

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 26, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Report of Select Standing Committee on Library

THE CLERK: — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the library committee, presents the report as follows:

Your committee has considered the reference of the Assembly dated November 30, 1979, namely the recommendations of the public documents committee under The Archives Act contained in the retention and disposal schedules comprising sessional paper No. 113 of the present session.

Your committee recommends to the Assembly that the recommendations of the public documents committee on schedules Nos. 210 to 215 inclusive be accepted and that schedule No. 216 be accepted as amended.

You committee, recognizing the important contributions Saskatchewan's Crown corporations have made to provincial development, requires that their evolving policies and activities be fully documented for posterity in the provincial archives and recommends the Crown corporations be reminded that their administrative records are valuable public property and that they are required to follow the procedures defined in The Archives Act (R.S.S., 1978, Chapter A-26) before disposing of any documents, files or records in another medium created in the course of their administration.

MR. D. G. BANDA (Redberry) moved, seconded by Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern):

That the first report of the select standing committee on library be now concurred in.

Motion agreed.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. D. F. McARTHUR (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly 28 Grade 11 students from Sheldon-Williams Collegiate sitting in the Speaker's gallery. These students, Mr. Speaker, are in the Grade 11 social studies program at Sheldon-Williams. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. David Evans. I know that the social studies program at Sheldon-Williams devotes a considerable amount of time to studying public affairs and politics in the province and in the country. I've had the opportunity personally to visit the school and speak to social studies classes. I know I gain a great deal from those visits and I hope the students do likewise. I look forward to meeting with the students and Mr. Evans at 2:45 p.m., providing House business permits me to do so.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. N. LUSNEY (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Yorkton, Mr. Nelson, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly a group of Grade 3 and Grade 4 students from the Fairview School at Yorkton. They are visiting with us this afternoon and I will be looking forward to meeting with them for refreshments on behalf of Mr. Nelson after question period. I would like to wish the students a nice visit to the legislature. I hope your visit here is informative and enjoyable and I hope you have a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Canadian Amateur Hockey Association

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I direct a question to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Culture and Youth. Has the Government of Saskatchewan yet made any formal representations to the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association in light of its decision which will cause a great deal of harm to Notre Dame at Wilcox?

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that. I know that the Minister of Culture and Youth has this matter under consideration. I spoke with him and we discussed this. I do not know whether representations have been made.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary. Does the Premier feel that the decision of the CAHA seems rather arbitrary and, to quote the board of regents of Notre Dame College, that it may be somewhat capricious? Would the Premier use his offices to make representations on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan and this Assembly to the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association, asking it to review its ruling and to consider the interests of a college, a national institution such as Notre Dame?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in some difficulty, since clearly the affairs of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association are ones which concern them and the associate bodies such as the Saskatchewan Amateur Hockey Association. It is my understanding that the Saskatchewan Amateur Hockey Association disagrees, and perhaps disagrees fairly violently, with the decision of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association on the matter of the interregional transfer. The Minister of Culture and Youth and I will certainly consider this matter. I have no reason to believe that we would do other than make the representations the hon. member suggests. I simply have not reviewed all the facts; subject to that caveat, I think I have a good deal of sympathy with the point made by the hon. member.

MR. LANE: — Final supplementary to the Premier. When representations are made would the Premier and the cabinet minister indicate to the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association that the representations have the support of the official opposition in this Assembly?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Yes, I would be happy to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Drought Program — Federal Cost Sharing

MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — As a result of statements made by Senator Hazen Argue over the weekend indicating there was no commitment of federal

funds to your announced drought program at this time, and because of the shaky record of the federal government participating in cost sharing programs initiated at the provincial level, there has been a rather serious suspicion by many, many farmers in Saskatchewan that perhaps this program will not proceed. I wonder in the minister would give this House a commitment today that the program will, in fact, proceed with or without federal funding?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member and the statements by the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, and other statements which came from federal cabinet ministers over the weekend, I can only suggest, in a very general statement, that perhaps the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, instead of politicking all his time in Saskatchewan, should check with what is going on back in Ottawa. In fact, there was an agreement by the federal deputy minister of agriculture and deputy ministers of agriculture from Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. Certainly, we are honouring the agreement made by our deputy minister, as other provincial ministers are. I would assume that the federal Minister of Agriculture would honour the agreement put forward by his deputy minister at the meeting two weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that all of the items which we put forward were not included in the agreement. I think the hon. member would notice in the statement put forward, we indicated we were pursuing certain things with the federal government and with the Canadian Wheat Board. An example is securing barley stops — calling on the wheat board to stop committing further barley to export sales, calling on the federal government to ask the grain transportation authority to stop allocating cars for the movement of non-board grains. Additionally, we indicated that we were pursuing, with the federal government, securing Canadian wildlife land.

Mr. Speaker, I note, in statements coming from cabinet ministers over the weekend, one from the minister from Manitoba where he indicated that there needs to be (and he would support) a policy of securing fodder supplies to meet the needs of the core herd within western Canada, in terms of beef. In terms of supplying fodder to the dairy industry, I note, in statements made by the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board last night, that they would be looking into securing barley stocks.

MR. BERNTSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in your ministerial statement last Friday when you announced this drought assistance program, you said the province will be requesting federal cost sharing of the entire package. That would indicate to me the funding has not been approved at the federal level. You are requesting it now. Will you give the commitment to the farmers of Saskatchewan that the program will go ahead with or without federal funding? Is it in place or not?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my answer earlier to the hon. member that certain aspects of it are in place: cattle transportation, feed transportation, 50-50, wells and so on, and they will in fact go ahead. I indicated to the hon. member that other areas are being pursued. And if he wants, Mr. Speaker, a commitment with respect to the province's concern, can I report to him that we are pursuing purchase of 1,000 tons of pellets from northern Alberta for the Saskatchewan milk shed, and we are indicating in that purchase that we will pick up as a province the freight costs and that will come to about \$30,000 as an example.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, final supplementary. The minister indicated that the program will cost about \$15 million to \$20 million. That is nowhere near the expenditure

that would be set out for the 1,000 tons of pellets from northern Alberta. I ask again, will you give the commitment to the farmers of Saskatchewan that the program will go ahead with or without federal funding?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my statement (and if the hon. member will check he will see) that if all aspects of the program have to be implemented, then it could come to a total of \$15 million (at least \$15 million), perhaps \$20 million. That's in fact what I said. There is already, Mr. Speaker, (I think the hon. member will appreciate that) some pressure off the program since the hon. member for Shaunavon and I had a report from the Maple Creek area where they received 1.5 inches of rain on the weekend. I am indicating to the hon. member that on some aspects of the program there are 50-50 cost sharing commitments, and I am indicating to the hon. member that our commitment is there to guarantee immediately the pressure areas. One of the pressure areas is meeting the needs of the dairy industry and we have responded to that as of today.

MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — A question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the 1,000 tons of alfalfa pellets that you mentioned — I am sure any knowledgeable livestock man would tell you that will comfortably look after about 300 to 400 cows in the course of the winter. Mr. Minister, would you not concede to this Assembly today and to the farmers that a cost of \$15 million to \$20 million, even if you have to pick that up, even if you have to pick up double that, is cheap at the price compared to the damage that can be done to the economy by the removal of purchasing power from the farming community which unquestionably, indisputably, is still the backbone of our economy? Would you not give your commitment today that you'll pick up the tab for \$15 million or \$20 million, double that if you have to, acknowledging that you cannot make it rain?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I'll report to the hon. member on the priorities of the job that needs to be done. The priorities of the job that needs to be done don't relate to next winter's feed supply. The priority and the job that needs to be done are to meet the needs in June and July, in particular for the dairy industry. And the purchase, or seeking to purchase 1,000 tons of pellets from northern Alberta is to meet the milk shed area in Saskatoon. We are seeking to purchase 400 tons of hay from Ontario to meet June and July needs. We are seeking to purchase 20,000 tons of pelletized screenings from Thunder Bay to meet June and July needs. Those are our priorities. We are committing ourselves to those as I have indicated to the hon. member earlier. I am saying also that there is a commitment at the deputy minister's level. Surely the federal government will honour the efforts of their deputy ministers in trying to meet the needs of this drought situation. There is a commitment for 50 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And will you honour your commitment?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, there is a commitment from the federal government for 50 per cent cost sharing. On certain aspects we are committed to the other 50 per cent. If we have to go beyond the 50 per cent in terms of Saskatchewan, we will deliver on the basis of meeting the needs as best we can to secure the basic herd in the livestock industry and to try to provide adequate grain stocks for the hog producers and the poultry producers of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Winter Supplies of Fodder

MR. THATCHER: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, your departmental people may not have informed you of this yet, but 1.5 inches of rain or 2.5 inches of rain (the hay crop for the bulk of Saskatchewan is now gone), even if it comes, at the very best with 2.5 inches of rain . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — What did you say — garbage?

MR. THATCHER: — Well thank you, read that into the record. I hope the livestock people of Saskatchewan will note the comment from the member for Kinistino that it is garbage that their hay crop is gone. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order.

MR. THATCHER: — I apologize for that little outburst, Mr. Minister, acknowledging the fact that the hay crop, at the very best regardless of favourable weather conditions from now on, is going to be very small and acknowledging the fact that you are trying to meet the dairy supplies for July and August (and you are talking in terms of very few numbers of cattle), would the minister tell us what your long-term commitments are as far as facing a winter feeding problem which we must face now?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is true we have to be concerned about the winter supplies of fodder. I think that is recognized within this program. I indicated to the hon. members what we are attempting to do to secure supplies to meet the June-July situation. In my announcement on Friday, if the hon. member would have listened, he would have noted two points. In addition to the purchase of supplies of alfalfa pellets from northern Alberta, I indicated we are also seeking to pick up alfalfa pellets within the province of Saskatchewan. We see the opportunity of picking up a large supply in the province to meet the feed needs for the winter.

I indicated also (and the hon. member should be aware of this) that the kind of rain we have been having will help this situation. Certainly it will provide one cut of hay. I indicated to the hon. member in my statement on Friday that in listing the available fodder supplies, we will be asking farmers to indicate what their availability is of seed oats; there is still time, good time, in the southwestern portion of the province which has been fortunate to have a good rain, to seed oats to be used for green feed which will assist in solving the fodder problem.

