

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Thursday, April 9, 1981.

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.
Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS
WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SOLOMON: — Thanks, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure this afternoon that I introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this Assembly, 40 grade 8 students from Sherwood School in the constituency of Regina North-West, who are located in the west gallery. The 40 students are chaperoned and accompanied by three teachers, Fred Short, Mr. Kehler, and an intern teacher, Mary Delanghe. I'd like to express my hope to the students this afternoon that they enjoy the proceedings. I'm sure they'll find them quite interesting and educational and, for sure, entertaining. I would like to say to them that I will be meeting with them afterward for some pictures and refreshments and a discussion. I look forward to their questions, and I ask all members to welcome them to this Assembly this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: — Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted and pleased to introduce to you, and to this legislature, 43 students from the St. Anne's School from Saskatoon Mayfair constituency. They are grade 7 and 8 students, I understand, and they are accompanied by Mr. Glauson, Mr. Reiger and Mrs. Dolezsar. St. Anne's School is just down the street from where I live, and we frequently use its ice facilities and its ball diamonds, so I am not unfamiliar with St. Anne's School. I want, on behalf of the members, to welcome you here. I hope that you find the activities here entertaining and educational. I look forward to the opportunity of meeting with you later on in the afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Suspension of SGEA employees

MR. HARDY: — I'd like to thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labor. Yesterday, Mr. Minister, I brought to your attention the fact that there were two employees of the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association) suspended for refusing to work in excess of 10 hours overtime without authorization. Today, two more employees have been suspended. Are you prepared to tell this Assembly what is really going on in this department, and what your department has done to correct this problem?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — In answer to the hon. member's question, I indicated yesterday that the officers of the apprenticeship and standards division were making a point of being in touch. I believe that as early as 1:15 yesterday afternoon, the labor standards inspector from Prince Albert paid a visit to the members. I was in Saskatoon this morning. I spoke with one of the employees in question who indicated that Mr. Apps,

the labor standards officer from P.A. had been in touch, and that he was conducting an investigation. That's my report on the matter as it stands now. I have nothing further to report until I hear from Mr. Apps.

MR. HARDY: — At 1:15 yesterday you said you were looking into the matter. At 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon at least two other employees were suspended. Do you realize that because of this, there is a possibility that the Regina Correctional Institute and other centres in the province are considering going out in sympathy on behalf of these four employees already suspended?

HON. MR. SNYDER: — No, I have no knowledge of that, and I'm not at all certain that the hon. member has knowledge of that, either.

MR. HARDY: — Final supplementary. Mr. Minister, it was brought to my attention this morning that the possibility has been talked about at both these camps, that the Regina Correctional Centre could possibly go out as early as 4 o'clock this afternoon, with picket lines being set up. I just wonder if you are now ready to act and resolve this issue before we find that the only people left in these centres are the inmates themselves.

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Well, we do have a lot of difficulty expressing ourselves and making ourselves understood, don't we? I've indicated to the hon. member that the difficulties in question were being looked into originally by the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association, the trade union organization which is responsible for processing grievances. They have been looking into the matter with the Public Service Commission. And when as late as yesterday morning, an inquiry was made of my department by two of those people, I immediately put a labor standards officer in to investigate. He is in the process of doing that now. I have nothing further to report. As the member indicates, there is a possibility of a walkout at the correctional centre. I am not aware of it. The correctional centre is not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor, as the hon. member will well know.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take the member for Nipawin.

Refusal of Attorney General to Appear in Court

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I would address my question to the Attorney General. The Attorney General is aware that a subpoena has been issued to demand that he appear as an officer for the government in the matter between me and the Unionist Party and the Government of Saskatchewan. Would the Attorney General inform the members of this Assembly why, through his solicitors, he has consistently refused to appear as an officer on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan to be examined for discovery in a matter which many people in Saskatchewan consider to be extremely important?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the hon. member that the position of the Government of Saskatchewan is best articulated on this legal matter by the lawyer who is representing the government, and that is Mr. Gauley of Saskatoon. If there is any error of specifics or nuance in my answer to this question (and that of Mr. Gauley), I want to make it absolutely clear that Mr. Gauley is the one which is to be taken as the legal position. But essentially, as I understand it, the posture taken by counsel for the government's position is that the issues at stake involved constitutional

issues or, more accurately perhaps, statutory interpretations of two conflicting bills: the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code and Bill No. 105 of which no examination of an appropriate officer is required.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General will be aware that the statement of claim not only outlines that it is a constitutional matter, but also it was a personal attack on the personal views of a member of this Legislative Assembly. Therefore, I ask the Attorney General: since in the government's own arguments before the court, in which we requested to examine for discovery, the Premier, Mr. Blakeney, the counsel for the government argued that it was not our right to examine Mr. Blakeney because the appropriate officer was Mr. Romanow, the Attorney General, why are you refusing to appear before an examination for discovery when in a previous argument on the same matter, you stated that you were the appropriate officer and that the Premier was not?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member phrases the question on the basis of refusing to appear. I have not refused to appear because I have not been requested by the appropriate legal documents to so appear in this case or any other case. If and when such documentation is served on me, and resolved according to the due processes of law, I (or whoever) will be obligated to respond to the appropriate legal documentation. That has not been the case; accordingly, I feel under no obligation to attend. I would dispute the hon. member's characterization of that as refusing.

MR. COLLVER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would say to the Attorney General, he has attempted to hedge; the documentation will indicate over the past three months that the Attorney General and any other appropriate officer of the Government of Saskatchewan have refused to appear. Is the Government of Saskatchewan in the person of either the Premier or the Attorney General afraid to face a situation in which he has to swear under oath and answer questions under oath, as opposed to this Chamber in which he can spread the kind of nuance and erroneous kinds of statements, misleading statements, that the members opposite and the Attorney General have been in the practice of making? Is he afraid to appear under oath and answer questions pertaining to this matter?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I would remind you and the members of the House that this is a matter which is *sub judice*. It is before the courts at the present time and, as I understand it, is a matter which is being considered by the courts. I believe the rules of the House generally are that, when a matter is before the courts, we should avoid debating it before the legislature. But, specifically put, the question is: am I afraid? I'm not afraid. I don't think any one of us would very much relish the prospect of appearing in any court proceeding, but I've done it in the past and if the obligation requires me to do it in the future, that is my obligation.

I'm not afraid, Mr. Speaker, but I don't believe that I am under any obligation to do so, until the appropriate legal courses require me to.

Oil Price Agreement and the Quebec Election

MR. ANDREW: — A question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. Mr. Minister, today's sale of oil and gas rights once again demonstrates the industry's reaction to the non-agreement, if you like, to an oil pricing agreement. My first question relates to the fact that Mr. Lalonde, in his foray into the Quebec election campaign, seems to be attacking

Mr. Levesque for taking a position in support of higher oil prices, a position, I might say, advocated by the governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

In view of the statement by Mr. Lalonde, (if I may read it) that “It’s only because of the Liberal energy policy that Quebec people are able to save millions of dollars,” my question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: would you agree that a victory for Mr. Levesque in the upcoming election in Quebec could be a stimulus in bringing that energy thing to a head and perhaps getting on with solving that energy question?

