when the rule clearly says 25 minutes, that is a breach of the rules and Mr. Speaker would naturally rule that it was a valid point of order. I would also suggest that any points of order arising out of question period by the rules, are brought up before orders of the day. So I don't think the member for Regina Rosemont raises a valid point of order at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: — I want to encourage all members to go back to the record after today is over to look at the points of order raised by the member for Regina Rosemont and the Leader of the Opposition, because I think we have a good example of examining what a point of order is. With regard to the point of order, I do not agree with the member for Regina Rosemont that he is in order. He is not raising a proper point of order. The question period is supposed to be a certain length. If a member feels the question period has not been to the full extent that is allowed for it, then he has every right to rise and say, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think the question period was too short today. That is quite in order. Now, I do agree with the member for Regina Rosemont when he says that points of order should be with regard to some rule that's been abridged in the House. I've always tried to adhere to that. I would agree with that part of what he said. I agree the member for Rosthern had a point of order. I found, essentially if he's saying that the amount of time allowed for the question period may have been too long or too short, that's in order. To argue about why it was too long or too short, I think we can't get into. We have to accept it as it occurs. If there are certain interruptions in the question period sometimes it can't be avoided.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
VOTE 11**

Item 1 (continued)

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Minister, I note a couple of weeks ago that you were off on what I believe you termed a public relations trip to make yourself known to the various financial circles in eastern Canada and in New York City. Mr. Minister, that brings up an interesting point because in your budget you indicate that by the end of this year, and I'm going off the top of my head here, assets of your heritage fund are going to rise to about \$915 million. I'm subject to correction on that and I haven't found it on the page.

Mr. Minister, at a time when you're looking to borrow money, I guess I should ask you why you didn't approach a province that also has a heritage fund, a true heritage fund — a province that has a heritage fund that's got something shocking, like money, in it. I note the smirk on the smile of your deputy, and I've heard some of his comments. We'll

just see whether your deputy is still smiling since some of his comments I noted bordered rather dramatically . . . Smile, Mr. Douglas your day will come someday . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no I'm not threatening, I'm just saying smile and we'll see how long that smile's there after the next election. Getting back to the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We fire hacks, you bet we fire hacks when we come in. You'd better believe it. Every hack will be out of here like that.

Anyway, getting back to the minister, rather than going down to Toronto, going down to New York, why didn't you approach the province that also has a heritage fund that's got some money in it — quite a bit of money in it — and a province which has been making these funds available to other provinces at slightly less than the current rate? The Premier answering in your absence indicated that no attempt, and I'm going back a couple of weeks, had been made to enter into such discussions with your counterpart in Alberta, and therefore I'll lead off this morning by asking you, have you considered borrowing money from the province of Alberta? If you have considered it have you made any overtures, and if you've made any overtures what sort of a response has there been?

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Chairman, I regret the comments of the member for Thunder Creek about his attitude towards the public servants of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I really don't think it's the place in this Assembly or any other place particularly, for members of the opposition to threaten public servants no matter what level they are at, whether they are senior public servants or otherwise. I want to make that point, Mr. Chairman, because I, as one who has been in this Assembly since 1971 and has had the privilege of being on the Executive Council in a number of departments, have nothing but a great deal of respect for the public service of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Now, it is true, as the member indicates, I did take a trip to New York and Toronto several weeks ago to discuss with various financial people a number of things, mainly the budget which I presented to this Assembly on March 13. That is something we do on a regular basis. I think it is important, not only for this province but for other provinces, to do that on a regular basis, not only in North America but also to do it in the European market as well.

The member asks whether we have made overtures to Alberta to see if we could borrow money from the Alberta Heritage Fund. Well, let me say, Mr. Speaker, we have not, up to now needed to consider the money available out of the Alberta Heritage Fund. The Alberta Heritage Fund provides loan money to provinces which are unable to borrow money in the same way the province of Saskatchewan is able to borrow money because of its financial situation.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Nonsense.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well the member for Regina South says, nonsense. But he should check the record. Mr. Chairman, he should check the criteria applied by Alberta in making that money available. Alberta makes that money available to provinces at the

best provincial rate. Saskatchewan has the best provincial rate. So, therefore, it is of no advantage to borrow from the Alberta Heritage Fund. Also, Mr. Chairman, Alberta provides the money to provinces which cannot get money on loan at the best provincial rate. They need the subsidy; Saskatchewan does not. We think it is appropriate for that money to be available to those provinces which are not in the fortunate situation our province is.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, I think maybe you or some of your officials should do some checking because that is not accurate. If you don't know, then I feel sorry for you. I suppose I should feel sorry for all of us as taxpayers because that is not correct.

First off, when you talk about the best provincial rate, maybe you should check that one out. You have an AA rating just like every other province in this country except one. There are two exceptions to that. There are two provinces with an AAA rating. I just assumed you knew all this, but for your edification, I will refresh your memory. There are two AAA ratings in this country: the province of Alberta and the province of Ontario. Naturally, I would be remiss if I didn't point out both of them are governed by Conservative governments. If you didn't know that, you should have known it. I'm sure they told you in New York, every other province except one in the Maritimes has an AA rating. Your rating is no better than Quebec's. It is no better than B.C.'s. It is no better than Nova Scotia's. It is no better than Manitoba's.

It is not true when you say the province of Alberta would not loan money to the province of Saskatchewan. The point of it is, I don't think you have ever checked. I don't think you have ever made an investigation. There is a reason why. I don't think you could face us, on this side, if you ever had to borrow from Tory Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, I suppose for you to approach the province of Alberta to borrow funds would be the height of degradation for this government. It would be an acknowledgement that Alberta has a heritage fund which functions, one that has liquid reserves in contrast to the one in Saskatchewan which has virtually no reserves, which has probably (if memory serves me correctly from a couple of weeks ago) barely more than \$50 million in it. The balance of it — what's it in? In causeways or bridges? All laudable projects, there's no disputing that, but hardly a liquid asset of any heritage fund; about two-thirds of it into the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, sitting there on an interest-free basis with no repayment schedule, no going rate of interest; almost \$600 million of the Saskatchewan taxpayers' money tied up in that.

You know what interest rates are today. They have escalated dramatically since 1977. They have kept on rising continually until yesterday when they dropped one-quarter per cent. The interest costs on just that equity money on Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is staggering. Thirty years ago just the interest on that money would have run the entire Government of Saskatchewan. So for you to go to Alberta and ask them to borrow some money, would be the height of degradation for your government.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister (you have avoided the question) if you have approached them; have you had any discussions with them, either on an official or an unofficial basis and what is their answer? You skated around the issue last time and I want a yes or a no from you. Have you talked to them?

Have you outlined certain conditions under which Alberta loans money? I wonder whether you really know. From what you have indicated so far I don't think you know very much about those conditions.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, we have seen the rates that Alberta has loaned out of the heritage fund at the time. A direct answer to the member's question is: yes, the deputy minister has discussed this with the deputy provincial treasurer of Alberta, so we have it from the horse's mouth so to speak. I want to point out to the members in the House that Saskatchewan borrows money at lower cost than does the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec in spite of the fact they have AAA ratings (and the member should know that). Every day, Mr. Chairman, our bonds are trading at a better level than Ontario Hydro, which has an AAA rating.

I also want to point out to the House and to the member opposite, Mr. Chairman, that when we talk about the borrowing of money and provincial debt we can compare Saskatchewan to other provinces in other ways as well. We can compare it on the basis of provincial debt. We have the second lowest per capita provincial debt in Canada, Mr. Chairman, second only to Prince Edward Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The member says the Heritage Fund of Saskatchewan is not a real heritage fund. I disagree. The heritage fund of this province is established for a purpose. It's established to stabilize the consolidated fund. We use it for that. It's established to develop the province and we use it for that. I could list, rhyme and verse, the number of projects in northern Saskatchewan — the expansion to the University Hospital, the renovations at the University Hospital and other kinds of things which are being paid out of the heritage fund from the provincial development expenditures. These are real investments for the future of this province and for the generations which will follow us. They are real assets, as well as the assets of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, which will appreciate in value — which unfortunately is not the case with money that you may keep in a tin can as the member obviously suggests we should do with our heritage fund money. So I think it is clear that we invest our money very well.