Firm Commitment re Drought Relief

MR. LANE: — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Why will the Minister of Agriculture not give a firm, unequivocal commitment that the program announced Friday will proceed with or without federal government cost sharing?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, because we have a commitment for federal government cost sharing. Mr. Speaker, we have a commitment and I indicated to the hon. member that the hon. minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board should check with what his other ministers have done, what his deputy officials have done, before making outbursts like he made this weekend in Regina.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary. In the press yesterday the minister did not make such a commitment and I ask you again, are the farmers being sold down the river by this

program? It may in fact not be proceeded with unless you get a federal government commitment, a commitment which he refused to make on Sunday.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question. I will answer it once more. As far as we are concerned as the Government of Saskatchewan, I assume, on the basis of the information that I have, so far as the Government of Manitoba is concerned, so far as the Government of Alberta is concerned and so far as the Government of British Columbia is concerned, there is a commitment for 50 per cent cost sharing with the federal government on a number of aspects of this program. I don't care what the members opposite say; I say that they will fulfil that commitment and we expect them to do just that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Purchase of Alfalfa

MR. H. J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. You announced a drought assistance program on Friday of last week. Some ranchers in my constituency are concerned that your program may interfere with the contracts for alfalfa hay purchases in the irrigation area at Outlook. Is it part of your policy to control who may purchase the alfalfa that is grown on the irrigated lands in the province?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I understand the hon. member's question. I want to check the record to see what in fact he has asked, and then I will follow up with an answer. I am not sure just what he means. To my knowledge there has been no indication of cutting off contracts that farmers in the hon. member's area might have, but I would have to check with the officials who are trying to work out the program.

MR. SWAN: — Supplementary to the minister. In your comments you spoke about the alfalfa pellets and you say you're bringing some in from other provinces and so on, but are you planning to control the sale of alfalfa cubes from the cubing plants in Saskatchewan?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, we are trying to pick up as much of the alfalfa pellets as can be made available to the Government of Saskatchewan through the crop season this season, and make them available for resale to farmers. That's our objective and I think the hon. member will agree that's an honourable objective.

Western Canada Standard of Living

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, about two weeks ago you were quoted (I believe you made the statement at one of your weekly press conferences), that it was your view that the people of western Canada were prepared to accept a lower standard of living in order to keep Quebec a part of Canada. Were you speaking on behalf of the other western premiers, namely, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Lougheed, and Mr. Lyon; or were you speaking on behalf of yourself, your government, or the people of Saskatchewan when you indicated that the people of western Canada were prepared to accept a lower standing of living in order to keep Quebec part of Canada?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have no recollection of any statement which could be interpreted that way and accordingly I am not able to respond to the hon. member's

question.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Premier. Mr. Premier, in the light of your answer, if I'm able to come up with a tape of about two weeks ago which very clearly has you making that statement or almost verbatim, would you then be prepared to respond in this Assembly to that question?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THATCHER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I now go down to information services and inquire as to the tapes that may be available and have been used? In other words may I assume that you will give them instructions immediately to drop everything to help me find that tape?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I will certainly invite the hon. member to go wherever he thinks he can find a tape which says that. I do not know whether the people down at information services would have a tape of what I may have said two weeks ago (I think was what the hon. member said) but I invite him to attempt to find such a tape wherever he thinks it might exist. I certainly don't know where it exists.

Cost Sharing for Forest Fires

MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. With the extreme forest fire situation in Saskatchewan, can the minister advise the Assembly as to the per day cost, and whether or not the federal government is cost sharing in the additional cost required for forest fire fighting?

HON. J. A. HAMMERSMITH (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I can advise the hon. member that the per day cost varies tremendously depending on the location of the fire, the nature of the fire, the kind of equipment necessary to suppress the fire, the distance firefighters have to be transported and a variety of factors that change on a daily, and in many cases, hourly basis. I can't give him an average per day cost because at this point we do not have a great number of people assigned to keeping books on the fires. We are directing our attention to limiting the spread of the fire and extinguishing those fires which we can. I think it would not be possible to give him a figure that would be particularly meaningful until such time as the fire season subsides considerably.

The answer is yes to the second part of his question. We will be in discussions with the federal government with regard to the possibility of further cost sharing but I do point out that under the northlands agreement, the federal government through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion contributed something in excess of \$600,000 towards the purchase of three Canso water bombers.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The federal cabinet minister responsible for western Canada I suppose, Mr. Axworthy, indicated today that there would be federal assistance coming to the province of Manitoba. I think he also said to the province of Ontario. This is my question: have you been in contact with that department to give you any indication that federal help will be coming to help fight forest fires in Saskatchewan?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (and I assume by that department, the member is referring to the department for which Mr. Axworthy is responsible, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, and I

can say to the hon. member that we have not been in contact with that department for cost sharing on the suppression of forest fires) is in continual contact through our joint management of our northlands agreement with the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, and yes, it is a matter that will be under discussion and has been.

MR. KATZMAN: — A question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan regarding the Chisholm log mill which burned down along with 1,000 acres of land: Mr. Minister, I am informed that your department was interested in the airplane crash that started the fire; in this case the Chisholm mill started a fire. Have you already alerted them that you will be asking for damages?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure the hon. member has his facts or their correlation quite knitted together. The airplane crash to which he refers was the crash of a jet fighter craft operated by the United States Air Force in connection with military exercises being carried out jointly between the Canadian Armed Forces and the U.S. Air Force, under the direction of the Department of National Defence.

The Chisholm mill (which he refers to is not really related to those military exercises, and is in fact owned (or was owned) by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I fail to see the relationship.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, DNS owns the place which caused the fire and burned 1,000 acres of land. Your department runs the place that started the fire. Are you informing your insurance company that they are now responsible, the same as you suggest that a United States airplane was responsible for the other fire?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I think the hon. member will find if he checks the record, that I was not talking to any insurance company about the liability of the United States Air Force. The mill he refers to was owned by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. The 1,000 acres he refers to is forest in the area for which the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is responsible — forest on Crown land. To my knowledge we do not carry fire insurance on the forest.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. W. J. G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, if I could have leave of the House, I would like to introduce a group of people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and the other members of the Assembly some distinguished guests in the House today from Windeck, West Germany. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery — Eckhard and Ingrid Damerau. These people are accompanied today by Conrad Hild, who will be known to some of the members as the former president of the student body of Canadian Theological College.

I'm sure all of us would like to join in welcoming these people to the legislature and to our province. We hope they enjoy their stay in Saskatchewan, and they have a safe journey back to West Germany.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

HON. E. E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)) moved second reading of Bill

No. 123 — An Act respecting References in the Statutes of Saskatchewan to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Certain Other Related References.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments in bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! What's the purpose of . . .

Point of Privilege

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I was rising to my feet because before the orders of the day you called government orders. I believe the member for Regina Rosemont said before orders of the day he wanted to introduce the guests. I was waiting for you to call orders of the day; I wanted to rise on a particular point, and I've missed it. I don't understand how we could skip from orders of the day to government orders.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I think it is possible that I did go on to government orders. I did call orders of the day; I think the record will show that, but I would be prepared to deal with whatever the member for Nipawin . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising on a matter of personal privilege with reference to an answer given in this Chamber today in question period, to a question posed by the member for Thunder Creek regarding the lower standards of living. The Premier of the province replied that he did not recall any such statement of any kind whatsoever, and refused to answer the question.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that is a misleading of this Assembly, but on April 17, 1980, right within this Chamber (and I'm quoting the Premier) he said:

Mr. Speaker, I think the answer shortly put is that western Canadians are willing to accept a lower standard of living than they might have in the short run in order to maintain a united Canada.

I ask Mr. Speaker to examine the record on this question posed by the member for Swift Current and the record of the Premier's answer to the member for Thunder Creek today as to whether or not the Premier was misleading this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I'll take the opportunity to examine the record at the earliest possible opportunity.

SECOND READINGS

HON. E. E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)) moved second reading of Bill No. 123 — **An Act respecting References in the Statutes of Saskatchewan to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Certain Other Related References.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to Bill No. 123 are simply a set of consequential amendments which follow after the establishment of the new Department of Rural and Urban Affairs and the subsequent repeal of The Department of Municipal Affairs Act, the Local Improvement Districts Act and The Local Improvement Districts Relief Act. The consolidated amendments cover 79 different acts in a number of government departments. In each case the amendment simply removed redundant references or clarified the division of responsibility as between rural and urban

jurisdictions. In each case also, Mr. Speaker, the amendments have been referred to the departments responsible to ensure that there is no distortion of the intent of the various amended clauses.

The passage of Bill No. 123, The Municipal Reference Act now before us is necessary to enable the citizens of this province to identify the Government of Saskatchewan's intention respecting ministerial responsibility for all or portions of 79 statutes now being amended.

In the absence of this bill, Mr. Speaker, ministerial responsibility would be required to be identified by order in council. It would obviously be much more difficult for those concerned with and working with these statutes to determine ministerial responsibility.

I think it is clear that to clarify the entire matter in one piece of legislation is preferable to dealing with the question of ministerial responsibility on a piecemeal basis.

I take pleasure therefore, Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 123.

MR. R. H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I realize that this bill is of a housecleaning nature, changing the wording from municipal affairs to rural affairs. Therefore I do not object to the bill passing through the House.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Point of Privilege

MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, it involves a question which I directed to the Premier today. It involves a subject which I believe the record will show he indicated he knew nothing about. It involves a point that the Premier indicated it was a subject he had never dealt with. I wish to draw your attention, on the date of April 17, page 1865, the subject was dealt with in the Assembly. The question I directed to him today regarded a statement that the Premier had made. The one I referred to was in the press but what I am referring to now is right in this Assembly where I asked the Premier on whose behalf was he speaking when he indicated that western Canadians would accept a lower standard of living in order to keep Quebec in confederation. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you recall his answer.

I'm saying that a question very similar to that was directed by the member for Swift Current back on April 17. If I may quote very briefly from the Premier's answer.

Mr. Speaker, I think the answer shortly put is that western Canadians are willing to accept a lower standard of living than they might have in the short run in order to maintain a united Canada.

Then he goes on to elaborate.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that this is grossly misleading this House. It was a direct question today. I accept that the Premier cannot be cognizant of everything. But, Mr. Speaker, I state categorically that I heard it on a press report. I heard it on a voice clip. Here it is in the Assembly. I cannot help but suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there may have been a breach of privilege on the part of the Premier today.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I'll examine the record to see if there is in fact a breach

of privilege here . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order! I've already dealt with the matter.