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think I’d rather not comment on the outcome of the Quebec election. I suspect the Quebec people are quite capable to making their own decisions without our help. It’s interesting to hear the member for Kindersley suggest and, indeed, recommend the election of the Parti Quebecois, but I don’t think I’d want to go that far.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary question. Mr. Minister, what I’m basically saying is that (from that point of view of the Quebec election as to the party that is supporting what I think is a reasonable, and I think you think is a reasonable, stand on energy pricing), there are various aspects to that campaign. Would you not agree that, should the PQ win that election (it appears to be one way or the other as to where it’s going to go), there could be a positive result from that victory and, in fact, the energy pricing will get onto the table and they’ll get on with the decision?

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I frankly am just not well enough versed in the policies of either the PQ or the other major party in Quebec, the provincial Liberal Party, with respect to their position on energy. Obviously, we would like to see elected in Canada 10 (or 11, I guess, if you count the federal government) governments that agreed with us on energy pricing. So to that extent I would agree with the member that we would like to see elected, all across Canada, governments which would take our position with respect to energy pricing.

Support for Independent Operators in Saskatchewan Oil Production

MR. ANDREW: — A new question. With regard to the sale today, Mr. Minister, it would appear that what is happening is the same thing that happened in the early ‘70s with regard to the industry moving away from the province of Saskatchewan to other areas of activity. Your government recognized the error of its ways in the mid-1970s and brought in new policies.

My question is: in view of the fact of today, which once again demonstrates that movement away, is your government prepared to do as it did before and make some modifications to your policies so that you can maintain particularly that small independent operator, operating in the province of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. COWLEY: — The last time they were saying it was an impasse between the federal and the provincial governments over the question of non-deductibility. That ended with some changes being made at the provincial levels. Obviously, we are open to any discussions with the federal government with a view to resolving this dispute. We have no intention, as I stated previously in answer to the question put by the member, of unilaterally lowering our royalties in order to make room for the new federal taxes.

Cutback in RCMP Services

MR. LANE: — A question to the Deputy Premier. The Solicitor General for Canada has indicated that there will be a cutback, and I believe your indications were that there would not be a cutback in RCMP services. Obviously, there is either confusion, or matters are in a state of flux. Although the cutbacks proposed by the Solicitor General are not extensive, they have potential to be. Has the Department of the Attorney General of the province of Saskatchewan any contingency plans, should negotiations break down further, in the paying for RCMP services in the province?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, first of all, no cutbacks have been formally announced or communicated to the Government of Saskatchewan, that I know. More correctly, what has been announced is the potential, or threat of a cutback in the eventuality of non-agreement (as I take it), on the question of whether or not the contracts are retroactive, and, more specifically, whether or not the words of a Telex communicate retroactivity. Accordingly, it is difficult to plan on contingency, based on the fact that we don't know what the cutback will be, if it takes place.

Quite frankly, I think the options are reasonably limited. We do not have an alternate police force in place that would be available to us in the foreseeable months, even if we started planning immediately - I think that would not be a realistic option. I simply think the realistic option is to look for an appropriately negotiated settlement between the provinces and the federal government - something we stand ready and willing to do, subject to the terms. So, I'm not able to respond with precision to the hon. member, since I do not have the facts at hand, as to what we are likely to respond to.

MR. LANE: — My supplementary. I agree with the Attorney General that the options are limited. I say they are very limited. It strikes me that the statements, the confusion, the lack of communication between you and the Solicitor General, along with the public negotiations, all indicate that both of you are playing a very dangerous game. Would the Attorney General please report as to when negotiations will start with the Solicitor General? I would hope that the Attorney General would take under advisement that negotiations should begin immediately - tomorrow, or by the weekend.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, negotiations have never ceased. Negotiations have continued for the past several months, so it is not a question of their having been cut off. Indeed, I believe that efforts are being made to prepare for another federal-provincial meeting of ministers within the next several days. I am unable to advise the member specifically of this, because we have delegated Mr. Williams, the Attorney General of British Columbia, to speak on behalf of all of the eight contract provinces. So it is not a question of negotiations having been terminated; it is a question of Mr. Kaplan having made what I consider to be certain ill-considered, ill-tempered remarks (people have heard me say this before) about the nature of retroactivity in the contract. This is the subject of dispute in the public press.

The negotiations, as far as I know, still are, as they always have been, at the official and ministerial level, and I'm fully optimistic that within a few days, those will again continue in the normal and ordinary fashion.

Care of Level 4A Patients

MR. SWAN: — Citizens who are in advanced mental deterioration are presently categorized as level 4A, and once they have been placed in that category, it is very difficult to place them in any of the existing facilities in rural Saskatchewan. When they

are placed in a hospital which is taking level 4 patients, it is found that they are disruptive persons in that setting, because they disrupt the physically ill who are being cared for. At the present time the only places available are in the larger centres. My question is: what will you do to provide places in rural Saskatchewan to assist people who are categorized as level 4A?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, first I want to acknowledge that the member asks a very important question which we have been addressing ourselves to in the last year or so. A study will be coming forward to me very shortly. The study is being done by the Department of Social Services and the Department of Health, and it also involves people outside government, about how we are to deal with the level 4A situation.

I think we also need to wait until the government makes a decision on the reclassification of the levels of care. I think it is very difficult to simply segregate people who are classified as level 4, and isolate them from society. I think this would be the wrong way to move. I think we need to address ourselves to the problem of having people remain in their own community, if that is possible.

I would like to see (and I know it's a difficulty) the hospitals in rural Saskatchewan address themselves to that problem. We have a number of beds in rural Saskatchewan which are not being used. I think there are areas where you have larger community hospitals, where people of this kind could be cared for adequately and with good quality care. We are addressing ourselves to that.

We have made moves in the last few years in setting up psychiatric assessment units in the various larger hospitals. I know the member realized that, but he's asking specifically for rural Saskatchewan. I think the one further thing we have to do is to establish group homes which will deal specifically with level 4A individuals.

Thirdly, we have a number of level 4A individuals in nursing homes throughout rural Saskatchewan; it may be that we can address ourselves to that problem by having a certain number of beds or a certain wing in that particular nursing home where 4A individuals can receive care. We are addressing ourselves to that problem and I am hoping that within the next month or two, or sometime this summer, we will be able to make some announcement in this regard.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, it appears to me this thing has been studied for the last two or three years, and every time we ask you a question dealing with level 4, it is under study. My question is: are you prepared to do something to provide services in rural Saskatchewan - particular in towns with a population from 3,000 to 5,000? I don't expect one in every village, but something in the larger centres.

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Basically, I think that is what we are addressing ourselves to. I think the member is making a reasonable request from me as the minister; I can certainly tell him we will be addressing ourselves to that problem, and we will come to some decision on it within the next month or two. But I don't think we can work with that in isolation from levels 2, 3 and 4; someone who is level 4A today may well be a level 4 tomorrow. I think that just because someone is diagnosed as level 4 should not mean . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I'll take the member for Thunder Creek.

Liquid Feed Supplements for Livestock

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, everybody in this province is very cognizant of the fact that we are in the middle of a very serious drought.

Mr. Minister, I'm sure you are aware of some of the difficulties in the livestock industry. Through lack of moisture the grass hasn't started to grow. The other problems are endless.