I want to point out one other thing, because I think it is important. If the member looks at the budget speech on page 29 he will find that I made it clear to the House the cost of Saskatchewan's bond issue last year, 1979, was the lowest yield obtained by any province on a Canadian long-term debt basis in that year, including Canada.

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Chairman, I want to make one brief, one very short comment. I heard the hon. member for Thunder Creek just a few minutes ago enter into these estimates (this committee of finance) by making a charge about a civil servant who sits in this House, by making a suggestion and a threat. Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member — he will not stay and listen to this; he knew what I was going to say; he immediately saw what I was going to say and he will not stay to listen — I believe that is a terrible illustration of what should not take place in an Assembly such as this.

Mr. Chairman, we have a long-standing tradition in our parliamentary system whereby a civil servant is not able to enter into political debate. A civil servant is not able to defend himself or herself against charges such as the hon. member has made. A civil servant is not able to defend himself or herself against threats made by a member of this

legislation or by any politician.

Mr. Chairman, I know the civil servant referred to does not in any way qualify for the description of 'hack'. He is a career civil servant, as are the great majority of civil servants in this province, dedicated to public service. This particular civil servant has worked for other provincial and federal governments in this country in very senior positions and has done a commendable job in those positions.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. members opposite have made these kinds of remarks and threats against public servants on previous occasions and I believe that they should cease making these kinds of comments against civil servants who, they clearly and well know, have no opportunity to defend themselves when they have clear and good defences against those kinds of charges. They have absolutely no opportunity to do so. I believe that not only should the hon. members (including the hon. member for Thunder Creek) stop making these kinds of suggestions but that he should also apologize to the civil servant to whom he directed his remarks very unfairly and without foundation in fact or whatever.

In addition to that I believe the hon. member should apologize to all public servants in this province who are making a dedicated effort to serve the public as committed civil servants who in no way deserve those kinds of comments. I say to you, if you have any respect for the public servants and for the traditional arrangement and situation that exists between civil servants and government, that the hon. member for Thunder Creek should apologize here and now to that public servant and you should apologize to all public servants in this province.

MR. THATCHER: — Well, I'm so pleased to see that the member for Regina Lakeview in the last couple of weeks has had some wheaties, or whatever, and finally has some stomach to get up on his feet and talk — because I never saw anybody take what you took over at DNS and still not have the courage to get up to defend yourself.

I made comments and reference to a specific civil servant who happens to be the deputy minister of finance, who has injected himself into a political debate. He has injected himself into a debate in press articles, which I don't have with me but can get very simply, as to a philosophical use of a heritage fund. I am sure the deputy minister knows to what I make reference. I call that getting into politics. We have no hesitation on this side of the House to say to any civil servant, do your job, stay out of politics, do your best for that government over there. Just stay out of politics and in a non-partisan way serve your minister and serve your government in the best way possible. We have no quarrel with that. That's exactly the way it should be.

But we also say to any other civil servant and I'll say it to that deputy minister again. You get involved in the political arena of debate and you're fair game. When there's a change in government, don't expect to be here under us because you've made your choice. You made your choice. You got involved when you were a deputy minister in politics. Fine, you made your choice; you're here now. You're in the political arena of debate and make no mistake, had you been there if we came into government, you'd have been gone and you knew it. You made your choice; you did it the right way. O.K. I say to that deputy minister, you've made your choice, you've become political. We don't apologize for that.

We say to any civil servant, serve the government of the day in the best way possible and you have nothing but our respect. I have nothing to withdraw from whatsoever. Mr.

Chairman, if we could perhaps return to the subject of finance estimates, having said that, I have nothing to withdraw from anybody. I think I've made a definitive statement as to our position on that subject. But my congratulations to the member for Regina Lakeview for finally getting on his feet. We'll look forward to him in the future.

Mr. Minister, regarding borrowing money from Alberta, which you have disdained. I think you mentioned that Quebec had an AAA rating and I say to you they do not have an AAA rating, they have an AA.

Mr. Minister, I want to challenge one statement of yours and I suggest you listen to this. I want you to show me the specifics of where you borrowed money at a smaller interest rate or less of an interest rate than from the province of Alberta. I think you just misled the House. And I want to see the specifics because if that in effect is true, there are other factors involved. I want a clear and definitive statement on that and I want to see the documentation. I don't believe you.

And while your officials are digging that one out, Mr. Minister, I'd like to ask you about a statement which came from the Department of Finance, I think it was during your absence, when you were in eastern Canada or in New York, whichever. I believe that someone in your department did do a bit of an assessment as to what it would cost or what it would save the province were they to borrow the entire amount of money, you are committing yourself for in this budget, from the province of Alberta. You know, Mr. Minister, that official made a funny statement. He said, if we borrowed all of the money from the province of Alberta, we only save \$9 million, a lousy \$9 million.

Now, of course, Mr. Minister, you can get up and you can say, what's \$9 million in a budget of \$2 billion? But \$9 million is just one heck of a lot of money. You know it's more money than you or I are ever going to make. It's more money than what probably anybody in this Assembly in total is going to make. And therefore, Mr. Minister, I'd like you to tell us about this. Now do you regard the figure of \$9 million as insignificant? That's your own people's assessment. That's their figure. Is \$9 million so insignificant that you can't lower yourself to approach the province of Alberta with their vast billions of dollars in their heritage fund to make a proper deal, the best deal possible for the province of Saskatchewan? Are you telling us that \$9 million is nothing?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all let me make a correction of my comment. The member is right. Quebec does not have an AAA rating and I'm aware of that and I included Quebec with other examples which I was using. The member is right in correcting my comment on the case of the province of Quebec. I'm not aware, in response to the member's question about Alberta, of Alberta borrowing any money in 1979. I also would like to respond to the member's suggestion that some official in the province of Saskatchewan, in one of the departments and I suspect he means the Department of Finance, made a comment about a saving of \$9 million if there were money borrowed from the province of Alberta.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, I said province of Ontario. I didn't say Alberta. When I asked you for that documentation I said Ontario, and that was in reference to where you said Ontario was borrowing at a shorter rate.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — My deputy informs me that if the member wants an Ontario-Saskatchewan comparison, we can provide that and I'll ask my officials to bring it out so he can have that comparison. I can either send it over to him or outline it to him in the

House when we get the information.

But let me come back to the question of the \$9 million that the member indicates some official said would be a saving to Saskatchewan if we borrow from Alberta. I am not aware of who or when an official may have made such a comment. If the member could indicate to me more precisely and more specifically, I would be pleased to pursue it.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, you made the comment in the Assembly that you were borrowing money last year. Your department with an AA rating was borrowing money at less cost to you, at less cost of an interest rate than was the province of Ontario, and I challenged you to show us. Show me the issue, the bond issue, the one from Ontario Hydro to which you are making reference and the issue that you are comparing it to. Let's compare the interest rate. I say they don't exist. Let's see them. You say that with your AA credit rating you are borrowing money at less cost than the province of Ontario. I don't believe you. I want to see it right now. I don't want to see it sometime after this session is over. You made a statement. I don't believe it to be true. Let's see it. You have enough department people here, get them out here and get it over here. Let's see the copy of the bond issues.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How long does it take to get the ink dry?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I stand by my comment. It's accurate, and I hope the member will be patient while we get the information here. It'll be here. Mr. Chairman, I have no problem in providing the information to the member opposite. He shouldn't exercise himself so greatly about it because he knows that in the past I have always provided that kind of information and I have no reservation of doing it now and as soon as we have it, you'll get it.

MR. THATCHER: — I trust that will be before the session is over, Mr. Minister. Pardon me if I . . .

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Certainly. I'm a very cooperative fellow. I will give it to him today.

MR. THATCHER: — Regarding your \$9 million — that's a published report; I think it came from information services and was published in the Leader-Post that they would save \$9 million by going to Alberta. Maybe we could find that other . . . If he's not too busy listening to tapes of radio stations, maybe Mr. Hinds could give you a copy of the release although he is probably down there listening to his tape-recorders.

Mr. Minister, you have gone to great lengths to pat yourself on the back for balancing your budget this year, and were this true I suppose we on this side should pat you on the back. Mr. Minister, would you agree that this year our economy is on a bit of a down turn, optimistic as you may be in Saskatchewan that we are going to remain untouched by any subsequent recessions?