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Point of privilege. Would Mr. Speaker report back with due dispatch because the possibility of the Premier misleading this House is of a very serious nature and we should be able to deal with it as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: — The member's debating whether I should report back as quickly as possible. I've already told the member for Nipawin I would report back. I've already told the member for Thunder Creek I would report back. Anything the member for Qu'Appelle has said is repetitious.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 87 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act (No. 2)

Sections 1 to 7 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 97 — An Act to amend The Education Act

Section 1 agreed.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed.

Section 4

MR. D. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — It indicates in this section that it gives further power for the minister to extend grant moneys up to the level of \$10,000. In the explanatory notes, I think it says, associations such as the federation of home and school and the Canadian Education Association, any special grants on account of special projects approved by him, provided that any such payment does not exceed \$10,000; this, Mr. Minister, gives you fairly wide-ranging power with funds to give out to groups. I understand from studying legislation that this is rather common in other departments and I suppose this is your rationale, that if they can do it in other departments and other ministers have this flexibility, then I would like to have the same. I don't discourage you probably from that type of a rationale. But the dangerous thing here is the delicate nature of the educational system and the types of lobbying groups which do try to bring in their influence upon the education of our young children who are at a very impressionable age.

I would hope, Mr. Minister, that one would be most cautious and screen very carefully the types of groups that would be given grant assistance, because there's a considerable amount of money there. I would think if this is of sound educational purpose then there would be very little concern or worry. But the ability to hand out funds and to have extra moneys to hand out may lead a department or minister to be a little negligent in the very careful screening of the purpose of the pressure groups or whoever they may be. It is in that regard, Mr. Minister, I am concerned about this extra power. I would want some degree of assurance (I know you will not be the Minister of Education as long as this act is in force) that within your tenure of office you would take the necessary precautions and look very carefully at who might be qualifying for this

extra funding if this power is that necessary.

HON. D. F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member has indicated, this is a common provision now in the departmental legislation. I know that the hon. member has made reference to the need to carefully scrutinize the grants and we certainly do carefully scrutinize the kinds of grants that are approved. I might indicate to the hon. member that the payment of grants is still subject to the authorization of the treasury board with respect to the specifics of the grants and also to the approval of the estimates in this House.

What this amendment essentially does is require one step in the processing for grants under \$10,000, and that is the step which requires an order in council to be prepared after cabinet has reviewed the proposal for the order in council. Certainly I can give my undertaking to the hon. member that the kinds of grants we pay here are grants paid to organizations with a genuine interest in education. We unfortunately, in one sense at least, do not have enough money to be very careless in our distribution of grants. I think I can assure the hon. member that if I had my total way in this matter I could find additional organizations for which I would also like to provide grants, but unfortunately it's just not always possible to meet all those needs.

We do scrutinize these very carefully. There are criteria that require the organizations receiving grants to be organizations with a genuine interest in education and with a genuine function and role to play in terms of support of education.

Section 4 agreed.

Sections 5 and 6 agreed.

Section 7

MR. TAYLOR: — I'd like a little clarification on this. What this is actually doing is providing mediation. Is it another step in the two routes that are open — the conciliation and the arbitration routes? If my memory serves me correctly the mediation was always there in the arbitration route. Now it's extending it over into the conciliation route. Is that the correct interpretation of what this implies?

MR. McARTHUR: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what is happening here. We've always had the opportunity under our legislation to provide mediation services in disputes at a certain point where the arbitration route has been chosen, but where the route of conciliation as the alternative route has been chose, technically under the act at the present time it is not possible to apply for and to provide the mediation services. It is the feeling of both the trustee members and the teacher members of the educational relations board, which oversees the general bargaining process, that it would be useful as a matter of right to have the opportunity to ask for mediation services. Therefore by this amendment, which has been agreed to by the members of both the trustees and the teachers on the board, we are providing that right.

MR. TAYLOR: — I would certainly support anything that would be an attempt to try to clarify or stop any disputes that might be happening, and I think that is the intent here. The only question would be, is this becoming necessary because of the conciliation proceedings not being too satisfactory, or does this in any way, shape or form weaken the conciliation aspect at all?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, no I think it's not because of any weakness in the conciliation route that's been identified but rather, I think, a somewhat different case. We have found that mediation is being utilized, particularly where the arbitration route has been chosen. It is being asked for and utilized. The education relations board informed me that it has found the mediation services greatly assisted in the resolving of disputes. What they tell me, including the chairman (Mr. Barclay, a lawyer in Regina who, I think, certainly is a person well-schooled in industrial relations generally) is that beyond what they expected, mediation has proven to be a way of resolving disputes and getting difficulties out of the way that are there and do not seem to move until you can bring in the mediation services. So I think the answer is not that there's any particular failure being identified in the conciliation process but rather a new respect, if you like, for the process of mediation as one of the steps in resolving the disputes. As the result of that we want to make it clear that it is there and it can be requested. If it is requested then it will be provided. So it's clear that additional step is available whether the arbitration route is chosen or whether the conciliation route is chosen.

MR. H. J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Minister, the mediation process was not allowed in the strike route and I believe because of that, it inhibited people from choosing the strike route. But if you open this up so that the mediation service is available to either group, then you really take away some of that concern they had before about going the strike route. It sort of makes it easier. Do you not feel that you're really making a mistake in moving in this direction?

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, in reply to the last point, if I felt I were making a mistake I wouldn't be here with this provision. So, no I do not feel I'm making a mistake. I think that the sort of dilemma the hon. member presents is this one . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's happened on occasion but I try to avoid it as much as possible. Certainly I think the point the hon. member makes is perhaps to some degree something one has to take into account and that is, if you have something that's working and works well, then of course people may look to that as a way of solving a problem. Now the fact that that is indeed then something which makes people less fearful of the conciliation route may be of slight concern in the way you indicate. I would indicate to the hon. member that I think when we have the conciliation option there as it is, and as the hon. member correctly points out, it can eventually lead to strike action if that is the end point. But it is extremely important that we have provided every possible means of resolving that dispute before the strike point is reached. What this provision does is just that. It provides an additional very important measure for resolving a dispute before the strike point is reached. Now the possibility that it may then make the conciliation route slightly more attractive is clearly outweighed by the fact that this process could indeed prevent the occurrence of strike action where it might otherwise occur. Strike action, as everyone knows, is an indication that all things have failed; it is to be avoided at all costs. I think it is incumbent upon us to make a provision for every possible measure which could help to resolve a dispute before strike action results.

MR. SWAN: — I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you would explain to me what you see as the difference between mediation and conciliation? Mediation was set up with the idea of having a person working with the two parties to try to bring about an agreement. I think if you look up the word mediation, and you look up the word conciliation, you will find they are the same words and mean the same thing. They are not being applied properly in either case. That is the reason you are having to introduce these amendments. Could you explain to me what you see as the difference between mediation and conciliation?

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think you must look to section 238 with

which we are dealing here. It points out that in mediation the education relations board may appoint a person or persons to act as mediator, in order to examine the dispute in question and to provide if necessary a report on the results of the mediation service. Such a report can often facilitate the further possibility of reaching agreement. That is somewhat different process than is provided for under the conciliation route. Now I agree there are many similarities because you are trying to work here to resolve a dispute. But the essential fact about mediation services is that you can get this report which will provide a basis for bringing about a settlement.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, you didn't answer my question. I asked you what you see as the difference between mediation and conciliation? I say to you that for all intents and purposes they are the same word and the process used is the same. Really in the one route you are almost providing two sets of conciliation or two sets of mediation, whichever you want to call it.

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, I refer the hon. member to the act, which makes distinctions between the two. Mediation services are described under section 238; conciliation services are described under section 247. The hon. member will note that in the case of mediation services the education relations board may appoint a mediator or a team of mediators, who shall immediately confer with the parties and endeavour to assist them in reaching an agreement respecting the dispute. The mediator or members of the mediation team shall report within 14 days on the report.

If you turn to the section dealing with conciliation, you will note that it is quite a different structure. A conciliation board may be established to assist in reaching an agreement but the conciliation board shall consist of three members; it shall consist of a member who is designated by each of the parties. If the parties fail to reach an agreement on the third person, then the chairman of the education relations board shall appoint the third person. It is hoped that the parties will reach agreement on the structure. They are quite different in their structure and in the way they are put together. The result can be that you get quite a different influence on the process of bargaining.

Now, I agree with the hon. member that when you are dealing with disputes, there are many intricate and subtle influences at work here. It is difficult sometimes to make a clear distinction about the possible net effect of one particular structure as opposed to another as interventions in trying to settle the dispute. The educational relations board is made up of two people from the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, two people from the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, and a chairperson who is a senior lawyer in Regina (very, very well-schooled in industrial relations). They advise me that their experience is that the less formalized mediation route is useful. It does not require the formalized structuring of representatives from the two teams and the striking of a third party, but rather the introduction in an informal way of a person who can come in to try to bring an objective viewpoint to the whole process and work to bring the parties toward reconciliation. Sometimes the difference in structure and perspective brought to bear by that person can be helpful in a way that a conciliation board cannot always prove helpful. Therefore, we are simply trying to add slight variation on their advice which they feel could be useful in certain instances.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, even in your own explanation, you have to go back to the word 'reconciliation' when you are talking about mediation. Basically they are the same thing. When this act was first introduced, and mediation was not put in this route, it was left out for that very reason. There is a difference between mediation and arbitration. But there is a very, very minute difference between mediation and conciliation, and

that's the reason it wasn't put in the first act to begin with. I don't really believe that you are doing the right thing by putting it in this one. That's why I am raising it. I think you are saying that your conciliation process is failing. If that's the case, let's take conciliation out or mediation out; I don't really see the need of having both.

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, the hon. member can certainly disagree with the need for having mediation services added to the conciliation route. I don't disagree with his right to disagree, and I don't disagree that he can develop reasons for doing so. But I do disagree with the hon. member from this point of view, and that is that there is a difference. There is indeed a difference, or why was the mediation services route even agreed to with respect to the arbitration part of the legislation? I say to the hon. member that there is a difference. It's a subtle difference. Subtlety is perhaps not the forte of the members opposite, but there is a subtle difference. I think that it is important, in recognizing what is needed to resolve disputes, to recognize that we may need different mechanisms which are subtly different and which can subtly influence the outcome of the disputes.