You announced certain measures in this Assembly. I would like to ask, specifically (in light of the fact that many cattlemen do not have grass to turn their cattle out on, and those who do have very poor quality pastures), whether your department has looked into liquid feed supplements which are readily available in Alberta and used on a limited basis in Saskatchewan? Has your department investigated the use of those? Has your department considered the possibility of incorporating the use of liquid feed supplements, as produced in Taber, Alberta, under the drought assistance program which you announced about a week ago?

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I can't answer the hon. member directly on whether the department has been in contact with Alberta with respect to liquid feeds. I can say to the hon. member that our program, which was announced last year and advanced for two months this year, was sound, in the sense that the experience has been over the years, with respect to feed, that the farmers have a good deal of ingenuity in finding feed, and getting it organized. If we provide a program for transportation assistance, it works pretty well.

The hon. member makes a point that the department can line up and inform cattle producers of the whereabouts of these special feed supplies. I think that's legitimate. I will pursue the answer to his question and respond to him by note, perhaps as early as tomorrow.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, I'm afraid you've been away from the cows too long and you've really forgotten the mechanics. The supplements to which I am referring are available commercially in the province of Saskatchewan. They are used by many cattlemen.

Because of their specialized use (the use that can be made of them at this particular season of the year, since there is no adequate pasture and the grass is not greening up), and the specific role for their use, which is now and for the next two months, my question is this: is your department investigating perhaps incorporating into your program (either through a program of direct capital grants for the dispensing tank, or perhaps by inclusion of the product itself into the program) liquid feeds, because the time for their use is now? They are in Saskatchewan, but they do take some expense to set up. This is in light of the fact, Mr. Minister, that in the program you announced, the only feed that is available is of very low quality, which is not very desirable at this key time of year.

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, it may well be that I have been away from the cows for a long time, but I don't think I've been away from the farmers who look after the cows. I think that maybe the hon. member has been with the cows too much and not with the farmers.

I still believe sincerely that our programs, when they relate to farmer initiative, are in

line. The hon. member has raised a point about what the department is doing. I indicated to the hon. member that I would respond.

With respect to further programs to deal with the drought issue, we have no plans to announce any further programs at this time. In fact, we'll not be announcing any further programs until our agricultural drought committee, the representatives of the farm organizations, meet. They plan to meet shortly after Easter. At that time, if any further programs need to be announced, they will bring them forward to us. We would then consider them, and an announcement would be made at that time.

Seminars for MLAs About Seat Belt Use

MR. SKOBERG: — I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Highways. Some time back, Mr. Minister, this legislature enacted seat belt legislation. I presume that most members of the legislature are aware of that legislation. I'm wondering whether or not the Minister of Highways, in charge of highway safety, would now indicate if his department is prepared to conduct seminars for those MLAs who are not familiar with the use of seat belts.

HON. MR. LONG: — Mr. Speaker, this question comes as a complete and total surprise. I'm not certain that I know just what to say. I suppose I could consider special seminars for MLAs who aren't familiar with seat belt legislation and the advantages of using seat belts in the province. I know that there are certain MLAs who aren't in favour of that sort of thing. I noticed in the April 3 edition of the *Leader-Post* an article from the *Edmonton Journal*. I might, Mr. Speaker, just quote a few short paragraphs from that article which indicate that there are MLAs who do need that kind of a seminar. The article reads:

Consider the terrible price Albertans have paid to exercise the right not to wear seat belts. Preliminary figures for 1980 show that out of the 442 people killed in Alberta, 272 of them would not have died if they had buckled their seat belts up before leaving home. Mandatory seat belt legislation, rigorously enforced, will help save Albertans' lives. It would also save public money by reducing the extent of traffic injuries and hospitalization.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call a page forward to distribute copies of this article to the members opposite.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 53 - An Act to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act.

Motion agreed to and ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Bill No. 54 - An Act respecting Electrical Wiring and Inspection and the Sale and Installation of Electrical Apparatus and Material

HON. MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an Act respecting Electrical Wiring and Inspection and the Sale and Installation of Electrical Apparatus and Material be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

ANNOUNCEMENT
Death of Former Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: — By way of information to the members of the Assembly, I wish to inform them that today it has come to my attention that the former speaker of the legislature, the Hon. James Snedker, passed away on March 31, 1981.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

REVENUE, SUPPLY AND SERVICES

Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 18
Item 1 (continued)

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I wonder if I might just respond to a question that was asked yesterday before we get into further questions? The question was put with regard to flight 272 to Phoenix, Arizona and I can supply information for the hon. member for Thunder Creek with respect to that flight. It was an air ambulance flight. The aircraft left Regina at 9:10 a.m. March 20 and arrived in Phoenix at 1:50. The crew on board was Jim Wilson, captain, Jim Guillaume, co-pilot, and Leslie Morton, nurse. The return flight left Phoenix at 11:30 and reached Regina at 3:45. Passengers were the patient and the family. The patient had broken legs and other injuries as the result of a car-pedestrian accident. This information is drawn from the requisition for air ambulance transportation completed when the flight is requested and approved by the Department of Health prior to the flight.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I'd just like to ask you some questions on return no. 41, tabled in the legislature last fall. How do you determine what companies you will accept credit cards from? I'll give you an example of what I am talking about. I notice that you have Budget, Tilden, and Hertz Rent-a-Car credit cards issued. As you know, there are several more rent-a-car companies. Are they barred from having credit cards with revenue, supply and services? As well, I notice in some cases you seem to favor one company much more than you do the other one. Is there a reason for that or is it on a bid system? Do they tender their rates, and do you supply those rates to your civil servants and various departments?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member could read the question for us. We are not aware of what he is talking about at all.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — This question is: (1) the departments, Crown corporations, boards, commissions, or any other Government of Saskatchewan entities, presently issuing charge cards to employees for any job related expenses including transportation, car rental, hotel, meals, etc.: (2) the number of cards currently authorized; (3) the names of

the companies that have issued credit cards to these entities; (4) the general guidelines or regulations that govern issuance and use of such cards; (5) the total amount paid to the issuing firms on such cards for March 1, 1979, to March 25, 1980; (6) the highest amount charged to a credit card for March 1, 1979, to March 25, 1980, and the holder of that card. I'll come to more questions but to get back to my original question . . .

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I think, Mr. Chairman, that was a general question asked of the government. The only credit cards we have in the Department of Revenue are one issued to the deputy minister in relation to Air Canada and one issued to myself as a member of the Executive Council. Those are the only credit cards we have in the Department of Revenue.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm quite aware that this is a question directed to the Government of Saskatchewan. Your department looks after the tender process and the purchasing and so on for all the departments, as I understand the function of revenue, supply and services. Therefore, my question again comes back to you. How do you tender with these companies for their supplies or services in the case of rentals of automobiles? Surely this isn't left open to anyone to do as he pleases. There must be a tender process, which the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services would follow. If not, why not?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — The only time we ever rent cars occurs if one of the officials is travelling in Ottawa and needs a rent-a-car. He would then rent one. We don't rent vehicles as such. The central vehicle agency buys the vehicles. It has them in its fleet and they go out to the departments for their usage.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — In other words, you don't rent any cars in the city of Regina or in the province of Saskatchewan. Is that correct?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I'm informed that on occasion we have rented vehicles for tax auditors working outside the province, say in Calgary or Edmonton.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — My question again: does the government not rent automobiles from various rental agencies in the province of Saskatchewan for use in the province, in the cities of Saskatoon, Regina, or any other town or city of the province?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I'm informed the answer is no, we do not. An individual may rent a car from time to time for a specific half day or something like that, but we do not rent cars as such, generally.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, all right then. I think perhaps it might warrant a further research on the government's part. My information says that you do. I have no information other than word of mouth that in fact some of the agencies consider the government as quite a customer when it comes to the rental of automobiles. I'll leave that for a moment. I'd like you to look into that. For example, you have Budget, Tilden and Hertz. How do you select those companies to issue credit cards or is there a credit card? I presume there is. How do you arrive at that? How do you do that?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I have to inform you that it's not our responsibility as a department to review those contracts. There may be rented cars from time to time by the departments, but we do not review that. We're responsible for the central vehicle agency, with some 4,300 vehicles allotted out to the departments on the basis of their need. And they are charged through revenue certain sums of recovery of costs related to those vehicles.