The fact that the Americans are very definitely going into a recession, regrettably drags all of us into it in one form or another and I don't think I'm making any dramatic statement there. I think that's a sad fact most of the western world has to face that ultimately we do follow the American economy in one form or another. Mr. Minister, since the Americans are probably already into a recession and since, as you look around Saskatchewan or Canada or anywhere else, probably we are just on the fringe of it (I don't say that as a criticism of your government; I say that as just simply basic

common sense) would the minister not agree that the past three to four years this government has made some very unfortunate errors in their mode of financing?

Mr. Minister, since 1975 your government (and I acknowledge that there were different ministers of finance) had never balanced a budget. Now, I am sure the minister recalls, and I am sure most members in this Assembly recall that 1975 to 1979 were probably reasonably good years in the province of Saskatchewan as far as the normal economic indicators are concerned. When you look at the level of construction, the agricultural conditions, etc., the normal economic indicators would rate those as pretty good years. And yet, Mr. Minister, your government chosen not to balance the budget. In each one of these years you chose to spend more than what you took in in revenues.

Mr. Minister, would you not agree that this year you are more or less contradicting the fiscal philosophy that was put forward during those years by balancing your budget? (We'll discuss that balancing act a little bit later). In other words, Mr. Minister, would you not agree that had those ministers of finance balanced their budget and in fact brought in a modest surplus in those four years that you could have balanced it this year with a great deal less difficulty than you did? In other words, would you agree that with economic conditions being what they were the last four years your predecessors should have balanced the budget — could have balanced it, should have balanced it, and in fact even accumulated surpluses on which you could have drawn this year? If you care to respond to that we'll move on.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I'm please to respond to the member's question. Indeed, we could have balanced the budgets between 1975 and 1979. There's no question about that. But you know that would have meant very severely cutting back on essential services. Now I know that some other provinces chose to do that and I'm not going to be critical of those other provinces. They make their decisions in their jurisdictions as they best see fit. I can use the example of the province of Manitoba which made some very severe and serious cutbacks in essential services in order to be able to not even balance their budget. I want to further point out to you and to the House that had we balanced the budget and not run those small deficits during that period of four years, we would not have been stimulating our economy to the extent we stimulated it. That in turn would have meant the growth which took place in Saskatchewan would not have taken place, and that in turn would have meant very likely in 1979-1980 we would not be in the position in which we can balance the budget without cutting back on the services and increase very substantially the funding to some sectors — and I use the most obvious example, the almost 14 per cent increase of funding to our hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, historically this province has always balanced its budget over a period of time and we're maintaining that tradition and that practice. As the member indicates, up until 1976 the province had an accumulated surplus (the member didn't indicate that, but I want to point out to him) of \$111 million. Since that time Saskatchewan has had relatively small deficits. The member did point that out. These deficits were incurred during a period of slower revenue growth with the objective of maintaining essential programs. We were not prepared to make drastic cuts in some of those programs in health care, social services and education which we think we should maintain the level of.

It is the policy of this government to balance expenditures and revenues over the economic cycle. The fact that we had four years of modest deficits, after four years of accumulating some surpluses and resulting in this budget with a balance, substantiates

the wisdom of that policy we have been following. You can carry the argument further and say that even though we have had modest deficits for four fiscal years on the consolidated fund because of the funding in the heritage fund, and because of the money that is being used for investment purposes and so on, we indeed — if you take the two fronts together — have never had a deficit, in fact we have always had a surplus.

MR. THATCHER: — Well, Mr. Minister, that was rather a pathetic indictment of your government's fiscal policies over the past four years. As I look at your heritage fund and what's in your consolidated fund in cash, I can't help thinking that after four bushel quotas for four years my father left more money in the liquor fund than you have in your heritage fund or your consolidated fund. Honestly!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — You know, Mr. Minister, you didn't even balance the budget this year. Let's discuss your balanced budget this year. What exactly did you do in order to bring in this balanced budget? You simply took money out of the heritage fund in contrast to last year, when revenues were normally paid from the heritage fund to the consolidated fund and then paid out, which showed as a budgetary expense, you simply paid them out of the heritage fund this year. By doing that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What's wrong with that? says the minister. I'll tell you. The difference is by doing that, they don't show it as a budgetary cash outflow. That's the difference. They don't show as an outflow from the consolidated fund. And that's what this whole thing is about.

Mr. Minister, I'll refer you to age 37. Maybe you've heard of things such as budgetary cash inflows, budgetary cash outflows. If it's not shown as a budgetary cash outflow from the consolidated fund, it's not shown in this budget. It's taken strictly out of the heritage fund. And here's where you did it. Under budgetary cash outflows, for example, capital: for 1979-80, you took \$150 million as a capital outflow. You showed it. This year, for 1980-81, you're showing a decrease. You're only showing \$146 million going out in this fiscal year — a decrease of \$3 million. Where's that gone from?

Well, I'll show you where it's gone from, Mr. Minister, because last year, in budgetary 1979-80, you took 82.5 per cent of heritage fund revenues and placed them in the consolidated fund. Get last year's budget if you don't believe me. I'm sorry the former minister isn't here. But you took 82.5 per cent of your heritage fund revenues and placed it in . . . Well, the minister's shaking his head.

Give me a copy of the budget. You got last year's budget? While he's digging it out, they're saying, no, sir. Do I have to table your own document for you? Find that for me, where it says 82.5 per cent. The minister's shaking his head, saying, no, sir. That's not true. I'll teach them. All right. Perhaps the minister could go to his last year's budget. From page 55 — the circle here — 82.5 per cent to the dividend into the consolidated fund. Well, Mr. Attorney General, if you would like to get into this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Why? Do you want to be the Minister of Finance?

The minister shakes his head and says, no, we didn't put 82.5 per cent of heritage fund revenues into the consolidated fund last year. I'm glad that the deputy minister's showing him a few facts right now. All right, maybe you've acknowledged that point by now.

This year, instead of taking 82.5 per cent of heritage fund revenues, you only took 60

per cent. What did you do with that other 22.5 per cent? Well, I can see that courageous member from Regina Lakeview in his usual spot on his backside sitting down chirping. I invite you to get into this debate. You've been in with your one favorite line. I'll look forward to you getting up there and I advise you to have your wheaties in the morning.

Mr. Minister, here's how you balanced that budget, pure and simple. Instead of taking that additional 22.5 per cent of heritage fund revenues and placing it into the consolidated fund where it had to be recorded as a budgetary cash outflow, you simply made those payments directly out of the heritage fund where they don't show as a cash outflow. In other words, Mr. Minister, that illusion of a balanced budget is nothing more than that. An illusion, a mirage.

Now that your deputy minister, I'm sure, has shown you about the 82.5 per cent which you were shaking your head about, I'll sit down and I want you to tell me. I want you to admit you didn't balance the budget, you just did a little bit of bureaucratic gibbertygash.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We are here in a debate on the difference between apples and oranges, because the member has either not read what page 55 of the budget speech says or is deliberately trying to ignore some things that it says. Mr. Speaker, the graph and the pie chart shown there talk about estimated budgetary expenditures out of the heritage fund. True, 82.5 per cent of the budgetary expenditures of the heritage fund was used for the consolidated fund, but only 63 per cent of the revenues to the heritage fund was used for the purposes of a dividend to the heritage fund. I wish the member would look carefully before he makes his speeches and asks questions about what it is he is talking about. He is talking about the expenditures and he is calling them a percentage of revenues. There is no way you can compare those kinds of apples and oranges.

MR. THATCHER: — Oh, yes, there is, because we're not talking apples and oranges, we're talking straight oranges here. You cannot deny this, pure and simple. You have paid more money, far more money, on a percentage basis directly out of the heritage fund to a variety of projects than you did last year. I make the same statement, you have balanced your budget simply by accounting techniques by paying funds directly from the heritage fund into that specific project. Many of these were capital projects. Rather than funneling them through the consolidated fund, because the moment you go through that consolidated fund it shows up as an outflow, in order to balance your budget you simply pay it directly out of the heritage fund.

Mr. Minister, that brings into play the ramifications of a bill before this Assembly bringing about changes to the heritage fund act. We want to serve notice to you that we regard this to be one of the more serious bills on the order paper today. We believe the heritage fund is in a loose, unregulated form at this time. We do not believe you should be able to simply, by statutory declaration, take money from the heritage fund. We believe that any funds coming from the heritage fund should go through this Assembly, not as a statutory vote but as a full scale debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Does it in Alberta?