I'm not holding up this amendment as being the saviour of the whole process, by any means; I am not saying that this amendment is even integral to the process. What I am saying is that, on the advice of the education relations board concerning the parties involved here, I have decided I should agree to the addition of this slight variation. It is different and therefore I think it's useful to add that difference. Now you disagree about the need for difference; I say fine. I happen to agree with the education relations board, the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. You disagree with that point of view. We will have to let this amendment stand the test of operations and see whether it does do as the members of the education relations board have predicted.

Section 7 agreed.

Sections 8 to 12 agreed.

Section 13

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, as I see this, this has to do with the payment of the boards of conciliation and arbitration. I notice that you are bringing mediation into the picture and there's no mention of any payment for the mediator; how that would be handled I don't know, or if that's handled by the department. There's no mention of a mediator in here at all.

However, the boards are willing to share the costs of the chairman in the conciliation or arbitration route and they would like to pay their representatives on that board is the way that I understand this. I just wonder if that is really the right route, to try to form mediation and arbitration boards which are really there to settle the dispute rather than to safeguard at all costs the vested interests which may be paying them.

I would think that what you had in the act, the shared costs, would perhaps be the route by which you might get more impartiality or more of a desire to solve this problem. But when you get people who say, I'm paying my man and you're paying your man, it looks to me that it's playing into the hands of the two groups in controversy and may be impeding the settlement, which I think is the reason for the assumption of these boards.

In summation, first, why is there no payments for the mediator or why is this not included or how is he paid? Secondly, why would you think that these parties being able to pay their representatives is an improvement over what was in the act before?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I believe it has been our practice, where mediation services are brought into play, that they are paid for directly by the department through the education relations board and that practice will continue.

I must say, with respect to the second point raised by the hon. member, it would be the one comment about this legislation that I feel some sympathy in terms of the point made by the opposition. I, too, had some reservations about the change from a common pooling of the costs to this amendment, which suggests that the parties to the dispute will bear their separate costs. I spent some time with the education relations board and the representatives from the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and the STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation) discussing this item with them for the very reason that I had the same concerns the hon. member has. What has apparently happened is that it has become practice for each party to bear the costs involved with their side of settling the dispute.

As a result, they have worked into that procedure; they find it workable and acceptable and they wish to have the act amended in order to bring practice into line with the legislation. With some hesitancy, I have agreed to propose to this House the amendments and I feel that we should give them the test of time based on their advice because the education relations board after all is the body involved in the disputes. Having thought it over carefully, I have decided to propose this amendment because it has become practice. They say it works better than the alternative would work.

MR. TAYLOR: — How did the selection of the people for these boards take place previous to this amendment? I can see how it's going to take place now. But the members were suggested by each of the groups (let's say the trustees and the teachers federation) and were they accepted by the minister? How were the members for the conciliation or the arbitration board established?

MR. McARTHUR: — The act makes provision for the way the different boards were constituted. With respect to the arbitration boards, I think I have outlined to the hon. members the way a board is put together.

Also, with respect to the conciliation boards, appointments are made by a similar process. That is, the parties are involved in making their appointments.

Section 240 of the act outlines the process, for instance, by which an arbitration procedure is set up. A party applies for arbitration. It designates the person who it intends to appoint as a member of the arbitration board. Then the other party is notified of the proposal. Then they make an appointment. And then the third party, the third person, is chosen through the same process I indicated with the conciliation board. So that is all provided for under the terms of the legislation.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, I think I can outline what my concern and my worry is here. Maybe this will bring it to a point. If there is some degree of control or saying who is going to be on . . . What I don't want to see happen is that one side is able to go out and, because maybe they have greater financial reserves, hire a person who costs great amounts of money, an expert in the field and who is certainly going to overshadow the person the other one hires. That is what I see as a danger. Therefore, this one fellow (if I could

equate it to the horse race) has a thoroughbred, where the other side has a Percheron in the same race. That is what I am trying to avoid. And if the legislature does that, then I wouldn't be so concerned. That is the fear I see. Then where do you get a balanced board and a board which would work for the mutual benefit?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has very correctly and astutely identified the potential difficulty with this amendment and the reason it was worded the other way or why it is currently the other way in the act in place now. I simply come back to pointing out to the hon. member that the people involved in resolving these disputes through conciliation and through arbitration (the teachers' federation and the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association) indicate to me (and I have met with them personally on a couple of occasions) that this is the way they are now operating.

They feel it works well. They wish to have that practice confirmed in legislation. They indeed have been operating outside of the provisions of the existing legislation. They are concerned about that. But they have a process which works. They would like to bring the legislation into a place which is consistent with practice. That is the reason for the amendment. I don't think there is any way of answering totally the concern that one may get some problems with this. But I think, based on the advice of the people involved here, they tell me they are making it work and making it work well. Therefore, they wish to have that confirmed.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, let's turn to perhaps a little different thought than just the pay. The pay has something to do with it. But when you come to conciliation, if each party is paying its own member then he becomes the advocate of that party. You know, once I pay a man's bill he becomes my advocate. I expect him to serve my interests. I believe that defeats the purpose of a conciliation board. In arbitration that process is all right because that is the intent. When you appoint someone to an arbitration board, he goes in as your advocate. But I believe you really defeat the value of a conciliator when you put him in as an advocate.

For that reason I think your act is not going to really improve the operation, but rather is going to be detrimental to the operation. I have served on both levels as an arbitrator and as a conciliator. I believe if you go in as a conciliator with your hands tied by being a paid appointee of a particular group, you cannot really be effective as a conciliator. So I wonder if you have given that thought and if perhaps, at least the conciliation board could be left out of this particular clause.

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we certainly have given it thought. I should point out to him that we get back to the difference between conciliation, arbitration and mediation. I agree with the hon. member with respect to mediation. That is why we have not made this provision with respect to mediation, because mediation is bringing in, as I tried to point out to the hon. member opposite, an objective outside party. But both conciliation (the conciliation board as established under section 249) and arbitration (as established under section 240) make this provision that the parties will appoint (you indicate you have been part of that and I recognize you understand that) their representatives to the board and then a third person is appointed. As a result of that, they are involved in advancing their own particular position to a degree in the search for a solution. I recognize they are sincerely participating in a search for a solution but they are, because of the structuring process, to a degree involved in representing their case.

As a result of that the people involved tell me they feel they want this opportunity to mobilize and pay their own costs of making their case, in both cases. As a result of that I have taken their advice and am prepared to stand behind their advice, notwithstanding my recognition that it's not necessarily perfect and there may be some of the difficulties that you point out arising. I think you are right. They're probably rather more important as concerns in the conciliation route than they are in the arbitration role.

Section 13 agreed.

Sections 14 and 15 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 118 — An Act to establish the Department of Economic Development

Section 1

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — O.K., we haven't got to short title yet, have we?

MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that there's a necessity and a need for this new department. I'm sure that somewhere someone would agree with that assessment but I really don't know, outside of government circles, who that would be.

Now, the logic behind it, Mr. Minister, sails right over my head and over lots of people's heads. I paused for that moment of silence; I was waiting and I had to wait and I almost thought, you know, they're going to miss that one. But then sure enough, the member for Kinistino — if you leave enough time, he'll finally take it. Anyway, Mr. Minister, the logic behind this act mystifies me because deliberately your government has chosen to downgrade the Department of Industry and Commerce. Now once upon a time the Department of Industry and Commerce was one of the most prestigious cabinet portfolios. Well, let's say it was a heavyweight portfolio in a variety of administrations. In the past two to three years, Mr. Minister, you have downgraded that department to where it plays — well to call it insignificant I think is to categorize it reasonably accurately.

This new department you are setting up may be necessary but I think you'll acknowledge there is a great deal of duplication. There's duplication with industry and commerce. There's duplication with SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). In short, the government may very well be dealing with a problem area. The government has always had a tendency to bring you in as chief troubleshooter in its problem areas. Certainly economic development outside the public sector has been a real problem for this government. So obviously, Mr. Minister, I'll pay you the compliment; they're turning it over to you and they're saying, Elwood, solve it.

I guess my question to you, Mr. Minister, is this. Why don't they make you Minister of Industry and Commerce and why don't they put SEDCO under you? So having asked that pointed and blunt question, I'll sit down while you tell me why they're not making you the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. E. L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Chairman, the member has the wrong place to ask his question. That question really should be more appropriately asked

under the Executive Council estimates. However, if the member wants to know the rationale for the creation of the department, it's that there was a ministry created a year ago and, as light follows the day, ministries are created and departments follow them. So that's the rationale for the Department of Economic Development.

MR. THATCHER: — Now come on, Mr. Minister, you can do better than that. You can do better than that! Heavens, no! Listen, we can either get to the point of this business and get it done and get out of this place, or we can play our children's games and go on until 5:30, 8:30, 9:30 or whatever.

Now, you know very well that you're not going to get away with answers like that. So again, you heard my opening comments. Now, Mr. Minister, maybe we could stop the cute little games. Tell us what's going on with this department. Why do you need it? Why are you duplicating what is basically already in place?

MR. COWLEY: — Again, Mr. Chairman, if the member would check the discussion in second reading, I thought I made it reasonably clear there wasn't the intent, with respect to the Department of Economic Development, to try to reinvent the wheel or to duplicate the services offered by the Department of Industry and Commerce.

Indeed the basic function I see being carried out by the Department of Economic Development is to act as lead agency and basically a co-ordinator of the many agencies which, I agree with the member, are involved in economic development. For example the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Industry and Commerce and various Crown corporations from time to time are involved in a direct and indirect way. The Department of Economic Development is an attempt to create an umbrella agency, albeit a small one, which can second people from various areas to put together (if you would like to call them) project teams for what we hope will be a significant number of major projects which overlap in various areas.

It certainly is not the intent of the department to enter into any areas where SEDCO, for example, would normally be, or to carry out the kind of project financing or that sort of thing done by SEDCO. Rather, if an opportunity came along which was identified by the Department of Economic Development or some people working with SEDCO, it would try to work with that.

I noticed the member's comments with respect to his view of industry and commerce and SEDCO. But, I think if he'll check the records . . . The members opposite obviously feel both of those agencies are very important judging by the amount of time they spent on them in estimates and in the Crown corporations committee.

MR. THATCHER: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's a very good point. How would you know what a good answer is? If you thought it was a good answer you should write it down and you should try it, so you'd have a good answer ready.

Mr. Minister, you described what Crown investments corporation is basically doing for the Crown corporations now. That's basically what you described. As this bill presently reads, you certainly have the power to delve into areas which SEDCO is now in. You very definitively have the power to do exactly what industry and commerce is doing.