MR. BERTSON: — Question three on this return is the names of companies that have issued credit cards to these entities. The names of the companies are: Air Canada, Sask Tel, American Express, Chargex, Visa, Budget Rent-A-Car, Tilden Rent-A-Car, Hertz, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and Delta Airlines. Were those credit cards solicited or did they just show up to the occupants, or how did you get them?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — The individual department would make that arrangement. We make no arrangements with regard to rental of automobiles.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you are announcing something to us here today that is really contrary, I believe, to government policy. Isn't all purchasing done through the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services? And a credit card in my opinion is the same as a purchase. Surely there must be a system involved in issuing a credit card to someone. I'm trying to determine whether this is done on a helter-skelter basis or whether it's done in a properly organized system or program where you have credit cards from . . . I don't care where they're from, whether it be Chargex or VISA or Air Canada or Tilden, etc. Are they just done on a department-by-department basis without the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services knowing anything about it? If they are, I suggest to you that system or program should be reviewed.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — The member may well be right in that the system should be reviewed, but we have no responsibility with respect to the rental of cars from Hertz or Air Canada or to credit cards or anything of that nature. We are prepared to investigate and get more information for you if we can, but it does not come under the purchasing agency of the revenue, supply department.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I certainly think you should be investigating and reviewing that system. For example, American Express' bill to the government this year was almost \$121,000. Now, when you have a purchase of that size surely there must be some kind of program in place to take care of this kind of usage? Somebody must know how these cards end up in the departments' hands or individuals' hands.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, a lot of that could be people's travelling and paying for their hotel bills and that sort of thing. We will investigate and report back. If you want us specifically to look into that one on American Express, we'll do so.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, I don't want you specifically to look into any one of them. I want to know how credit cards are handed out to individuals and how the companies are chosen to issue credit cards to you or to any other minister or any other senior civil servant in the government. Are they just coming out helter-skelter? Are you asking for them? Are they supplying them? You know, there has to be some kind of system and if there isn't, then I suggest to you that one be put in place because the total amount involved here is well over a million dollars. That's a lot of expense. I realize that most of it is Air Canada, however, there again there could be several different flights which could be used as well - not necessarily only Air Canada. This one happens to be. I don't know why we don't use PWA (Pacific Western Airlines) or others, you know . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the other one belongs to the federal government. So what difference does it make? Perhaps you might get a better deal. How do you know? Maybe the flights are better. I suggest an investigation of it, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I said we'd investigate and report back. I can tell you how I get the credit cards for my cabinet car. They're sent to me through central vehicle agency.

And they're sent to me for all of the oil companies. They're given to me at the time I get the car. I sent them all back except the Co-op and the Petro-Canada ones. But I'm prejudiced, you see.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You've opened up, I think, another one. Are you saying to me that all the oil companies are supplying you with credit cards?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I'm saying that the central vehicle agency supplied me with credit cards from Esso and Gulf and all those, and I sent them all back to CVA except Petro-Can and Co-op.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You know, when we asked for this information, we asked for all cards and they're not listed. How come?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — How do I know? Part of our department with respect . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The government got the question. I would like an answer. You're telling me now that other credit cards have been issued and they're not on this list.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — You can ask the Provincial Secretary. He supplied the information with regard to them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I don't know why I would ask the Provincial Secretary. Frankly, the purchasing agency is you. And I believe that if the Provincial Secretary is involved with this, then it should be moved over to your department and not left to him.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I should point out to the hon. member that those are only employees' cards, not the ministers' cards.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I beg to differ with you. Are you saying this is for employees only? Is that what you said? Oh, you're right. Not for the ministers. How come you missed the ministers on this?

MR. BERNTSON: — Are there no employees of the government who use credit cards for Petro-Can or Co-op or the major oil companies from time to time?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I can only report for the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services. I, as a minister, get credit cards from the oil companies. I said I only used two of them. That's my prejudice, if you want to call it that. My deputy gets an Air Canada credit card. Those are the only ones we have in the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — How did your deputy get his Air Canada credit card? Let me ask you that question.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — It was authorized by the Department of Finance.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — So now we have the Department of Finance in it. When you say "authorized" does that mean the request was made for it?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Yes, they would have to make a request.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — So, there seems to be some system in place. Can you explain what the system is? This is what I asked earlier: what system do you have for it?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — As I said long ago, Mr. Chairman, we will investigate it and report back. I am simply saying that an Air Canada credit card was requested by my deputy because he had to fly Air Canada to meetings on behalf of the government.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Okay. I will accept that. Hopefully you will look at it, review it and come back with whatever policy you have in place for it.

MR. GARNER: — First of all, I would like a list of all airplanes the Government of Saskatchewan owns and the cost of running those airplanes. Well, maybe you had better supply that first of all.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I can read these out to you. These are the CVA aircraft: model PA31T Cheyenne, seven to eight seater, purchased October 1975 from Corpac Ltd., Calgary; PA31T Cheyenne, seven to eight seats, \$787,125, purchased January 1978, Corpac Ltd., Calgary; PA31 Navajo, seven to eight seats, \$155,460, January 1969, Trans Aircraft, Hamilton (that's where it was purchased); PA31 Navajo, seven to eight seats, \$263,424, purchased from Glen Air, Hamilton. Those are the planes in the fleet of CVA - 2 Cheyennes, 2 Navajos.

MR. GARNER: — That's the total CVA has in the province. If you could send that over me, I would appreciate it. I would like to bring up the farm fuel cost reduction program. What amount was paid by the government from the time it was implemented (I believe 1977 or 1978) up to the time it was cut off?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — The cost was \$60,376,237.44. The program began in 1974. Those are the payments up to the end of . . . I'm sorry. They're estimates for the last two years because there are still applications coming in. I might point out to you that of the some 70,000 farms in Saskatchewan in 1978, we received 48,409 applications for farm cost reduction.

MR. GARNER: — Give me a breakdown, Mr. Minister, of each year on that please.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — To the number of applicants? . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. GARNER: — Does that have the breakdown of years, Mr. Minister?

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, you stated that 48,000 had applied, out of the 70,000. Have you any idea why the others didn't apply?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Really I don't know. If the program was very important to farmers generally, we would think a larger number of them would apply.