MR. THATCHER: — Yes, that's true in Alberta; yes it does. Mr. Minister, we're saying the amendments which you have before us — changes to the heritage fund — are serious and with ramifications that go far beyond what appears to be the case and what you're

presenting to be the case. We say it is a very dangerous principle for the heritage fund revenues, which are the revenues of non-renewable resources, in other words, our capital. When you start spending those revenues it's like spending a portion of revenue from your house. It's like a farmer, in order to pay day-to-day expenses, selling off land. It catches up with you.

These resources are non-renewable. Who knows when we're going to run out of them. Certainly the increase in price of some of our resources is going to carry you for a while, but we all know that our oil resources in this province and elsewhere are going to diminish. As you squander these resources on day-to-day expenditures, it is a dangerous, dangerous precedent. We say that you've done it in the past, we say you're doing it just as much now as you ever did in the past. However now you're doing it a little more dangerously because you're paying day-to-day expenses, day-to-day capital grants, directly from the heritage fund instead of at least recording them in a proper, responsible manner by going through the consolidated fund.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, let me point out something which I think the press and the members in the House should know. The member opposite talks about the money in our heritage fund being loosely spent and being unregulated. Well that's just not the case. It's just not true, Mr. Chairman. Every cent of money which goes to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund is voted in this legislature. The member may talk about statutory — he may want to put any title he likes on it, but the fact of the matter is that if he would take the time to read the legislation and the estimate book, he would find that all of the funding in the heritage fund which is going to be spent has to be voted by the legislature in this session.

Mr. Chairman, there is a difference. They use the Alberta Heritage Fund for comparison purposes. Let me point out to the House that in Alberta 70 per cent of the non-renewable resource revenues they receive never gets to the heritage fund. It goes to the consolidated fund. Mr. Chairman, 100 per cent of the non-renewable resource revenue in Saskatchewan goes straight to the heritage fund and then it is reallocated as decided by the government and the treasury benches, and then as considered and decided by the government and the treasury benches, and then as considered and voted on in this legislature by the members who are here. It is pointed out to me that if the members wish to become informed about it they should look on page 121 of the Estimates and it is all there.

Now I want to point out something else. The member indicates there is some funding of the heritage fund (some of the revenue of the heritage fund) which is used to pay for certain capital developments. I don't apologize for that. Once again, if anyone opposite would take the time to read the legislation he would find that within the legislation which establishes the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund there is a provision for money out of the heritage fund to be used for provincial development expenditures. I am prepared to defend that, as every member on this side of the House is prepared to defend it, because we believe (as I indicated earlier) that we should be using non-renewable resource revenues today to develop this province for the future and for those generations which will come after us.

That doesn't mean only taking the money out of the heritage fund and putting it into a bank account. That would be ludicrous. Anybody who knows anything about investment — and the member for Regina South knows a great deal about it — would say it does not make sense to leave your money sitting in the bank. He won't disagree that if you can invest it in some real assets, if you can use it as we do for provincial development expenditures on projects such as the expansion to the University Hospital

or the renovation of the University Hospital, certain resource and recreation development, roads into the North, then you are using that money for a good investment for the future. It will benefit not only each and every one of us and the people we represent now, but it will be of considerable benefit to the next generation and the generation which comes after it. And that's a good investment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Well, Mr. Minister, I suppose there is certainly some logic in what you are saying. In today's sort of economy perhaps it is foolish to leave money in a bank with the ravages of inflation and perhaps investment should be made into real things. Very respectfully, Mr. Minister, I point out to you that there is quite a difference as to what sorts of investments you make.

We all know that our resources are going to run out ultimately or that the revenues derived from our resources are going to diminish sharply, barring some dramatic change in technology. Where do we sit when that happens, Mr. Minister? Where does the next generation sit? Because you build a tax base on natural resources which all of a sudden isn't there. What have we done with many of the windfall revenues that we've had during the decade of the '70s? What can we say we've accomplished with it? Well, we're buying back our own land— and that we've already had — we're buying it back. The government's buying it back. The land was there and it was producing; it's still there and it's still producing. We bought it back. What did that do? We're buying back potash mines that were there and producing. They were producing revenues for the government. All right, so now we can say we own it. But still, they were there before. Is that wise use of our resources?

What has really happened in this province, Mr. Minister? What can we do well? We might as well face it. General Motors is never going to be building their cars in Regina or Saskatoon. I doubt that Ford will be either. I doubt if John Deere's going to be manufacturing their heavy line of farm equipment in Regina or Saskatoon.

Mr. Minister, the thing we can do well and the area in which your government has broken down completely is in the area of setting up a climate and an atmosphere for secondary development, secondary industry and I use for example, feedlots. Here we are, we've got the cattle out here, we have the grain out here and the feedlot industry has all but disappeared from the province of Saskatchewan. Because the feedlot industry has gone the packing business has pretty well gone. What have we got? We've got two packers operating in Saskatchewan now — major ones, only one of them which kills hogs. There's another one. We've chased the hog industry right out of Saskatchewan. Frankly, if it were not for the Hutterite Brethren there probably wouldn't be any hogs, period. I don't know what percentage that the Hutterite Brethren are now putting out, but the percentage grows dramatically year after year. Take them out of there and you don't have anything purporting to be a hog industry. The feedlot industry is gone. These are areas in which we can and should be doing well. What has your government done? Zero; you bought the land back and bought the mines back.

Mr. Minister, our province, down the road 20 years — long after you and I are past tense, politically anyway — is making no provision for that day when we do not have these vast revenues generated by our non-renewable resources. This obsession with buying back what we already have is hardly making any sort of a provision for the future. We're not in any way, shape or form doing anything to provide that alternate tax base, those alternate jobs which are going to be necessary when the day of reckoning must

April 18, 1980

ultimately come. You know, Mr. Minister, just one little item that was brought to my attention is that your government is going to take \$55 million and make a loan to the Saskatchewan Grain Car Department of Agriculture to the corporation for the repayment of the loan. Mr. Minister, I'd like a clarification on that.

First, I'd like to know what the repayment schedule is for that \$55 million. Now from the Department of Agriculture, from the minister's revenue for this year, you're taking \$6 million which is going to go to the corporation, and then go back to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund. Mr. Minister, do I interpret you correctly to say that the entire \$55 million going to the hopper cars (and I acknowledge the usefulness of the hopper cars), in contrast to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — which has no repayment schedule, probably will never pay back any funds to the heritage fund, is paying no interest to the heritage fund for their revenue — is going to have to be paid back? Now do I interpret you correctly on that?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, it's important to make the point that hopper cars will depreciate over time. The value of the potash corporation will grow. The value of the potash corporation and the potash mines will grow over a period of time. But let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that there are other benefits we have been able to accrue to the province of Saskatchewan and its people which the member should recognize.

Where were the employees in the head offices of the potash corporation before the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation was established? The member for Regina South says, ah! Well, where were they? I'd like the members opposite to stand up in this House, Mr. Chairman, and say to the members here and say to the public of Saskatchewan how they, if they had been a government, would have brought about such a development. I'd like them to say that and I challenge them to say that because I know they cannot; it would never have happened. Some 200 head office jobs now existing in the province of Saskatchewan were, previously to the establishment of the potash corporation, existing mostly out of this country, but everywhere else than in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the heritage fund has invested \$418 million into the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Now, the return, Mr. Chairman, because of the profit of the potash corporation in 1979 has been 18.7 per cent for a profit of \$78 million. Now, the members opposite say, it's a bad investment because the mines were here. That's true. Indeed, those mines were here and they're still here. The difference is, Mr. Chairman, had it not been for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan that \$78 million, which is the profit of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, would have gone out of the province of Saskatchewan to the head offices of the companies that own the potash mines before the potash corporation was established.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That is the difference and I guess that's the difference between the philosophy of the members opposite and our philosophy. And I don't argue that. We ought to have some differences. That's why they're over there and we're over here. But, we will stand by our position on the development of our resources because we think it is the right way to go.

Let me just point out some statistics which I think will be of some interest. Through SaskOil we are involved in the development of our heavy oil deposits, and not just

SaskOil but the private sector, hopefully Petro-Canada with the federal government. WE have in Saskatchewan a vast deposit of heavy oil. It is estimated that something in the area of 15 billion to 20 billion barrels is in place. Now that's a pretty good investment to make sure that we are assuring for Saskatchewan farmers oil is developed, so they have an assured supply in the future. And that was our argument with the previous federal government. The members know very well the attitude of the previous federal government toward the price of oil and toward putting an 18 cent excise tax on it and the likes of that.