From reading that bill and looking at it from this side of the House it appears it is simply a very expensive and needless duplication of what we already have in place. We will

very definitely concede that there are far too many agencies working in far too many diverse directions, pushing and pulling at the same time. Let me tell you, we don't need another one! We need fewer agencies and a more sensible approach with fewer people doing more things. The way you have set it up now you've got a hodgepodge here and a hodgepodge there. Now you say, well we've got to put up something in the middle to run all these octopus arms we've got out here. Really, what you're doing is adding needless, senseless duplication to what we already have.

What will happen to the agencies which your new department is going to replace? Well, the employees who are presently in these agencies are going to stay right there. They're going to keep performing the same job. There may be some lateral transfers, but you're not going to cut down the size of the agencies and the number of people who are presently involved in doing what they're now doing.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that this bill as it is presently written is simply a vehicle being set up to do what is already being done. Instead of adding one more agency, why don't you chop what you have in half? Chop it in half to the point where the right arm once again has a vague idea what the left arm is going to do, instead of this chaotic mess we now have in our bureaucracy (where one bureaucrat gets to meet the other bureaucrat maybe at the Christmas party). I'll let you respond to that before I move into a fresh area.

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member suggests I cut the agency I have in half. I didn't ask Mr. Beaudry but I don't think he would like me to cut the Provincial Secretary's office in half. I think if the member will check over the last several years the Provincial Secretary's department has not contributed in any significant way to the growth of the bureaucracy. I also want to say to the hon. member that as far as the Department of Economic Development is concerned (and I realize this is being recorded), I can assure the member (he can check next year and catch me up on it if he doesn't agree with me) that I don't think the staff envisaged by myself for the Department of Economic Development is going to have any significant impact in terms of the number of bureaucrats who are running around the province or anywhere else.

I think the function I described, or at least attempted to describe (perhaps not to the member's satisfaction) in the second reading discussion, and which I attempted today to discuss in very brief terms, doesn't seem to me to be a function which duplicates that which is already there. Rather, it attempts to use the staff we have to do some very good work in terms of economic development and industry and commerce and SEDCO. It is not an attempt to duplicate that but rather to use it in a more meaningful way in conjunction with other departments such as the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Mineral Resources — you pick the groups which can be worked with.

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I don't think the minister is being as forthright as he should on the purposes of this particular bill. First of all, the power set out should be covered under the act implementing SEDCO and The Department of Industry and Commerce Act, so the bill is not needed to carry out any of the functions. But what does this bill allow the government opposite to do that the others don't do? I can't recall another one where the specific power and one of the major powers is for the government to engage the services of advisers, specialists and consultants. This bill is the biggest political pork barrel bill you could have brought before this Assembly. And that's precisely what this is for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — You set down in every other act . . . Of course you won't give us the information on consultants and advisers. You're getting so blatant on being able to hide it that you now think you can bring in an act in which the main purpose and main power is to allow you to appoint advisers, specialists and consultants.

The minister says it is a department to co-ordinate the Crown corporations. On one hand he says Crown corporations aren't government; they are separate. Now he says he's using a government department to co-ordinate the Crown corporations. Would you make up your mind which way you're going? That was supposed to be Crown investments corporation. You assured us that was the purpose of it.

SEDCO? I think you have just proved the fallacy of your argument by saying you are using the same staff. If you're using the same staff, what do you need a whole new department for? As a matter of fact I would give you some very good business advice, I wouldn't touch the same staff, going by the decisions that SEDCO is making (for example, the waste and mismanagement in Henninger malting in your own riding). Boy, if we ever get those records, you won't be around. Let me tell you it was a \$32 million blunder. How many jobs did you get with that? A couple of hundred?

AN HON. MEMBER: — 63.

MR. LANE: — Sixty-three jobs? At \$32 million? Roughly \$500,000 a job. Even the federal Liberals can't match that level and they've been in business a lot longer. They try harder and they still can't meet the level of a half-a-million dollars per job created. Take a look at Shane Industries! And you're going to get into Shane Industries in this new department?

What you should do is fire them. You should get rid of the guys who advised on Shane Industries, including the cabinet ministers. And I use that in the plural. You should be getting rid of the people who allow the government to make the SEDCO blunders and bad decisions and waste the taxpayers' money. You know, the government opposite has forgotten the taxpayers' money is a public trust. You moved away from that a few years ago. Now you're acting like it is money to be thrown around, that there is no accountability. You just use those same people; you just said it. Those are your words; that was your defence. You weren't going to add to the bureaucracy. You're going to use the same people who were prepared to give Rogers Lumber \$2 million the day before it went into receivership. I wouldn't give those people a nickel to go down to the candy store, for heaven's sake! And you want to use the same people. Do you think those people are competent and qualified? Of course they're not. They're not good enough to deal with business. Is that what we're going to have more of? That's what you said, that you're going to use the same people.

There is only one reason, and that's the political pork barrel of the advisers, specialists and consultants. In other departments it's assumed that a minister can hire consultants, but this is the only one around where it's the main power. What kind of a statement do you make? You don't set out your goals; you don't set out your objectives; you don't tell anyone what you're really trying to do in your bill. What you say is, it's for the purposes of furthering activities related to economic development and to make annual grants. But what are the terms for economic development? What activities are related to economic development? Is it another Shane Industries? Is that economic development? Golden Acres: is that economic development? List them. You know . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're nuts!

MR. LANE: — Say that again. I demand a retraction from the hon. member, on a point of privilege. I demand you to retract that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would ask the members to refrain from unparliamentary remarks.

MR. LANE: — You will very pointedly note that my references to the activities of some of the government officials who make such recommendations as Shane Industries and their incompetence is not an unparliamentary remark. Obvious there is some truth to that particular comment.

This bill, as I say, is going to be the political pork barrel. I'm going to give the minister an opportunity to take an amendment to this bill, if he would. Under section 7, the minister will:

On the first day of each session, table the names of the advisers, the specialists, the consultants, how much they were paid in total, a copy of their contract, the specific function they are to undertake, and upon completion a full copy of the report.

There are no reasons for this other than to give grants under section 6, and to hire consultants, specialists and advisers. Never has this Assembly (and I venture to guess if any other government in Canada, the press would have been stringing the minister up for even introducing something like this) — but in this province somehow we think it's proper to give money to defeated NDP candidates so that they can squander \$175,000 or refuse to come clean with personal guarantees after losing hundreds of thousands of dollars. We lose money in Mossbank Foods where a former NDP member . . . Time after time when we go to the ridings of NDP MLAs, we see what? — a \$28 million write-off (it should have been) on Henninger malting in your riding? What do we have? Fibre Form has gone into receivership in Kelsey-Tisdale. We have Mossbank Foods in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. Look at the different ridings. Not only are you giving them to your former members, you're making bad investments in the NDP member's riding and you come before this Assembly wanting a bill whose sole purpose is to make grants, and hire advisers and consultants.

My first question to you is: will you propose an amendment right now and bring it in the manner I suggested, that you will table the reports? Will you give the contract at the outset, the amounts that they are being paid, the individuals, at the first day of each session?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to try to get into a debate with the member on the various activities of SEDCO or any other agency in the past year. There's a proper place for that. The member has had, and will have, his opportunity to do that.

I would like to make a couple of comments with respect to his critiques of this present bill. For example, section 7 of which he makes a big deal is an exact section lifted from the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs legislation. I think the member would find it's also in other bills, although I obviously haven't had a chance to peruse that. With respect to his request for goals and objectives, certainly we could have put the bill in essay if the member would have like it. As the member is fully aware, any competent draftsman can write you an essay of goals and objectives, which allow you to do

anything you want or not to do anything as the case may be. As I said when this bill was being given second reading, in my view the success or failure of the department on this particular legislation will be how well it carries out the various activities assigned to it from time to time.

With respect to his request for tabling of contracts etc., all I can say to the hon. member is that any money expended under this bill will obviously have to be voted by the legislature either as an estimate or a supplemental estimate. Any money expended by this department will show up in public accounts. Any questions raised by the members opposite in estimates or whatever with respect to the contracts, etc. let by this particular agency will be dealt with in the same manner as our contracts with respect to other departments in this House. I am sure there will be occasions when we will not want to table, and make public, contracts or the results of studies, etc. that have been done because we'll still be in the process of negotiations and discussions with the agencies we're working with.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, this bill, if it's passed in its present form, could potentially make you the economic czar of the province of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I didn't use the term godfather, but I suppose that there is a possibility. Mr. Minister, this bill if you choose to take it, renders you a great deal of personal power. Really, it doesn't matter whether section 7 was lifted intact from the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs. It was a bad clause there and it's just as bad right here. I think we have said so. We must have said so, being a very efficient and loyal opposition; I am sure we must have said so. It is still a bad, bad clause and one which really should not be in there. The history of this government making public very many details of anything is atrociously bad. You are an extremely secretive government. Your record of making things public is atrocious. Your past history of making your studies available, your interim reports to the opposition . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Perhaps Mr. Deputy Chairman would like to earn that extra allowance which he receives for sitting in that chair and keep a bit of order? That's of course based on the assumption he could find time to listen during this. Never mind . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: — Order! The member for Thunder Creek has the floor.

MR. THATCHER: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I wondered when you were going to earn that extra allowance that we pay you for sitting there. You didn't hear me the first time. Thank you.

Mr. Minister, returning to the bill. This bill conveys, I think, an unnecessary power onto you. My question to you specifically is, what exactly are you trying to get at? Now to develop the resources up North we have SMDC; for helping small businesses and medium businesses get rolling, we have SEDCO; for the promotion of Saskatchewan as a marvellous industrial base, etc., etc., we have industry, trade and commerce. O.K., now we have you and your department. Mr. Minister, I may have missed some of the debate on second reading but what exactly, what area, are you trying to get at in this bill? It has gone by me; I honestly don't know. Perhaps you could speed this thing up. Let's run through this; let's get down to brass tacks. Tell me, what you are up to? Tell me, what you are trying to accomplish?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do is get a department established for the ministry we already have, as I explained to the member. I also indicated in the second reading that it was an attempt (the ministry of economic

development and the department on the assumption it gets created) to co-ordinate some of the government's various activities in economic development, some of which are done by industry and commerce, some of which are done by agriculture (identified there) and some by the Crown corporations. That is the basic purpose for which it is being put forward. As I suggested to the member for Regina South in the debate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the member wants to enter into another debate. He will certainly, I am sure, have his opportunity.