MR. SWAN: — Perhaps I should give you some of the information I received from an accountant last week. He told me that the reason the people he serves are not applying is because of the harassment of the department. He said that they send in their applications and that continually forms go back and forth, back and forth, about 20

times, until they just say it isn't worth it. And that's why the applications are not coming in to cover the full 70,000.

As a matter of fact, the chartered accountant, who is quite capable of doing his own figuring, tells me that he has long since quit bothering with it, because of the nuisance that he finds in dealing with your department.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Obviously there are errors which occur in terms of making out applications and they have to be returned, but less than 1 per cent of them are returned . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's not nonsense; it's a fact.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I think basically one of the problems with this program is the hassle that farmers have to go through with extra book work and everything else. Why couldn't you, with this program, have implemented it so that it was taken off at the bulk dealer where the farmer purchases the fuel and save the additional . . .? I would like to know the administration costs of this program by your government and how many people were employed.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — First of all, it would be much more expensive to administer it through the bulk plants because it does not apply to heating fuels and you'd have to make a differentiation there in relation to the distribution of that fuel. Actually, when Alberta had a program, our cost was about one-third of its cost. Alberta did it through its distributors.

MR. GARNER: — That's a decision and that's an assumption you're making, that it would cost more. I'm not concerned about Alberta; let Alberta take care of itself. It seems to be doing a pretty fair job. What I am concerned about is Saskatchewan. Are you saying the bulk dealers are not competent enough? That's what I'm understanding from the statement you just made, that they're not competent enough to handle this Mickey Mouse program?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — We're not saying they are not competent. We're saying we'd have to pay them a commission to do it, and the cost would be greater than the cost of doing it ourselves.

MR. GARNER: — Just a minute. I would like to know your administration costs on this program.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — He says he'll get the figure. It's about \$100,000, but he'll have it pretty soon.

MR. GARNER: — Then you seem to know that your administration costs would be higher if bulk dealers were doing it. What is your estimated cost if the bulk dealers were handling this program?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — About \$300,000.

MR. GARNER: — How do you arrive at that decision?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Using a similar commission to what was used in Alberta, it would cost us about \$300,000. I might point out the bulk dealers in Alberta were not very happy with the situation there either.

MR. GARNER: — That's using the Alberta thing. There are many times, Mr. Minister, when we wish you would follow Alberta's example on some of these, but you are making a decision on the program in Alberta. If you want to talk about Alberta, fine. How much was their rebate? What was the maximum on it? I don't know; I haven't had time to check it. You tell me what their rebate was and the total, if we are talking about Alberta.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — It started out at 10 cents a gallon. It's still in effect in Alberta. They pay a 12 cent rebate and there's no \$300 limit. And, obviously, you can't put a \$300 limit on if you are doing it through the bulk dealers. There is no way you can control it.

MR. GARNER: — Well, you see there's proof of the program right there. Just to get this on the record, what is the limit here? I know what it is, but you tell me what the limit is here.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — \$300.

MR. GARNER: — Let's have that one on the record. What is the limit here in Saskatchewan? You just stated that in Alberta there was no limit on it. Okay. Well, you can't compare administration costs at all when you are talking no limit on 10 cents a gallon. How much a gallon were you paying here? Okay, 10 cents a gallon, but you see, once again you had a limit of up to \$300. That's why I stated it was a Mickey Mouse program in keeping up with the times . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just a minute. You can get your two bits worth in here, too. But you are talking about Alberta, which had no limit, and Saskatchewan with a \$300 limit. Why don't you try? It's this government that tells us about the billions they rebate to the farmer on his fuel to keep the same relationship. Then the gasoline tax went up again from 12 to 15 cents (that was 1974-75, 1975-76, I think). The gasoline tax then went back up from 12 cents to 15 cents, and the rebate dropped to 4 cents. It was related to the price at the pump differential. When the gasoline tax went back up to 19 cents in 1977, the program was dropped. That's the basis on which it was initially set up. It was reinstituted in 1978-79, I guess, at 10 cents per gallon.

MR. BERNTSON: — Okay, how many applicants were there for those years?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Applicants? 48,409 in 1978 (that's the calendar year, I presume) — 69 per cent of the farmers applied; over 30 per cent did not apply. In 1979, we had 43,850 applicants — about 63.4 per cent of the farmers applied.

Now, in 1980, we announced that the program would cease in 1981, but anyone who had not applied in 1978, 1979 or 1980 could apply. We have had 22,715 applications so far in 1980 . . . (inaudible) . . . Do you want the year 1974? Just that one year?

MR. BERNTSON: — The number of applicants for each year, from the inception of the program. You gave me the number of applicants for the year 1978 on.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Okay, we'll get that. We don't have it here.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, I want to comment at this point on the entire

philosophy of the government toward energy, as it relates not only to agriculture, but to the entire province.

The province of Alberta has taken the attitude that their people in all sectors of the Alberta economy should benefit from their proximity to their natural resources and from the fact that they have them. It's unfortunate that the Government of Saskatchewan chooses not to do the same thing. It's unfortunate that the Government of Saskatchewan refuses to give the benefits of our resources, our potential wealth, directly to the people who reside in the province.

I could point to another example – the people of Alaska, who found oil some six or eight years ago. It's not an oil field in league with Saudi Arabia, but it's a significant oil field. Do you know what they did in Alaska? They simply wiped out income tax. If you had lived in Alaska for a certain number of years, they simply said, "You don't pay any more income tax. We are taking enough money out of oil; we are not going to tinker around and take it from you and then give it back to you in another form." They simply wiped out income tax.

All right. You can say that's a unique situation. They don't have that many people. But nonetheless, it's a very interesting philosophy. And contrast that with the Government of Saskatchewan. We are going to bleed everybody and then pass the blood around. And that in a nut shell is the philosophy of this government as it pertains to our natural resources. I listen to the member for Saskatoon. That's sickening. I agree it's sickening. It's a sickening situation when gas is cheaper in Toronto than it is in Regina or Saskatoon. I agree it's sickening. It's disgusting. I couldn't agree with it. It's much akin to what the member himself is.

Mr. Minister, I apologize for that outburst. The epitome of ignorance always brings that inexcusable outburst from me and I apologize, Mr. Chairman, that I just react to ignorance that way. I must learn to control myself a little better.

It's a disgusting situation when they can buy gas cheaper in Toronto than they can in Regina. Do you know what? Premier Bill Davis won an election by flogging Peter Lougheed for banditizing them in gas prices. Because of Peter the Great, he said, "That's why you are paying this outrageous price for gasoline." That's in Ontario. That's in Toronto. I would say it's a pretty shrewd game and no doubt Peter will reciprocate. He'll flog Bill Davis and he'll get about 90 seats in Alberta. I agree, it's a cute little game. You never know, we just may possibly do the same thing. We may flog Allan and we may get about 50 seats, too.

Getting back to the seriousness of the matter, when you can purchase gas in Toronto for less than you can in Regina and Saskatoon (and they think they're being taken to the cleaners), it's time people took a look at the priorities in this province.

But I want to go back to the farm fuel cost rebate. You know that thing was a garbage program to start with. There was garbage in this respect. Why didn't you just simply take it right off the bulk dealer and forget this nonsense about sending in the receipts, compiling all these silly forms and hiring a bureaucracy to process them; just simply take it off at the bulk dealer. But heavens no. You couldn't do that.