The federal government as it was then (and we are now speaking to the present federal government) ignored the need to develop this heavy oil deposit. We're prepared to make a commitment to it and we did that with the establishment of the energy security division in the heritage fund.

The member for Thunder Creek says potash is a bad investment. I just indicated why it was a good investment. Let me give one more argument. The potash reserves in Saskatchewan are estimated at 70 billion to 80 billion tons. That's 40 per cent of the world's potash reserves and this should sustain production for several thousand years.

Now Mr. Chairman, I don't agree with the members opposite that the climate for investment in Saskatchewan is not a good climate. I think it is. If it were such a bad climate, why would Northern Telecom make the announcement it made along with the Minister of Economic Development in Saskatoon that it will establish a major plant in Saskatchewan? That's a secondary industry and we're most pleased to have it. I notice that even the Leader of the Conservative Party joined with us in welcoming the establishment of Northern Telecom. What he needs to do, Mr. Chairman, is tell the members who sit in this House that he thinks it is a good idea so they will support his position. IPSCO is expanding. We have had, since 1971, the establishment and expansion of quite a large number of small farm manufacturers in Saskatchewan from Degelman's to Schulte Industries in Englefeld. Doepker Industries in Annaheim and some little manufacturers across the south of the province. So I think the record speaks for itself. We have had a lot of catching up to do in this province. We have had to overcome certain disadvantages we have had and to some degree continue to have because of misguided policies with regard to transportation and other things by both Conservative and Liberal federal governments in Ottawa. We are continuing to try to get those things resolved and because the climate (as the Financial Post Conference in Saskatoon indicated, to a man, to all those who were there from across North America) is a good one in Saskatchewan; we are getting some results.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — I wonder if the minister would explain to the farmers of Saskatchewan, particularly at this time when we have farmers selling off quarters of land to find enough operating capital to put another crop in, why SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation), Saskatchewan Potash Corporation, and others have been getting literally hundreds of millions of dollars at zero interest with no repayment schedule but when you go to buy hopper cars for your Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation (something to do with the agricultural sector in Saskatchewan) you set up a repayment schedule and you force the agricultural community to pay for these things while in every other sector you are dumping money in like a drunken sailor?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, let me point something out. Money invested in

the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation will return a profit that will benefit the Saskatchewan farmers as it does any other citizen in Saskatchewan. The cars that the Grain Car Corporation of Saskatchewan has ordered will be leased to the railways at no cost. That is of assistance to the farmers, just to get grain moving. For the Saskatchewan farmer (and this is what he appreciates, I would like to tell the member) it could make it possible (in our estimation) to gain a revenue because he is now going to be able to move that much more grain at an additional \$150 million a year. That is where the benefit is and it is a good one. It is no secret (and the members opposite will agree because I have heard them quote it in speeches they have made, as we have made) that in 1979 the Saskatchewan farmer lost, in revenue which he should have had if he had been able to move his grain, something in the area of \$250 million. The member says, half. Fine, if he wants to use the half, I am prepared to agree with him that it is half.

I think, Mr. Chairman, he supports my argument that the purchase of the hopper cars by the grain car corporation will help move some of that grain. The province of Alberta has made a commitment to 1,000 cars because prior to that they wouldn't move; the province of Manitoba made a commitment to leasing 400 or 500 hopper cars; and the former federal government made a commitment to leasing 400 or 500 hopper cars. The present federal government is talking about reducing that number, and I think that's unfortunate. In fact, I think it's despicable, but overall, there is going to be a major benefit to the Saskatchewan farmer because of that.

Now, I know it is not my role to ask the opposition a question, but he asks me to explain (and I've tried to do that) why we are doing what we are doing. I would like him to explain the position of the Conservative caucus when they say on the one hand, when the member for Thunder Creek is in the House, that we should not take money out of the heritage fund for the consolidated fund, then he leaves and the member for Souris-Cannington gets up and says we should take money out of the heritage fund because that's where the money for Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation and SaskOil is coming from. We should take some of that money and we should put it in the consolidated fund. Please be consistent! Tell us what your position is.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Chairman, the minister touched on almost everything except the question. The question quite simply was why every other sector gets interest-free, no repayment schedule money but the agricultural sector in Saskatchewan is expected to repay the \$50 million and I understand, at the rate of \$6 million a year? Why agriculture, particularly at this time when agriculture is hurting, not only in Saskatchewan, but right across the prairies?

Before you damage yourself patting yourself on the back, I would like to table some pictures I took last weekend while I was at home for the Minister of Agriculture to look at. What they are, are grain hopper cars. Oh my goodness, there's one which has the Manitoba crest on it; Manitoba crest, and there it is sitting at the Patterson elevator in Carievale, Saskatchewan. I think we should applaud the efforts of the Manitoba government for helping to move our Saskatchewan grain. I would like to table these for the Minister of Agriculture. They are moving the grain; that's what counts. And when that lease is done there will be another one and another one. Where are your cars? They haven't even cranked out the welder yet to glue them together. I'm not sure we can trust you birds any more than we can trust those turkeys in Ottawa that are backing off their commitments.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I will be speaking on this argument a lot more a little

later on because some of my colleagues have several questions they want to ask. However, for the benefit of the Minister of Finance, on the subject my colleague for Thunder Creek brought up (and that is the heritage fund and the appropriation of those funds), I would just like to tell the minister how we would handle it, where we say you are wrong, where we say you are juggling the figures to make your budget balance.

You attempt to balance them with deception, if you want. For example, in your heritage fund composition of assets there is \$123.7 million exactly due from the consolidated fund.

The member for Thunder Creek mentioned the grain cars. If you are going to be repaying them from the consolidated fund or the loan of \$55 million, why not take it from there in the first place? I'll tell you why and I'll answer the question. It's very simple. You wouldn't be able to balance your budget if you took it from there in the first place. So why would you take it from the heritage fund, then repay it from the consolidated fund? If that isn't correct, then you correct me. Because in your budget, you are indicating a \$6 million (I think it is \$6 million) repayment from the consolidated fund. That doesn't make any sense. You can answer that one and I will get back up.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, can I ask the member if he is saying, why do you not take money out of the heritage fund and then repay it out of the consolidated fund?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, that's what you are doing. I am asking you why you are doing it?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, simply put, because it's a capital item which should be financed over a period of years, rather than financing it all in one lump sum. We are taking money out of the heritage fund; we are putting it into the Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation. Over a period of time when all of the arrangements have been worked out, that money will be repaid out of the consolidated fund. That in itself is a very substantial, very important and necessary subsidy (if the member wants to call it that) to the Saskatchewan farmer. We think it is important because one of the major problems faced by the Saskatchewan farmer today, among others, is the fact that our transportation system, because of neglect and lack of attention by federal governments of both stripes — Conservative and Liberal — is in a very sorry state. I think there are all kinds of figures around, including figures which the members have indicated, which show that to be the case.

We have made a commitment as a province of Saskatchewan, which to a large extent is an agricultural province, to try to do our part and our share to assist and bring a change in that transportation system so the farmer can move his grain, so he can meet that projection of increased sales by 1985 which the Canadian Wheat Board has been saying is going to happen.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I keep hearing a lot of double talk from this government and from that minister and I just heard it again. The fact of the matter is, you say it is a capital expenditure; you have hundreds of millions of dollars of capital expenditures in the consolidated fund. What is so different about this one? Yes we agree that it is a worthwhile project. Yes we agree that it should be taken out of the heritage fund and placed in that area but not repaid out of the consolidated fund. What you are attempting to do is juggle the books. Take it out of the one but you haven't enough money, so you take it out of the other, then repay it back from that fund. Now that doesn't make any sense.

You talk about a heritage fund. Will you look at what you have? You keep saying you have \$915 million in assets. You don't have \$915 million in assets. You have \$50 million in liquid cash and that's all you have; that's all you will ever have at the rate you are going.