As I indicated, I believe, to the member for Regina South there would be a Department of Economic Development and also a Department of Industry and Commerce. If the members opposite like, they should check the activities of the various other provincial governments in western Canada and in Ontario or the federal government. They would find indeed that in many cases, if not all the cases, there is more than one agency involved in the whole area of economic development. I think at the federal level there is a Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce; there is a Department of Regional Economic Expansion. They obviously fill different roles. The purpose of this particular department, as I indicated to the members opposite, is an attempt to have an overview in economic development, involving not only the small business and large business, the mining industry, the Crown corporations and other areas, but rather a co-ordinating function.

MR. D. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Well, Mr. Minister, I can't understand — in this province you have a Department of Industry and Commerce, as has already been pointed out (whether it is efficient or inefficient, I suppose, is subject to question), which I think to any reasonable person is there for the purpose of developing industry and commerce in this province. We also have SEDCO. I'm sure you are well aware that we and many people in Saskatchewan are concerned about its efficiency. Its track record is certainly nothing to brag about, but it is another avenue by which industry, commerce and business can be developed in this province.

You talk about co-ordinating in the Crown corporations. You have the Crown investment corporation which, as I understand, is there for the guidance of the Crown corporations and for expertise and advice on their investments. When I look at this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . My colleague questions the expertise; I think that is a very good comment because I think many people question that expertise.

I look at this and see that basically all there is in this program is the issuing of grants. To issue grants to groups, clause number 6:

the minister may, for the purpose of furthering activities related to economic development, make annual or other grants, on any terms or conditions (on any terms or conditions! You understand that?) that he may prescribe to any person, agency, organization, association, institution or other body within or outside the province.

Well, when my colleague calls you the economic czar, I think he's putting it very mildly. You have SEDCO and I understand you're supposed to go through some preliminary work to find out if an operation is viable. But day after day, there's indication of ones which were supposedly viable that are going broke, that are not efficient operations, such as Shane Industries and the ones the member for Qu'Appelle has been pointing out. But here it is, with the minister to make these grants on any terms or conditions that he may prescribe, so there is less control as to the economic viability under this bill.

Then you stated in this House, just a few minutes ago, that you're not going to have any more staff. You're just going to be using the SEDCO staff — we point out we question some of their economic knowledge because of their track record — but then why are you coming up with this new department? You say it is to justify a ministry which has been created. Well, that is a terrible way of running a government. You create a ministry and then you helter-skelter around, hurry around, to develop a department to justify the creation of that ministry. I think that's putting the cart before the horse.

But I suspect there is something else in the creation of this department which my colleagues have not pointed out. When you look at the name, An Act to establish The Department of Economic Development — economic development by whom? That's the question I think we should be asking here in Saskatchewan; economic development by whom? Is it going to be economic development by the people of Saskatchewan or is it going to be economic development by the government sitting opposite?

I'd like to go back in history a bit to a book entitled Douglas in Saskatchewan. Maybe history is repeating itself. It states here:

In 1950 (30 years ago), the CCF set up an industrial development office and appointed a socialist to run it. The office turned out a vast amount of propaganda in an effort to put a good complexion on a bad situation. In its zeal to make much out of little, the office sometimes let its publicity run away with its judgment.

I wonder if this Act to establish the Department of Economic Development isn't just a reincarnation of the 1950 industrial development office that really and truly — I've listened to what you said, Mr. Minister, and either it's coincidence or it's design when you say there are certain things in agriculture — I've heard you mention certain aspects in the Department of Agriculture two times in the debate this afternoon.

I say to you Mr. Minister, are there areas of agricultural development, agricultural processing that we've been calling for on this side of the House that could have tremendous economic spinoff and benefit for the people of Saskatchewan? Is this government wanting to get into that sector and interfere with the private sector in such types of activities? That's what I think this bill is for. This bill is just to give you wide, sweeping powers, the ability to grant, the ability to appoint people, hire retainers, hire people who are advisers so the government opposite can try the old Tommy Douglas experiment of getting into economic activity.

My friend tells me there is some more that should be read into the record. In the year 1961, when neighbouring Alberta and Manitoba were adding more multimillion dollar factories to their industrial domains, the development office of Saskatchewan issued a news release announcing it had successfully negotiated a business deal with a native of Ghana, a package of industrial promotional literature in exchange for monkey skins. The announcement prompted one cynical citizen to suggest that the skin be displayed from the flag pole atop the Legislative Building as a reminder to Saskatchewan electors of how the socialist had made monkeys of them.

Mr. Minister, I certainly hope the design of this department that this new bill is bringing in and that you were appointed the minister of and now need a department for, is not to duplicate the financial bungles that took place by the Douglas government in the 1950s. And that's what I suspect this bill is. It's an attempt to give you the power by which you can get into something in the agricultural sector as you've been pointing out.

I think this is very serious for the people of Saskatchewan. When we have a Department of Industry and Commerce, we have SEDCO, we have the Crown Investment Corporations, why then are we having to come forward with a new bill to establish the Department of Economic Development?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Chairman, just one brief comment. The only comment is that I think Robert Tyre is about as good a critic of the Douglas government in Saskatchewan as Peter Newan was of John Diefenbaker.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this bill in second reading and the minister knows exactly my feelings about this bill. But I'd just like to go over a few items of the bill itself. The other day the minister indicated, and I was just trying to look it up in Hansard (it would take me a minute or two to find it) that the only person who would be involved in this department would be himself.

The bill itself says the staff of the department consists of a deputy minister, to be called the deputy minister of economic development, and any other employees that are required for the proper conduct of the business of the department. Their duties are those prescribed by law and any that may be assigned to them by the minister. Well, that indicates to me that as I said the other day, there's going to be an awful lot of room here for expansion. I don't know that this government will ever have a department where there's only a minister involved. I don't know why they would need one to begin with.

The minister a few minutes ago made reference to the federal government having a department of economic development and I believe he said the province of Ontario. Well, number one, the federal government is certainly not the Government of Saskatchewan; whether or not I would even agree to have that in the federal government is a matter of discussion, but not today. As far as the province of Ontario is concerned, again, when we compare the sizes of the two provinces, if they can justify the need for their Department of Economic Development, I don't know why it would apply to Saskatchewan. And again, even if they do, I would suggest that if they have both departments, they could probably do with one. However, I would say this, they don't have a SEDCO and a Department of Industry and Commerce and a Department of Economic Development and so on, and on, and on.

Another thing that bothers me about this bill, Mr. Chairman, is the very fact that the grants — we already have SEDCO and we already have industry and commerce, and I've expressed my opinions on that before. Under SEDCO as I understand it and as the minister of SEDCO has indicated in correspondence — and I have the letter to confirm that — an applicant for a loan from SEDCO requires 20 per cent or 25 per cent, depending on the circumstances of the down payment. Well, we already know that they have not followed this particular ruling and regulation of SEDCO. I'm wondering if this bill would not just further strengthen the argument by the government that where the applicant for a loan doesn't have the down payment, they can come through the Department of Economic Development and get the down payment from there through a grant and the rest of the money from SEDCO. That is all that bill tells me they can do. Otherwise the Department of Industry and Commerce already has the power to make grants and SEDCO has the power to loan the money and to get involved in equity positions.

Mr. Chairman, we could debate this bill for a long time, but I know that we have many other items to come up today that we want to get into and debate. Rather than

prolong this argument and this debate, I would move, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan):

that Bill No. 118 be not proceeded with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The question before the committee is the adoption of section 1 of an Act to Establish the Department of Economic Development to which an amendment has been offered by the hon. member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) and seconded by the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan):

that Bill No. 118 be not proceeded with.

I find the amendment in order. Is the committee ready for the question?

Amendment negatived.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, it is our position that this is an unnecessary bill which simply is not required. It's our position that it is far too open-ended a bill which is passing too much power to too few people. We are opposed to this bill very strongly because we don't think we need an economic czar in the province of Saskatchewan. We need economic development yes, but we don't need an economic czar. There would be no necessity for this department and there would be no necessity for this bill if the Department of Industry and Commerce did any sort of a job in this province. Since you have chosen to have the Department of Industry and Commerce structured in its present fashion, it has gone downhill in morale. Many of its people feel downgraded. Consequently we have had a real downturn in the economic activity in this province. The Department of Industry and Commerce the past two to three years has been a dismal, dismal failure, with a constant turnover of deputy ministers. This is a sure sign, a guaranteed sign that something is wrong in the department. Far be it from me to suggest it's the present minister who is responsible for a great deal of this downturn, but perhaps it could almost be stated that it would not be inappropriate for one to suggest this. We have far too many government agencies involved in the field of economic activity in this province. It is absolutely the epitome of bureaucratise, I suppose, to add one more agency to supposedly co-ordinate this cluster of agencies presently existing.

Mr. Minister, I say to you today that I really think, I really believe, that the people of Saskatchewan can survive through this fiscal year if this bill is not proceeded with. I respectfully suggest to you that there may very well still be a market place with which we may somehow limp through if this bill is not proceeded with. Mr. Minister, you know very well that this bill gives you too much power. You know that we have got economic problems in this province in comparison with our sister western provinces. We all know that this is an area which has got to be tackled but this is not the way to tackle it. Tackle it by putting somebody in charge of industry and commerce whom the business community will have some confidence in and not scoff at. So that's step number one. Cut the number of agencies you have which are already duplicating each other. Don't come forward with a bill or another agency which is merely going to co-ordinate the mess we have already because they will just further entangle it. You have more in operation there than you need; chop it in half and we'll all be better off.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — You know the Minister of Government Services says, out of my funny book. I am glad that he admits Tommy Douglas in Saskatchewan is a book he doesn't like. It seems to be very fact finding and I was debating if I should read a few more comments from it, and obviously I should not pass up the opportunity to do so. Of course you all know who this fellow is, or at least I assume you would.

Well the minister from North Battleford, who belongs there, should continue making comments. I can continue to come off the subject for as long as you would like . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, you want the page number, for the Minister of Education. But you don't know how to read pages, Mr. Minister of Education. You'll get somebody to read it to you. I know that, Mr. Minister, as the member for Thunder Creek was saying earlier, those of us who had the unfortunate privilege of sitting in Crown corporations watched the list of different items brought in by SEDCO and how they muffed it all. You know, we had all kinds of waste and (as referred to earlier by the member for Qu'Appelle) the Saskatoon fiasco and so forth.