We had to fill out our forms, keep our receipts so that we could get a letter from little Allan that says, "You lucky guys. We're sending you some money because you're being charged too much in the first place, but we, being the good guys, are going to give it

back to you.” And it was a crock of garbage and I don’t think too many people fell for it. On top of that, as the member for Regina South points out, the maximum was \$300. You might as well have taken the money and, for all the help it was, sent it down a well.

It’s not so much that we’re upset at you for removing the program. The \$300 wasn’t worth the cost of administration. But it is the concept that your government has toward agriculture. People in North America, and particularly in Canada, have always taken it as their God-given right that there will be cheap food available. For North America, we are just very fortunate that this has been a fact of life, because that is basically the reason for our affluence – cheap food. Basically, that is what it is because, other than that, the other people in the world have caught up to us in technology, mass production, the ability to produce and manufacture goods such as cars, etc., at the same competitive price that we can in North America.

It has been cheap food which has enabled North Americans to live in their affluence and, particularly, the farmer has been the one who has caught it on the nose. The farmer is caught with these high input costs of which gasoline, energy is rapidly becoming the most significant factor. Anybody who is a farmer in this Assembly can tell you, in terms of percentages, just how much that fuel bill has risen as a percentage of cost on his entire operation. The rise has been dramatic. I think it is fair to say that, in most operations (that is for those of you who keep books) it has doubled in the past three years.

Agriculture, being the backbone of the Saskatchewan economy, deserves a little more from this government than what it is getting. The fact that the province of Alberta chooses to benefit not only all residents but specifically farmers in the field of energy is an example that this government should look directly at and at least make an attempt to emulate. Those farmers are still the backbone of this province.

You can tinker with your uranium mines. You can buy potash mines. You can talk grandiosely of all the wonderful things which are going to come from northern Saskatchewan, but we all know that the bills are going to be paid for the rest of this century right out of that land that was flying by going east the other day.

I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that I think your record in helping farmers in the field of energy, in taxing them, is shameful. SPC has done a rotten job in getting natural gas to the farms. In fact, it hasn’t done a job at all. The farmer in Alberta has such a natural advantage over his counterpart in Saskatchewan that it’s disgusting. He pays half as much municipal tax. He pays about, all in all, 50 per cent less tax than what a farmer in Saskatchewan does, whether you’re talking about fuel tax, sales tax, income tax, or any tax you want . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, 50 per cent is probably giving the benefit of the doubt to this government.

I see one of the other few farmers heading for the exit. He knows that every word I’m saying is true.

Mr. Minister, your department has never made any effort to ease the burden of energy costs to farmers. It’s one area where you can take a direct role. It’s an area in which you should take a direct role. I don’t necessarily mean in the area of subsidization. You have talked so much about keeping the family farm. Your government has talked about keeping the family farm. You talk about land bank and you talk about this and that. The fact of the matter is that since you became the government in 1971, we’ve lost 20,000 farmers – 20,000 farmers right out of Statistics Canada.

I invite the member for Regina Lakeview to examine it. The member from Regina Lakeview knows that the period of rapid acceleration of losing those farmers was under his stewardship as the deputy minister of agriculture, a stewardship which turned one of the most prestigious posts in the civil service into a hack job. He started it. I invite the former deputy minister to check the number of farms . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You make a valid point, now back to the subject. I apologize, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Minister, to return to the subject, your department has done absolutely zero for the farmer. I invite the minister to see what the Alberta government, in terms of the cost of fuel, has done for its farmers. It has given them a competitive advantage over farmers everywhere else in Canada and, particularly, in Saskatchewan. You say, “So what?” It’s reflected at the other end of the farm cash receipts. The Alberta government has given agriculture a break. The result has been an intensification of agriculture. The result has been that Alberta, with 15 per cent of the arable land, is now putting out more in terms of gross farm dollars than Saskatchewan with 40 per cent of the arable land. The reason is not that they are better farmers. The reason is that they’re given an incentive, they’re given a break in Alberta.

The Government of Alberta, instead of being the master of the farmers, is the farmers’ servant as much as possible. It has given them the break of being close to the natural resources and being a part of the natural resources. That is the difference. It’s reflected in the most accurate way of measuring what that agricultural sector will crank out the other end in terms of productivity. You know what the result is? It’s a broader tax base on which to collect your sales tax, your E&H tax and all your other taxes. That’s part of the Alberta success story.

You know what the pathetic part of what I’ve just outlined is? The pathetic part of it is that, although the Alberta experience is there for you people to see and potentially emulate, you don’t understand it. The concept of a government serving some individuals is totally alien to you and totally beyond you! . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . As the member for Souris-Cannington points out, it is an alien experience to you or probably, even more precisely, a close encounter of the third kind.

The way your government and your department tax energy – and the fact that you will not give any benefit to the users in this province for the geographic advantage which they enjoy – is an indictment which, I suggest, will be brought home to this government very clearly, should you ever decide to call an election.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, after that tirade we should have another windstorm. First, I’d like to answer the question asked with regard to the cost of administering farm cost reduction. It was \$99,400. We have 11 temporary employees working on that program.

I think it would be of interest to break down the cost of a litre of gasoline to see where the money goes, in answer to the hon. Member for Thunder Creek. The Saskatchewan gasoline tax is 5.1 cents per litre. That’s 15.7 per cent of the cost of 32.5 cents per litre (as an average cost currently in this province). However, Alberta gets more on that litre of gasoline than we do in Saskatchewan. It gets provincial royalties and provincial corporation income tax totalling 17.2 per cent. The gasoline which is used in this province comes from Alberta. That’s a fact of life. Federal taxes and levies are 29.5 per cent or 9.6 cents per litre of that cost. The oil company charges related to exploration, development, production, returns, refining, wholesaling, retailing and some return to

them are 12.2 cents per litre or 37.6 per cent of the cost. So, our tax is 15.7 per cent out of 100 per cent of the cost of that litre of gasoline.

The member for Thunder Creek gives off a big spiel and then runs out of the House. He says that we do nothing for the farmers. Mr. Speaker, \$550 million of this year's budget comes out of the heritage fund, basically oil and potash resource revenues. If that revenue didn't flow into the consolidated fund, we would have to raise the E&H tax from 5 per cent to 15 per cent to raise sufficient revenues.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Are you say that's going to the farmers?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Part of it is going to the farmers, obviously.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You'd better outline what part.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Well, I'm simply saying that it's going to the population of Saskatchewan. If you want to know what goes specifically to farmers, I'll give you some examples: farm trucks, purple gas, \$12.6 million saved by their not paying any tax on the gas; farm equipment, purple gas, \$4.1 million saved; farm equipment, purple diesel, \$7.5 million saved. That's \$24.5 million. There are other things in here as well. Farm machinery repair parts, no E&H tax, saved \$38.4 million. It must save it for the farmers. Construction services, \$65 million. Obviously, part of that is to the farmers . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Would you ask that fellow to be quiet, Eric, so you can hear?