We have a suggestion for you and we have said it before. How do you handle our heritage fund? Look at Alberta and you will see what kind of heritage fund you can really have. You made the comment earlier today that I agree that you place your money where the best . . . I think you said you don't put your money in the bank. I have never said that. What I will say is, you put your money to obtain the best return, both in dollars and in service. That's where you place your money. You don't use it for ongoing expenses as you are doing with the heritage fund today. When you talk about \$123 million due from the consolidated fund, that is nothing but ordinary expenditures out of that fund. When you talk about \$53 million of the provincial expenditure fund, take a look at those expenditures; they are no different from all kinds of expenditures you have under the capital expenditures of the different departments of the government.

What is the difference between one highway and another highway? You have capital expenditures on your highways of \$93 million, yet in the heritage fund — highways and transportation, causeways, airport, northern Highway No. 106, No. 155, No. 2 — over \$8.5 million. What is the difference between one highway and another one? Why an expenditure called a provincial expenditure on one hand and a consolidated fund, capital expenditure on the other hand? You are juggling the books on the heritage fund and the consolidated fund, you will never have a heritage fund at the rate you are going and you will never balance your consolidated fund if you use the proper accounting in your consolidated fund.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — First of all, let me say to the member, Mr. Chairman, that the northern roads which he mentions are unique to the extent that they are northern roads related to resource development. Mr. Chairman, in order for that resource development to take place, there has to be the development of certain infrastructure. There has to be the development and the capability of providing certain transportation systems and, therefore, that is a legitimate expenditure out of the provincial development expenditure portion of the heritage fund. That is not any different, Mr. Chairman, than expenditures out of the Alberta Heritage Fund and I use the example because they use the comparison, which they make for medical centres, which they make for Syncrude. We could debate that one for a little while too.

But the fact of the matter is that moneys which we are appropriating through provincial development expenditure portion of the heritage fund to things like the engineering building in Saskatoon, to the veterinary college building at the University of Saskatchewan, to the roads for northern development, to the University Hospital in Saskatoon as well, to the La Ronge aircraft maintenance facility, are all related to the development of this province, not only for today but for the future as well and most of them are related to the development of our resource potential of which we have such a large amount in this province.

And that resource development has made a very significant impact on the revenues to the Provincial Treasury of Saskatchewan from some \$33 million in 1971-72 to well over \$600 million of non-renewable resource revenues alone in 1980-1981. And it's that kind of development this government since 1971 has encouraged, and not only encouraged but made sure that the people of Saskatchewan have received a fair return

from the development of those resources, a much better return than you will see happening in most other provinces where they do not use the approach we use as a government in this province.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — It astounds me, the logic that is used by the minister when he talks about development of a mine and that's why the highway is going to be built and that's why the capital expenditure comes from the heritage fund. Well, I also would like to remind the minister that a highway to a potash mine in Esterhazy or one in Lanigan or anywhere else also provides transportation to a mine and development the same way as it does to a uranium mine in the North. But I also would like to remind the minister that not only will it develop the mines in the North but it will also develop tourism. It will develop forestry and fishing and the fur marketing industry and a number of other industries and areas. So I still say to the minister that you are juggling the books to make your figures balance.

Alberta uses 30 per cent of its heritage fund for the future; 70 per cent goes for the ordinary expenditures of the government; 30 per cent is retained. We suggest to you that is what this government should be looking at for the development of the future resources of this province. When are we going to see natural gas distribution in this province on the scale we see in Alberta, as an example? Where could that money be going? That's the kind of heritage that we can leave to the future generations of this province, to develop our agricultural industry in this province which this government has done absolutely nothing about, as evidence of which we have lost 8,000 farmers since you have come to power in 1971. That's where your 30 per cent of heritage fund money should be going; to develop the resources, to develop the agricultural and the renewable resources of this province, but you don't seem to have any interest in that area. You look at the tourism budget we just approved yesterday in this House. A crying shame! A crying shame for the size of that budget! The Attorney General's department is twice as big. It gets twice as much money as tourism (something that could develop the future of this province) does. But you pay very little attention to that. The fact of the matter is that with all your non-renewable resources in this province, you are still screwing up. That is a fact. I hope that isn't unparliamentary language, Mr. Chairman. If it is, I withdraw that remark.

The fact of the matter is that until you think about the future of this province, the agricultural sector and the renewable resources, and start paying attention to that and stop pouring the kind of money you have into potash and uranium mines, then you're not going to have anything.

You talk about a profit in the potash industry. Well, let me tell you how much money you lost last year in the potash industry. You lost \$43 million in the potash industry last year. You didn't make \$43 million, you lost that much money. How did you lose that? Had that money been invested in the renewable resource sector, that's the kind of money you would have made and benefited from. But if you'd take a true accounting of the investment you have in the potash industry, you will find as I did that your loss was \$43 million.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Let me first of all, Mr. Chairman, speak to the last comment of the member in the opposition, the hon. finance critic. He says the potash corporation in 1979 lost \$43 million. I don't agree. In fact the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in 1979, as well as paying the royalties and other charges that any other potash corporation pays to the provincial treasury and the heritage fund, earned a net profit of \$78 million. In 1979 the potash corporation had a profit of \$78 million, Mr. Chairman.

The member opposite is obviously challenging the auditor's report provided by Winspear and Higgins, probably as credible an accounting firm as there is anywhere . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . As of June? The whole 1979 profit was \$78 million, that's what I'm saying. I indicated this in the budget speech and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has been the Crown corporations committee. I think it has been there and it was discussed there. I'm sure the minister in charge indicated what the profit in 1979 of the potash corporation was, as supported by Winspear and Higgins and also by the provincial auditor who signed the document which supports the Winspear and Higgins . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Let me finish, Mr. Member . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — If you're insisting on that \$78 million, will you send over your figures on that because the annual report shows \$46 million, I believe.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Once again, Mr. Chairman, the opposition is using tactics to mislead and to misinterpret. The member opposite is talking about the report which ends in the fiscal year of June 1979 and he tries to use that \$46 million profit and said I was not \$78 million as I announced in the budget. That's what you're saying. If the member read the budget carefully or if he would listen, he would know that I said the profit of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan for the year 1979 — the calendar year — was \$78 million. I invite you to look at the budget speech and you will see it's pretty clearly stated there and should be not subject to misinterpretation.

Mr. Chairman, let me make one point about the amount of resource revenues in Saskatchewan which go for the consolidated fund. In Alberta, as the member says, 70 per cent of non-renewable resource money is used for consolidated fund expenditures. In Saskatchewan the dividend for consolidated fund purposes is only 60 per cent. So the member opposite is trying to make the argument that somehow you should not be using this money for the purposes of consolidated fund expenditures. He also has to accept the argument that because we are allocating only 60 per cent as a dividend to the consolidated fund expenditures and because Alberta (which does not even put that 70 per cent into their heritage fund in the first place) is spending 70 per cent, we're doing a heck of a lot better job than the province of Alberta is.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, you talk about misleading and not wanting to mislead, Mr. Minister. May I just refer you to page 27 of your budget. In this Assembly whenever we have talked about years, we've talked about fiscal years, not calendar years. If you're going to juggle your figures to that extent, I say to you we have a serious problem. The report I received was dated to the end of June 1979. That's what we take as the year 1979. If you are going to change the figures around to suit your purpose, then we have a serious problem. It says, and I will read it to you:

These statements indicate that in 1979 the Potash Corporation recorded a profit of \$78 million.

Mr. Chairman, 1979 — it doesn't say calendar year. We go by fiscal year in the Assembly whenever we talk about statements. Since when did we start splitting them up?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, we have a case again of apples and oranges. Although the provincial government operates on the basis of a fiscal year, which is from April to March, the Crown corporations don't necessarily operate on the fiscal year. I think that the budget speech is pretty clear on page 27. (I thank the member for reading

it. I was going to do it and now I don't have to). It's pretty clear when it says that the profit for 1979 of the potash corporation was \$78 million. Now, I'm sorry the member misunderstood that. I don't know how I could have made it any more clear. But I think anyone who would read this budget speech would have interpreted it as the profits for the year 1979. There's no doubt about that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You show me, in your budget speech or any other documents that you provide in this House, where you have ever used a different year than the reported year of that corporation or of the fiscal year of this government. Now, that's absolute nonsense. In Crown corporations we have asked for quarterly statements and we're told they're not available. How come they're available for your information and when you want to make it look good in your budget speech? That's the reason for the \$78 million. You talk about a \$46 million profit that existed from July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979. Now you're going to dissect that and change that around. Now you're going to take six months of one fiscal year and six months of another fiscal year and put it into your budget as \$78 million. How can we even prove these figures when we don't have a statement to scrutinize. That is sheer nonsense and you know it.