Oh, the Attorney General is back, Mr. Chairman. I thought we had the privilege of not having him here today, but he's back . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the obvious one that your little friend, I think . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order! The hon. member for Rosthern has the floor, and I would ask the hon. member to try to confine his remarks to section 1 of this bill — An Act to establish the Department of Economic Development.

MR. KATZMAN: — You know, Mr. Chairman, the members from their seats talk considerably, yet when we give them an opportunity to get into this debate they don't seem to join in it. It's Bill 118, for the member for Saskatoon Centre and the member for Nipawin (who doesn't follow much debate in this House).

Mr. Minister, I was just looking through some of the articles you want in this particular bill. As members previously have said, this is just creating another bureaucracy. I think one member put a new title on you, Big Daddy or something like that.

If you go back in the Tommy Douglas book, there are comments referring to the different things Mr. Douglas suggested during the years and how he would change things. Well, Mr. Minister, the interesting one I always enjoy seeing in all the bills your government has been bringing in lately is the authorization to give away \$10,000. You know, make grants up to and not to exceed . . . To whom do you give them? What are the criteria? You never really seem to tell us. The only minister who has had the fortitude to tell us where he was going to spend the money was Mr. Robbins. No one else has told us where the money was going to be spent.

Before we go any further, Mr. Minister, would you like to suggest where you are going to spend some of this \$10,000? What types of individuals, corporations, or whatever would qualify for these subsidies and grants which you are suggesting? Would you like to answer this question first?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Chairman, until such time as there are some estimates and some money to spend, there are no grants.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, that is the most foolish statement the member has ever made. He knows he can always just spend the money and come back in here next year with supplementary estimates. They have been doing it forever. And he is the

minister, I think, who does it the most.

As my seatmate would say, just look at the cemeteries and see how much money they have. I think he said for seven years it was always in the supplementary estimates; it never comes in on the budgetary vote; it always comes in the backdoor.

Mr. Minister, that is the way you bring it in. So let's hear where you are going to spend the money you haven't received yet, but for which you are going to come back here with supplementary estimates. Would you like to answer that question?

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the minister. On May 21 (I don't know what day that was, but it doesn't matter) when you introduced second reading of the bill, you said and I quote from Hansard:

I think, Mr. Speaker, the intent of the department is to try to co-ordinate some of the activities which from time to time come along and cross over several agencies.

You didn't even say to co-ordinate but 'to try to co-ordinate.' First of all, are you now saying, Mr. Minister, or were you saying then that your departments today are not co-ordinated?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, that is like the question — when did you stop beating your wife? Obviously we attempt to co-ordinate the activities of various departments. This is an attempt to improve upon the co-ordination. I said 'to try' because while I have tremendous confidence in our abilities to do things (as I think the member will recognize), from time to time they don't succeed, once in a while. So I was attempting to be frank with the member to say that the job of the department will be to try to co-ordinate these. I hope it will succeed. It may not. I guess time will tell.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, why wouldn't the Department of Industry and Commerce be able to do the same thing?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, I suppose, Mr. Chairman, the question could be, why can't the planning branch of the Executive Council do it or why couldn't it be done by some other agency? That certainly is a question.

The government obviously has chosen this vehicle as the route for attempting to do this and give it some profile. Now whether it is a good or a bad idea depends on one's point of view.

As I have said, in many other agencies in the country and in many other provinces, some have taken this route; some have taken different routes. It is simply one of the different courses available to the government and this one was chosen. The member can make the case that it could indeed be, for an example, the planning branch of the Executive Council. I can't argue that it couldn't be.

It is just that in our deliberations it was felt that a new agency, a Department of Economic Development, would have some profile in terms of economic development, simply because of its name if nothing else. Furthermore, it was a vehicle that in some other jurisdictions had worked reasonably well for this kind of project.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, since you seem to like the name, and you give no other reason

why the department should be created, would you be considering, perhaps, getting rid of industry and commerce or another agency, and replacing that one with this one, instead of creating something new and creating more expenses for the taxpayers of this province? You argue yourself that you can't argue my point, that it couldn't be done by another agency or that you don't need this one. Well then, if you're insisting on this Department of Economic Development because, as you say, you like the name, then why don't you change the name of industry and commerce and call it Department of Economic Development, or another one? But why the duplication all the time?

MR. COWLEY: — The member continually puts words in my mouth, or at least takes my words and changes them around. I certainly didn't suggest the only reason for the department was that we like the name. I think if the member checks the records that's not quite what I said. I think if the member looks at the Department of Industry and Commerce and the many activities they carry out, the small business reps and these sorts of things, it plays a role which is a very important role in this province. I think if the member checks the records, I think I checked the other day, in Saskatchewan last year, in 1979, there were 4,500 new companies.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How many moved out?

MR. COWLEY: — There were 1,500 either created or registered in this province; 1,500 for a net gain of 3,000. I think that indicates in some areas at least there's a significant amount of activity in this province. I would hope we can continue that level of activity in the province, and that the new department will add something to it. As I indicated to the member, I didn't envisage a large staff. The member asked me how many staff we had now, and I said none, which was true. Obviously the department will at least have a deputy minister. That may or may not be an employee of the department. One way we could go I suppose is to name, for example, the deputy minister of finance as the deputy minister of economic development, if one didn't want to have any staff at all. That's just a theoretical example, not one I'm contemplating.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you might be able to tell me what kind of assistance you might be giving. I'm quoting from Hansard again:

It's not the intent to replace or duplicate the Department of Industry and Commerce, which will continue as it has in the past with its promotional activities.

Of course, the way I read that is that all they do is promotional activity.

. . . with its activities with respect to business and SEDCO. We will work with departments such as the Department of Agriculture.

What kind of assistance, what kind of work would you be doing with the Department of Agriculture?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, let's assume there was some area in agriculture processing (which one of the members offered as an example) that seemed like a good one and where there was some interest expressed, perhaps, by an outside party, or interest expressed (if it were in the fertilizer industry) by someone who had been in contact with the potash corporation or something. It was going to involve agriculture. That would be the kind of area where we would look to agriculture for some of their expertise, either in terms of markets which there might be in Saskatchewan for those

kinds of products, or in terms of their knowledge about other parts of North America or western America, or whatever in terms of markets, conditions, trends, and so on for those kinds of products. We might look to them for some expertise also in terms of the people they have on staff, agrologists and so on.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, using some of the words that you're using, it would indicate to me you haven't done much of a study for the need of the department, because you say the kind of thing, might and maybe and all the rest are very vague. So I'm going to ask you what kind of work, and you used a couple of other examples, you do with Sask Tel, SPC? I can go on in every department of the government, but Mr. Minister, by your own words when you say the kind of thing, and the maybes and the mights, what kind of a study have you made that indicates to you and to this Assembly that you need this department and if you have made such a study, if you have such a report, will you table it?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Chairman, the study (I believe) which led to the creation of the ministry in the department was conducted by Executive Council; if the member has a question with respect to the study, the appropriate place to ask it is under estimates. Certainly the study wasn't carried out by the department because there was no department to carry it out. In terms of government reorganization, the way we're organized into departments and so on, most of that work (to the best of my knowledge) is done by the Executive Council. When there was, for example, a Department of Continuing Education created some years ago, as an offshoot of the Department of Education, the study (as I recall) was not carried out by the Department of Education, but whatever work was done, was done by the Premier's office and probably by Executive Council. That led to the creation of a Minister of Continuing Education. So I think that would be the appropriate place to ask for any studies, etc., that there may be.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Under what department are you saying I should ask for the studies?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, I presume that for the studies, etc., which led to the appointment of the ministry and following that the department, one should ask the Premier under Executive Council.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Again, Mr. Minister, you keep saying you presume. I can't understand how you can be so vague about a bill you introduced; you're going to be the minister involved and you don't seem to know anything about it. Now, if you're introducing a bill in this legislature creating a new department, surely if it were decided by some other department (such as the Executive Council) they would have passed on to you the information, or the report, or the study, or anything else for your use in determining whether or not this department is feasible or required. Now, to tell me you presume it was done by Executive Council, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I'd have to say to you that I presume, in that case, that you don't need this department. If you know, or if you're saying to me there was no such report or study — fine, I'll accept that. If you're saying to me you don't know whether or not there was one done, fine. But please don't tell me you presume there was one done. And please don't tell me it might be by Executive Council or it could be some other department. If you know of a report or a study, I would like to know where it is, whether you have a copy, and whether or not you will table it today?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to table any information in this legislature with respect to this bill. As I indicated, when the ministry was created there was material which I received with respect to the contemplated role of the department.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I can't hear. Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to hear the minister's answer and I can't hear it.

MR. COWLEY: — All I'm going to say, Mr. Chairman, is that with respect to the information I have about the formation of the department, I don't intend to table it. I suggested to the member where he might ask questions under it and I believe that to be the right department. I obviously was not privy to any information as to whom the Premier may have consulted in creating the ministry. I didn't ask him whether or not he had asked the Department of Finance to do a study for him and I didn't ask him to table it with me; so I can't say whether or not there are studies in existence with respect to it. I know what information I received with respect to the department, and I indicated to the member I am not prepared to table that.

MR. R. L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — I understand, Mr. Minister, what you are saying is that you require this department to co-ordinate activities within various departments of government. Would that be a fair statement? And if so, is there a weakness now with the co-ordination from department to department of government?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, I indicated again to the member for Regina South, if the member had been here with respect to this — obviously, we felt the co-ordination could be improved upon or we wouldn't have embarked on the creation of the ministry and the introduction of the bill. It is like, as I said, one of those questions such as when did you stop beating your wife? The member expects me to say there was no co-ordination at all, and therefore we had to introduce the department to bring it about. That obviously isn't my view of the situation. Rather, this is an attempt to improve upon that co-ordination, and the directness of its ability to deal with economic development.

MR. ANDREW: — Obviously, Mr. Minister, if you're saying there are weaknesses in the government structure now with regard to co-ordinating activities (which I take it there are more and more of), we become more complex in government and one department has application to another department.

You seem to be indicating that this will facilitate a much better co-ordination of all departments. My question basically becomes this: is that the only vehicle you have by which to better facilitate the co-ordination of government programs?

MR. COWLEY: — It is the only vehicle I have.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, it is not agreed to. Mr. Minister, you indicated a few minutes ago you are not prepared to table the report you have, but that we might be able to get a report from the Executive Council estimates.

Before we move off this bill today, can we have assurance from your government whether or not you will table such a report during estimates of Executive Council?

MR. COWLEY: — No.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Why not?