If you total the amount the farmers receive in terms of exemptions in E&H tax on purple fuel and that sort of thing, you have in round figures about \$70 million to \$80 million. This fellow gets up and says that we do nothing for the farmer. In addition, I point out again that \$550 million out of the heritage fund is of real value to all the farmers as well as every other person who lives in the province.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you are all heart, black! Members on my right earlier explained to you why only 48,000 farmers claimed. I'll give you an example; I'm talking about the farm cost reduction program. I have here correspondence from a farmer. It took him a year and it finally came to me in September of last year. I was asked to help this farmer resolve the 1979 claims that he had been sending you, back and forth, to try to get the claim settled and paid. I will say that when I went down to your office, to the Revenue Building, and asked for the assistance of one of your staff, it was resolved in 15 minutes. The staff was most helpful. They were only following instructions as laid out by your department or by you or whomever. Just to give you an example of the silliness of the returns of the claim, "Were they gallons or litres?" was the question. You know, litres didn't come into effect until May of 1980. So they had to be gallons, didn't they? You could have solved that problem a lot sooner. That's a fact. I want to say that in 15 minutes, the clerk in your office said, "Let me take care of it. I'll see that it is done." It was done just that quickly. But it took a year to resolve the problem. Those are the kinds of frustrations which the farmers have been faced with. Some have finally said, "It's not worth my time, not worth the bother, to claim \$300 and have to waste all that time and energy in trying to get it."

Your program has been reasonable. You had probably closer to 100 per cent participation. Again, Mr. Minister, it's a direct help to those farmers. Your government should consider implementing this program again.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, the member for Thunder Creek said the program was a bunch of garbage and we should get rid of it. These two members should get together.

We appreciate the fact that you helped someone who had difficulty. I point out again that there are bound to be some errors in any program. The vast majority of those people did not have any problem, over 99 per cent of them. Obviously, if you have some problems, we will have some problems and we are most appreciative of any help you might give with respect to that. If you will give us any information on any of those situations which arise, we will certainly check and find out why those errors occurred.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I'll just correct you on one point. Most of them did have a problem. The return was very high. I think you should check that out. It is too late now; the program is gone, so it doesn't really matter any more. My colleague for Wilkie has just made a very interesting point — perhaps we should expect to see it come back just prior to the next election. I don't know if that will actually happen, but I wouldn't be surprised. Did you want to reply?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Yes. We're taking it out just before the election. How do you explain that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, does the government go through your department for the tendering of advertising?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — No, information services of Executive Council handles the advertising.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Generally speaking, what policy does the government have for purchasing? The government as a whole spends a lot of money on advertising. Advertising is one of the largest expenditure made by this government, and you say it's done through government services, where all kinds of patronage can and does take place. I know that hurts the Attorney General, but I intended it to.

Why is it that you tender all kinds of contracts through revenue, supply and services, but don't when it comes to advertising? I would like to pursue this matter in a little more depth.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Well, I can only answer for the advertising we carry out in our own department, and that's related to a need for employees, or if we're selling CVA (central vehicle agency) cars, etc. Our total expenditures last year were around \$29,000. Information services has the expertise and experience with respect to it, and they carry that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, the Department of Highways has expertise in equipment; Sask Power would have expertise in electrical equipment; Sask Tel would have expertise in telephones and telephone equipment. All the departments supposedly have expertise in whatever they are dealing with. I don't see that as being any different. You may have only spent \$29,000 (and I hope that's all you spent was \$29,000). I think that's a lot of money for your department to spend, because I don't know what you are advertising for . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, vehicle sales would be a fairly expensive item. How do you handle the advertising in your department? Do you tender it?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Advertising through our department is handled through information services. They handle the advertising for the government.

I should correct a statement. I said it was \$29,000 for our department and it was less than that, so I should let you know it was less. It cost us \$15,205 for sales and salvage auction sales, and \$6,368 for other advertising related to employees and things of that nature, for a total of \$21,000.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I'm glad you corrected that because if I would have found out later I would have been a little upset. I don't know how much money the government spends, but we have found departments that run into the millions. As a matter of fact, one of the departments you are responsible for runs over a million dollars in expenses; I'll be discussing that with you later.

There are 25 Crown corporations in this government. As you know, some of them are spending a lot of money. We know that the advertising expenditures for the Government of Saskatchewan are in the millions of dollars. We only need look at your annual report. The value of purchases going through your department for the year 1978-79 was \$95 million. Advertising is a good percentage of that figure. It's in the millions, so it's a percentage of that figure . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Not in this figure, I'm saying over and above that.

Why then would you not use the same procedures and the same policies in buying advertising as you do in buying automobiles or equipment or a lot of other things which are bought for the different departments and Crown corporations?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Clearly, the purchasing agency makes purchases on behalf of departments for specific goods. You say the Department of Highways has expertise in terms of equipment and obviously they pass on to us what they require. Then we canvass the market in terms of tendering and buy for them. They are your concrete items; automobiles and pieces of equipment. Advertising does not come under our jurisdiction. It does not come under the jurisdiction of purchasing agency. It's under the jurisdiction of information services and Executive Council.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — That's the advertising, you mean. The equipment comes under your jurisdiction. I know that; you're not announcing a policy I'm not aware of at this time. What I'm asking you is to bring the advertising into your department for the tendering process, so that it's done on a fair and equitable basis. We all know that the Government of Saskatchewan deals with only two advertising agencies in the province of Saskatchewan, both of which are very strong NDP supporters. So you're probably paying 100 per cent more for that advertising (and then some) than you would if you put it on a tender basis.

This is the logical way of buying anything, whether it be advertising, automobiles, stationery, office equipment, or whatever. The fact of the matter is that what you're doing is allowing the government (and you're its Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services, which could encompass advertising) to give millions of dollars to two firms which are supporters of the NDP.

Who knows how much comes back to the NDP coffers because of it? It's probably a large percentage of the millions of dollars spent by your government in advertising which you don't know anything about, because it doesn't go through the tender

process, which is the logical way and the businesslike way of doing business.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Those are pure assumptions, Mr. Chairman, by the member for Regina South.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Of course they're assumptions. What else would they be? Will you allow me to look at the books of the government? Never. How can I possibly prove it? I can't prove it. It's a fact that Dunskey and Struthers get all the advertising. It's a fact that you can't deny. And the only reason they do is that they're strong NDP supporters. Show me the books and I'll prove it. At this point all I can do is base my facts or lack of them on assumptions. That's a fact; that's right. I can't do it any other way, but I'm telling you that's the way it is.

The fact is that you are buying the total advertising (or 99 per cent of it) from those two firms, which are strong supporters of the NDP and which probably donate large amounts of money to the party because of the business they get from the government.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — We get all this before public accounts in terms of the Department of Revenue.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — As we all know, public accounts is a very secretive little organization of its own and I have no way of knowing what's going on in there.