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — I say to the Minister of Finance, I definitely agree with the member for Thunder Creek and the member for Regina South, that you have been playing around with these figures to balance this budget. I definitely agree with them.

I am going to get into a different line of questioning, Mr. Minister. The questions I am going to ask you . . . but then there isn't much sense asking them, because it doesn't seem like he is listening to me. The questions I am about to ask you are the grass-roots questions asked by people every day. I am not going to get into these big figures. You are the Minister of Finance and this province, in the last few months, has brought itself to the same as the rest of Canada and the United States) a disastrous situation. The economy has fallen down badly. The government has overspent; the people have overspent. You have balanced the budget, but was it the right year to balance the budget? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just let me get through. I say this province is getting itself in the same position as it was back in 1934.

MR. ROMANOW: — Those were PC days back then.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I was born then and you weren't, Mr. Attorney General. The PCs were not in power then, the Progressives were and we have nothing to do with the Progressives. I say we are the Progressive Conservative Party.

I say to the minister, that's exactly what happened to them, as a recession and a depression (which are two different things) came about with no one in the province being able to do anything about it. But now we can do something about it, Mr. Minister. We know it's coming. They say all across North America we are entering into a recession. We have to do something about it, but we have to start at the beginning with government spending. I see you have balanced your budget, but I say maybe, Mr. Minister, before you have my questions answered, you may have to unbalance that budget. You are going to have to come up with some more money some place, or else put it in a different place.

You must know, Mr. Minister, what has happened to the farm economy in the last couple of months. Not it wasn't that way when you made the budget up. When you

balanced this budget (you probably started making that budget up months ago) we all agree that perhaps we weren't in this state of recession that we are now. In the last few months, what has happened? Farmers are going broke every day. Don't just say we are to blame on this side of the House; there are 44 of you over there who have them going broke every day. Construction workers are going broke. Hog farmers are going broke. There are people losing their homes in this city and all cities in this province.

I say it is right in the hands of the finance minister to do something about it. We stand up here during question period and we ask the Minister of Agriculture and we ask the Minister of Rural Affairs but they can't do a thing about it because you hold the purse strings. When in Ottawa, who is responsible when a situation is bad? You and the Premier (you are the big ones in this province) have to come up with an answer to what is to be done in this province. Never mind what they are doing in Ontario or Alberta or Manitoba or in the States. We have to do something here to save our people from utter disaster.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! Order please. Might I just say to all members, I think we could get along much better with less help from those who are not on their feet participating in the debate. I think you are all elected here by your people to act as responsible members and it would certainly expedite the proceedings of the legislature and in this case the estimates of finance. The member for arm River.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a few more remarks before I go into my line of questioning, if you think this isn't serious, what we're into this province this last month. I have made it my business and so has the member for Milestone; we've been contacting our banks in our local areas to see just how bad this situation is. In my own area, I have contacted eight banks. Some of them won't give you information and some of them will but eight banks did and said that 65 per cent to 70 per cent of the farmers of the communities are running their farms on operating loans. They said 68 per cent in the Milestone area and I'm not saying which bank. Now, I'll tell you, if interest at 18 per cent and 20 per cent . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who set it?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Now never mind getting into that; we know who set it and I'm not blaming the NDP for setting it. If you guys want to talk get up and talk when I'm through, otherwise, keep quiet. Now listen, we're not blaming you for the interest rates but we're blaming you for not doing something about it here in this province. Some new programs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm asking you the questions, you don't ask me anything. I'm asking you and when I get to the end of my line of questions I have one question here that if you don't answer the way we want it answered — it came from a group of farmers yesterday — we're going to stay on item ! until the snowballs fly and I can guarantee you that. We mean it.

Now, I'll tell you why you balanced your budget this year before I sit down. I'm going to take you back to last year's budget . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . now this is serious. Everyone of you keep really quiet and listen; maybe you'll remember what the hon. member said here last year. Mr. Minister, I mentioned balancing the budget for 1979-80. We could have, he says, but this would have meant less money for our municipalities, our schools and hospitals. It would have meant higher property taxes for our senior citizens and higher costs for our farmers. Is that any way to treat our people in Celebrate Saskatchewan 1980? You balanced your budget on the back of these people out here and that is everybody in the whole province of Saskatchewan.

You've made a joke of everybody. You must have had some assistance from somebody because the only one I knew in my time who could really balance budgets was that Mr. Fines; he could balance it any time he wanted to.

I was at an auction sale in my district last Saturday. There were 5,000 people at this machine sale and I had my executive out talking to the people throughout this whole sale from 10:30 a.m. Now we spent the whole day just talking to farmers and do you know what they say? We are in a worse position now than we ever were in the '30s because we have something to lose now, really something to lose. The biggest thing said was, what's our government going to do about it? It's up to them in this province.

We can't help the high interest rate but we can sure help you people not coming up with some programs to save these people from going broke. It may affect them for the rest of their lives. Don't you understand when a farmer or a construction man has to go broke? I can tell you stories in this city here; you know them as well as I know them. Old people back serving in these cafes — 300 cafes in this city and most of them on Albert Street. Who do you see? Old women back trying to make a few dollars to save their homes. How would you like to be some of them? Just because you cabinet members can sit there with big fat salaries, you don't stop to think about the grass-roots people who are going broke. They are going broke every day.

Now, I could tell you a story about a good friend of mine in this city; he is a superintendent for Sask Pool. He said he has worked all his life and all he has when he is through is his home and the hope of a few savings and his pension. Now his interest rate is being recalculated this year in 1980. He says it has jumped up so much that his 64-year old wife has to go back to work to try to save their home.

I don't say it is your responsibility about the interest rate but I say it is your responsibility that these people don't lose their homes. It's right on your hands, Mr. Finance Minister, and nobody else and we're not going to leave the finance estimates until you come up with some answers. You're either going to unbalance this budget or rejuggle your figures. Now where would the best money be spent? There was \$500 million on nuclear development in the last — \$300 million has been spent now and \$200 million more is going to be spent in the next year. What would that \$200 million do to help people to save these homes and these farms and save these hog farms, save the construction people from going broke. Small businesses — you don't care about them, you want a big, balanced figure over here.

The Attorney General mentions the latest Gallup poll — boy, if he would have been out in Arm River with me last year or last week, there wouldn't even be any sense in running a candidate against me in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — There wouldn't even be any sense. Because what would surprise the Attorney General is people from your own party, your own workers coming to me saying, what's going on down there? They wouldn't even let you have your say down there. That's what they're saying. But let's get serious. I'm not joking here. This is serious. Now this is the first question I want you to answer for me. Do you think the economy has fallen apart in this province? Now that's the first question I'm going to ask you.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — No, Mr. Chairman. The economy has not fallen apart in this

province. The economy in this province is strong. Mr. Chairman, the only thing that has changed since this budget was put together — the budget we are considering in this committee of finance and which we discussed in the budget debate, at which time the members opposite did not spend any time talking about interest rates or about those kinds of issues — is that the interest rates have increased substantially. Why have those interest rates increased, Mr. Chairman? They have increased because of policies of Conservative and Liberal governments in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Now, it's almost laughable, Mr. Chairman, to hear the member for Arm River stand up and make his pious speech about the need for action. Where was that member when the Clark and Crosbie government was in Ottawa? Where was he?

Mr. Chairman, where was that member and his colleagues when, between July 23, 1979 and October 25, 1979, interest rates increased from 11.75 per cent to 14.5 per cent and his party in the federal government in Ottawa rewarded the Governor of the Bank of Canada by reappointing him — where was he? Where was that member and where was Mr. Clark and where was Mr. Crosbie and where were the Conservative members of parliament from Saskatchewan the day before yesterday, or was it yesterday, when there was a non-confidence motion in the House of Commons which condemned the majority Liberal government for failing to change monetary policies in effect since 1979, and for not instructing the Governor of the Bank of Canada to lower immediately the current interest rate by at least two percentage points? Where was he Mr. Chairman? And where was the member for Assiniboia and where was the member for Saskatoon East? And where was the member of parliament from Moose Jaw? (Saskatoon West, I'm sorry — I know where the member for Saskatoon East was, Mr. Chairman; he was supporting that non-confidence motion.)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — And where were all the Progressive Conservative members? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and I use the word 'progressive' guardedly, Mr. Chairman. But where were those members of parliament the day before yesterday in the House of Commons when that motion was there. I'll tell you where they were. The vote was 272 to 32 and the only members in the House of Commons who supported that motion were from the NDP — the Conservative stood with the Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The comments the member now makes hinge, Mr. Chairman, on the brink of being ridiculous. Let me mention one other point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! We're having a lot of racket from both sides of the House and the hon. minister, I think for that reason, is having to raise his voice. Maybe we could calm it down a little bit.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to make sure the members opposite could hear what I was saying because they were making so much noise I was afraid they were not able to.