MR. COWLEY: — I don't have either the authority or frankly, the desire. Certainly I am in no position to assure the member that I will table a report that: (a) I haven't seen; (b) I don't know exists; (c) I don't know what form it is in; and (d) is on the part of the Premier.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I wonder if the minister might answer a hypothetical question? Since it seems to be a hypothetical department, as my colleague for Kindersley has suggested, this bill indicates to me that it is a great opportunity for the government on the opposite side, during the year of an election, to really hand out the grants, all kinds of (I was going to call them bribes, but I guess that is maybe not the right word) grants, favours, and not only before the election, but immediately after.

You've been doing a good job of that over the years. Shane Industry is a prime example of that — \$175,000 in one year, down the drain with not a nickel put up by the candidate who was defeated, not one red nickel put up — \$175,000 of taxpayers' money down the drain! Now, how many favours to political friends do you intend to make under this bill during an election year, prior and after?

MR. COWLEY: — None.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we have the minister on record saying, none.

AN HON. MEMBER: — A change of policy.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, certainly we intend to hold you to that because if such a grant, if any grant is ever made to a defeated candidate following that statement made by the minister . . . I would be very careful in the future grants made. Certainly, you haven't been very careful in the past. You have blatantly dished out and handed thousands of dollars to defeated candidates of your party. I don't see any reason why that would change from the past. Now, will you also tell me this: since you are going to be co-ordinating all of these departments, and SEDCO (because that's what you said), will you guarantee this Assembly there will be no future and no further grants and favours made, such as have been made by SEDCO and other departments, to defeated candidates of the NDP?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member asked in his opening remarks for assurance from me that there would be no grants made to defeated candidates (during election year I think he was talking about, prior to and after). I assured him of that in terms of the Department of Economic Development. I want to just remind the member that he wants to remember that after the next election when he comes to me looking for a grant.

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, in response to the member for Kindersley, stated that had he been in the House he would have known something or other. It should be noted that whenever the member for Biggar is speaking in this House one could be absent for a week. It's like watching the Edge of Night; you can come back and still pick up where you left off.

I don't think that's too valid an argument at all. I think that what we need to very seriously consider, and I think what the government needs to very seriously consider, is the bill before the House; An Act to establish the Department of Economic Development.

Now is capsulizing some of the arguments that have been made, one has to make these very valid points . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Very well, the BMW runs very well. If the Government of Saskatchewan was one-third as efficient as the BMW we'd have a good government in the province.

Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I want to tell you this in capsulizing the arguments that have been made on this side of the House with respect to this bill. First you are creating yet another department so the bureaucracy continues to grow. That's the first valid point. When you create a department like that the obvious question from this side of the House is, what do you need it for? Consider that already passed in this legislature are two bills with respect to northern Saskatchewan.

I'd like the minister responsible to be listening so he can answer some of these questions. They are very valid questions and I think they do deserve answering.

We have Bill 19 — An Act to amend the Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act, and Bill 45 — An Act to amend the Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act. When you take Bill 45 and Bill 118, either we need one or we need the other for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and for economic development for northern Saskatchewan. We only need one of these bills. If in fact we do need your Bill 118, then I think the second valid argument to be made is that the economic activities of this government are not synchronized in any way, shape or form and Bill 118 is necessary in order to synchronize that financing.

Now, Mr. Minister, it seems to me that it would be incumbent upon you to describe to the House, in particular to the members of the opposition and for the benefit of the backbenchers on your side of the House, to what extent this bill is going to represent the economic interest of the people of Saskatchewan. In what areas is the department of tourism going to benefit from this in any way, and if so, how? Is the Department of Agriculture going to benefit from this economic development bill in any way, and if so, how?

What about northern Saskatchewan? I think that's a very important correlation to draw with respect to this bill.

What about that economic development, that potential, that vision which I described to the House for the next decade for northern Saskatchewan? A vision which the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan was smart enough to pick up on and he doesn't disagree with me one bit; there needs to be economic development; there needs to be local autonomy; there needs to be a vision taken by this government on the long-range and not short-term policies. The minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan has accepted that challenge with regard to economic development.

Well I want to know, Mr. Minister, how is Bill No. 118 going to affect the economic development in northern Saskatchewan? I want to know how it's going to affect it with reference to Bill No. 45? I want to know how it's going to affect northern Saskatchewan with respect to Bill No. 19?

Well, let's take a look at the other important factor which needs to be considered here, a very important factor. You have a spending ceiling of \$10,000 and anything in excess of that, you go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. With the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, he can go up to \$25 million. By my understanding of it Bill No. 118 is that there is no ceiling. You have the powers to spend money in any way you, as a minister, see fit through this bill. That in itself is the next important factor to which we must address ourselves with respect to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, if the member for Nipawin were to speak as much on his feet as he does

from his desk, he might be a little better heard in this House. He's flashing his money around there. He might flash a little over here. Did he lose a little money in a bet? If he's betting with us he'll lose every time, I can assure the House of that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, that leads us to the most important aspect of this whole bill and the direction this government is taking. With Bill No. 118 it can be compared with the number of bills this government has introduced which give the ministers, the cabinet, the sweeping powers of expenditure and of expropriation, takeover, to buy and sell as they like the properties of the people of Saskatchewan with no guarantees that in fact there will be any economic development. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate very much if the minister could tell me in which way this bill will co-ordinate the economic activities and if it isn't going to do that, I want to know how it's going to affect the economic acts which we have in the statutes now without a conflict of interest between your bill and those other bills?

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Chairman, the member made a comment about the grant giving section. It's virtually the same as any other department. If you look at the Department of Agriculture, there's no ceiling there either. There's no ceiling in the Attorney General's department. But for over \$10,000 they have to get an order in council.

The member makes a comment with respect to the economic development agency in northern Saskatchewan and the fact that there would be an economic development department in the province of Saskatchewan and tries to make a point of that. Obviously there's a Department of Social Services within DNS so the same case could be made there; you don't need a Department of Social Services for southern Saskatchewan if you have an agency in the North dealing with it. Obviously we have chosen to deal with northern Saskatchewan in a separate and special way. I take it the member doesn't agree with that which is fully his right.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the minister. Your study, or the study that you say you have or the report from the Executive Council, whatever it is you have that you won't table — is there any indication in there as to about how much money will flow through this department, say next year or from the day assent is given to the bill.

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Chairman, I was asked this question by the press — a member of the Canadian Press — and I indicated that I thought the expenditures for this department in the current fiscal year would not exceed \$100,000.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — How about the second year?

MR. COWLEY: — Well, again, Mr. Chairman, I have a little difficulty answering that question. Obviously, I don't know for certain what particular task the department may be assigned, but I would not think it would be a significant sum of money unless there was a major study being carried out and the department was assigned it. There's nothing in the estimates, if the member is looking there. There is no department to have estimates for. So, if we have any funds this year, they will be by way of supplementary.

But I wouldn't expect the expenditures for the department to rise significantly in the next two or three years. I think it's basically a co-ordinating function. They have the right to do some studies and that. I don't anticipate it making grants at this point in time. It has that power, as every other department does, but I don't anticipate it having a large

subvote — in fact no subvote — to make grants out at this point in time.

With respect to its expenditures two years hence, I would be surprised if they exceed \$0.5 million.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Just to pursue that a little bit further, what are your long-range plans then? You say you're going from \$100,000 to \$0.5 million in about three years' time. What are your long-range plans for expenditure?

MR. COWLEY: — The long-range plans, unless it's assigned some duties which I don't contemplate now, would be in that order taking into account inflation as far ahead as I can see.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest you consider a little order in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I can say to the hon. member for Moosomin that I always consider order in the House.

Section 1 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 26

Blakeney	Mostoway	Cowley
Pepper	Banda	Cody
Romanow	Kaeding	Lusney
Snyder	Hammersmith	Prebble
Kramer	Kowalchuk	Thompson
Skoberg	Dyck	Poniatowski
McArthur	Byers	Lingenfelter
Shillington	Vickar	White
MacMurchy	Rolfes	

NAYS — 9

Berntson	Rousseau	Muirhead
Birkbeck	Swan	Katzman
Taylor	Pickering	Andrew

Section 2 agreed.

Section 3

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, before the Premier leaves the Assembly, I wonder if you'd allow a question? Well, Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Premier if he will answer a question if I pose it to him.

The question I have is very simply this. The minister responsible for this bill, the one who introduced this bill, indicated to the Assembly that he assumed you had a study which

had been made respecting the Department of Economic Development. Will you at the time of the Executive Council estimates table the study?

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — No, I do not have any study for tabling.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier would entertain another question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. We're dealing with section 3. O.K., if they want to ask questions.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Premier, was there ever a study made to determine the need of the Department of Economic Development?

MR. BLAKENEY: — A study, meaning by a consultant or something? The answer is no. Look, with all deference, Mr. Chairman, members opposite are not likely to give us much advice on how to organize governments.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They can't even organize the opposition.

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right. The number of departments that a government ought to have and how the functions of a government ought to be discharged is something about which we can get advice best from those who know it best. And those are our senior public servants and some of us in the political life who have been around for some time. With all deference, about the last person I would ask how to organize government as to whether there should be a separate department would be an outside consultant who didn't know the operations of the department and the government.

So the answer then is that obviously we have given it some study but we did not have a formal study prepared suitable for tabling.

In other words we don't have a study from PS Ross & Partners or from any other of your private sector friends in respect of whom you want to get a consultant's fee for doing something which, with all deference, I and my staff could do better than your consultant friends.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Well, if both of you would like to sit down then I'll think about it and probably call on one of you. I think the questions are kind of out of order, so if we could get back to the bill.

Section 3 of the bill, is that agreed? I call on the hon. member for Nipawin.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the member for Weyburn, if he would permit me to ask a question about this bill. Would the Chairman be prepared to accept my questioning the member for Weyburn?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, I would not. In fact I hesitated to allow the Premier to answer the question but he had some responsibility being the head of the government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, he's not part of the government. No, he's not, neither am I.

Is section 3 agreed?

Section 3 agreed.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed.

Sections 6 to 8 agreed on division.

Sections 9 to 11 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill on division.

MR. COLLVER: — Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Make sure that the division is a fair division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — O.K.

Bill No. 95 — An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act

Sections 1 to 11 agreed.

Section 12 as amended agreed.

Sections 13 to 20 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 90 — An Act to amend The Residential Tenancies Act

Sections 1 to 12 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act

Section 1

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could call it five o'clock?

The committee recessed until 7 p.m.