But we had a federal budget brought in by the Conservative government in Ottawa by the minister of finance, Mr. Crosbie, sometime ago. We helped bring them down for all

the right reasons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Now, I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman that we brought them down because of their high interest rate policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman that we were out there campaigning in that federal election because it was that Conservative government, supported by each and every one of those members which put an 18-cent excise tax on farm fuel.

Now, I asked the member for Arm River if he thought the interest rate situation was as bad as it was and, if he had such compassion for Saskatchewan farmers, why he, after that federal Conservative budget was brought down, issued a press release saying he supported that budget without any qualification?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did he do that/

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes, he did. If he wants, Mr. Chairman, and if this House wants, I'll bring in the article that I clipped out of the Watrous Manitou. I hope that wasn't a case of spying. The member for Arm River now gets up to make his point in his usual flamboyant way because he's feeling a little guilty. But that article quotes him as saying that budget brought down by Mr. Crosbie ought to be supported by everyone including the high interest rate policy, including the 18-cent excise tax, including all of those major measures which made that government worthy of being defeated in the House of Commons.

Mr. Chairman, we have not, in this party and in this government, in any way been wishy-washy about our position on what should happen to interest rates. The members of the Conservative caucus, when there was a federal government in Ottawa which was Conservative, said interest rates need to go up. Now they're saying something different in this House. But their colleagues in Ottawa, same party, who have a chance to vote on a non-confidence motion which says that interest rates should not go up, vote with the Liberal government, side by side, and support the present policy. If that member opposite is really serious in what he is saying, he should be impressing on Mr. Clark and he should be impressing on the Conservative caucus in Ottawa that they should take a position which would try to make the present federal government change its position on interest rates. They are responsible for those interest rates. The Conservative government was responsible to those interest rates. That's where action has to be taken, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that what we are seeing here is a desperate opposition. We're seeing here a desperate opposition which more and more is losing its credibility. We are seeing here an opposition particularly in the debates of these estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! Let's let the hon. Minister of Finance continue here relatively uninterrupted if at all possible.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, before the members opposite interrupted me, I was making the point that the members opposite have no credibility, the members opposite have switched their position for what they think is political expediency so many times that no one in Saskatchewan and rural Saskatchewan, in particular, is prepared to believe them any more. So now what we get is the member for arm River and his colleagues getting up and making speeches and waving their arms and trying to take away from their federal caucus, somehow, the heat which they are feeling because when they were in government they supported a high interest rate policy and when they are in opposition, they are still supporting a high interest rate policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I have to ask the question, Mr. Chairman, who is it they are supporting? Are they really speaking in support of the Saskatchewan farmer or the Saskatchewan home-owner or are they supporting the banks and the mortgage companies of this North American continent? I am saying, Mr. Chairman, they are clearly supporting the lending institutions in action and in support. That support is recorded in the House of Commons. It is supported by statements those people made when there was a federal Conservative government in office at which time they supported the high interest rate policy which is now, and has been for some months, a great burden on a lot of people, not only in Saskatchewan, but also across all of Canada. I say if those members opposite want to be credible, then they better start clearly stating what their real position is rather than wish-washing around the whole field.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Your party is so far left even if you were voting for motherhood we could hardly support you.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, isn't that interesting, Mr. Chairman? I think what the member for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. Let's make our speeches when we're standing.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It really tells us what the attitude of the Conservative Party is. They are so entrenched in their position of supporting the banks, the lending institutions and the high interest rate policy with their colleagues in Ottawa, that even if it came to a motion in this House or a motion in the federal House of Commons hitting at the issue and bringing about the right answer which is lower interest rates, they would vote against it because somebody else brought it in. So what kind of a policy position is that? It is a non-position. It is a facetious position. It is strictly nothing more than political expediency which will further destroy the little credibility those members have.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the members opposite why they are so anxious about this high interest rate policy. Because they know who that high interest rate policy benefits. Let me give you some examples. Here are some contributions made to the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan. This is under The Elections Act, 1971, Mr. Chairman. I don't know who the Manufacturers Life Insurance Company is. I don't deal with them. But it seems, from what I have here, that insurance company

contributed \$1,000 to the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan. And then, interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman, there is the Royal Bank of Canada. I can't remember ever getting any contributions from the Royal Bank of Canada. But what about the Conservative Party? The Royal Bank of Canada contributed to the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan \$4,000.

Is it little wonder, Mr. Chairman, that in practice when those Conservative members are in power, whether it's in Ottawa or whether it's in Manitoba, or heaven forbid if it should ever be in Saskatchewan, their actions are in support of that kind of disastrous economic policy which brings about high interest rates? When they are in opposition they still support it but they make different kinds of speeches. They make different kinds of speeches for the benefit of the press and for the benefit of this Legislative Assembly, saying how difficult things are because of high interest rates. But they go back to the people who fund their electoral coffers and they get from the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce \$3,000 in contributions.

Why, Mr. Chairman, are they able to get those kind of contributions? I don't know but I have to ask, is it because they say one thing in this House when they are in opposition and they say something else when they meet with these people who provide all this funding? Is it because they say to the big lending institutions, look don't really believe what we say because we're only saying it for political purposes? Don't really believe what we say, look to Ottawa where our members of parliament, our colleagues, have voted the way you would want us to vote. Really our position is not as we say it is.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's clear this country has followed a policy of high interest rates unwisely. I think it's unfortunate that we have had governments in Ottawa such as the Conservative government led by Prime Minister Joe Clark at that time and Finance Minister Crosbie and supported by our member for Arm River not only in action but in words, which followed the policy of high interest rates. Mr. Chairman, I think it's clear that was unwise. If we are going to put this country on the right rails, if we are going to return the control of the Canadian economy to Canadians we're going to have to change both of those kinds of governments. That kind of a change will only happen, and the day will come soon, when there is an NDP government in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, over the years since 1971 when this government came to power, we have been very attentive to the needs of various sectors of our economy. We have provided millions upon millions of dollars to Saskatchewan farmers when the hog industry was in trouble and we had to provide a subsidy. We introduced the farm cost reduction program which will return to farmers this year almost \$16 million. Now does the member think that's a good move? It's funny that in his remarks he wouldn't comment on that, Mr. Chairman, the member makes no point of mentioning the \$18 million which will be returned to people who have mortgages and are paying on those mortgages and interest; \$18 million to those people when they fill out their income tax this year. For the members opposite to say that this government within its means has not been able to provide some assistance, is somewhat incorrect and not exactly the case.

It still comes down to one issue. Our economy, Mr. Chairman, is strong. We in 1979 saw the job opportunities in this province increase by 15,000. We have seen the population of this province grow and it continues to grow. We see the mining and the resource development sectors strong. We see the agriculture sector strong. The only

April 18, 1980

thing which has changed is the level of the interest rates which have been supported, brought about and caused by Progressive Conservative and Liberal governments in Ottawa. That's the point, Mr. Chairman. If we are going to tackle the problem of the economy in this country as it affects all provinces, that tackling has to be done in Ottawa. It cannot be done by Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Saskatchewan or Alberta; it has to be done as a matter of national policy. If the member for Arm River wanted to make any sense, he would be making that point here today and he would be joining all the members of this House in saying to the federal Minister of Finance now, as he should have been saying to the federal Minister of Finance when there was a Conservative government, you're wrong! You should change your policies. If you are prepared to maintain your policies of high interest rates, then you should take the measures necessary to see that the harm you are causing is being looked after.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are going to spend some time dealing with this and other issues in consideration of the estimates of the Department of Finance, as well as other departments, and seeing that it is Friday and I know members wish to return home, I ask leave for the committee to rise and report progress.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:49 p.m.