Mr. Minister, I would like to look into your report just for a few minutes. I want to spend a little time going through my files again, but meanwhile, why have your standing orders increased by almost \$8 million in the last year? That's another area that bothers me a little bit.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — It's a matter of efficiency. It's a case of leaving the standing order with the department, and they can reorder at a set price throughout the year rather than having the thing processed continuously through the purchasing agency.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Are you telling me that you are giving out standing orders for the whole 12 months that gives a set price for the whole year on today's market? In every instance?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Not necessarily.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I thank you very much. I didn't think it was.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — In those instances we were able to negotiate it, obviously.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — That makes a big difference in the "yes" you gave me before. That's a fact. I know for a fact you can't possibly hand out a standing order for 12 months and the price is going to remain all the way down the line in many instances. I happen to know because I used to get them. So, Mr. Minister, be careful in some of your answers. What does the \$36 million in standing orders include? Give me the generalities of who would get a standing order, and what kind of services and supplies that would include.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — High volume items like paper. There is a great deal of paper used in the government, obviously.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You can do better than that, I'm sure. That's one. Give me a half

dozen examples.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Typewriters, calculators, adding machines, hospital supplies.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Calculators and adding machines. Why would you give a standing order for calculators and adding machines and electronic equipment? Now there are many, many kinds on the market; again, we go back to the tender process. The prices change, the services change, the personalities change (or the personnel I mean), and there could be a variance there — quite a considerable variance — from month to month from different corporations. I don't know what volume of business you are doing in that, but it would seem to me that again you are missing the boat on getting the best price and service, and so on and so forth.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — No, we're not missing the boat in terms of getting the best price. We test out the machines most suitable for our use. We negotiate a price on it and that's the price we get.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, you wouldn't do that for automobiles. You can negotiate a pretty good price on a car. I agree with you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm having a little difficulty myself. Okay, you quiet him down and I'll do the same on this side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Listen, could we have a little order. The hon. Member for Regina South can't hear himself think.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. Mr. Minister, in automobiles for example, and I happen to know you prefer American Motors' cars . . . You used to. It doesn't matter . . . No, no, let's go back to what I was going to ask you. You negotiate prices, quality, service, etc. on cars and you do it on equipment of other kinds. I find it difficult to accept that you would take office equipment on a standing order (being able to negotiate at the beginning of the year and remaining constant throughout the year), and not make comparisons from time to time to find out whether or not you could get a better piece of equipment, better price, better service from personnel, salespeople, and so on.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Well, automobiles, of course, are not on standing order. With respect to some of the other equipment, we do renegotiate from time to time throughout the year as well. I mentioned items that would be on standing order, such as paper, typewriters, calculators, and things of that nature. We negotiate prices on them and sometimes renegotiate during the year.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Do you do the purchasing for continuous forms, for example? First of all, let me ask if you do it on behalf of the Crown corporations as well as the departments?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — If the Crown corporations request it, yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Are you doing any? How much of that are you doing? Give me the total for the departments as well.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — We'll have to get the information on the Crown corporations and report back to you.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — How was that tendered?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — This form is a rather specialized order. The first order will be negotiated. After that, it will be tendered. There are often very few who will supply that kind of material. There are very few supply houses.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — That's right. You negotiate the first order, and from then on it's an automatic renewal with that same firm. Is that what you're saying? Would you mind explaining that?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — If the firm is the only firm able to supply that order, and often that is the case.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Not too often. I might suggest to you, Mr. Minister. I did a little research on that particular item. I find there are only two firms in Saskatchewan providing that service and the supplies. I also find that you are purchasing something like (I don't have the file with me so I'll do it from memory) an amount of about 90 per cent from Ontario. Why would you not encourage that business to remain in Saskatchewan and support Saskatchewan businesses?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Basically, I think you're referring to business forms. The organizations we bought from are: R.L. Crain Limited, Moore Business Forms, Systems Equipment Ltd., Wascana Office Equipment Ltd., IBM Canada Ltd., and Willson Office Specialty Ltd. Those are the organizations which supply that type of form. Do you know of others? Tell us what they are.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You haven't even listed the two that are here in Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — The two are Lawson Business Forms (Saskatchewan), and Paragon Business Forms (Western) Ltd. We bought substantial amounts from both of them. Total purchases are approximately \$1.5 million, and both of those received over \$300,000.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Is that \$1.5 million amount the total purchases of revenue, supply and services? Does that include continuous forms?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — No, they're purchased for other departments.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — For example, SGI buys more than that.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — You can't buy for Crown corporations, except when they request. This is for government departments.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You said \$1.5 million for other departments, and \$300,000 that you buy in Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — \$148,000 in round figures.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — \$300,000?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — \$628,000 was bought from Paragon.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — That's not the figure you gave me a minute ago.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — \$319,000 in one case, and \$309,000 in the other, adds up to \$628,000.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The one in Saskatoon then?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Lawson and Paragon are the names. I don't know where they are.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You should be more familiar with the Saskatchewan businesses and companies. What I am saying to you is that you should inquire as to where you are doing your buying. The large percentage of what you are doing is bought out of the province. Moores is out of the province, and all the others you listed are out of the province. The fact that they have salesmen here doesn't mean they have the employees here manufacturing the forms. Why are you not encouraging Saskatchewan business?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — To answer that question on why are we not supporting Saskatchewan businesses, it's a tendering process. You believe in the tendering process. You can't have it both ways. It's based on the low bid.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — When you take a \$10,000 order, and it goes to Toronto because it was \$8 cheaper, then I think the tendering process has to have certain guidelines and a certain amount of flexibility that could be used with a little common sense. The fact of the matter is that the bulk of that business (and this is the one I have done some research on) is going to Ontario and other provinces. If you look at the number of firms in western Canada that can manufacture those business forms, you will find there are 44 of them. Two of them are in Saskatchewan and the rest are located in Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia. Out of that total of 44, two of them locate in Saskatchewan. Why? Because they don't receive encouragement from this government to support them.

Between these two firms, they hire over 100 people. If you double the production or the orders, how many more people could we be hiring here in Saskatchewan? Rather than giving that business to firms out of the province, we could be keeping that business and the money earned by that business here at home. That's what I'm trying to get across to you.

If you would do a little research on it, you'll find – in fact, I'm going to be bringing it up later with the Department of Industry and Commerce – that in all instances, Saskatchewan has far fewer of the same kinds of businesses that are established in western Canada.

Why? Because businesses are not encouraged to come here. In fact, they are discouraged from coming here. On the one hand, you don't support them and on the other hand, you harass them. Therefore, you don't get or keep these businesses.

Your department could start the ball rolling by perhaps giving some preferential treatment to Saskatchewan businesses, and not going out of the province.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, the member's arguments are not supported by the facts. He says there are 44 such firms in western Canada, only two of them in Saskatchewan, and they got 40 per cent of the business on a tendering process.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why didn't they get 90 per cent?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Because of the tendering process, obviously. And you believe in the tendering process; you tell us that all the time. Are you saying we should have preferential treatment?

AN HON. MEMBER: — For Saskatchewan firms over others? Yes, certainly.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Okay, let's see what happens if you have preferential treatment. We tried this once before in the past — it has been tried in this province. It reduces the free flow of materials from province to province, acts as a non-tariff barrier between provinces, subsidizes the less efficient supplier, increases costs in the province that adopt it. B.C. has this in spades right now and they have a 10 per cent preferential base for their purchasing. It places an added burden on provincial taxpayers because it's a public subsidy, leads to retaliation when restrictions or preferences in one province result in the adoption of similar measures in adjoining provinces. The long-term result, therefore, is that it is not in the interest of the suppliers within the province which originated the restriction or the preference.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Just to wrap this up, Mr. Minister, the fact is that you have not given some kind of relaxed rules. When I look at a \$10,000 order and it's lost because of an \$8 higher bid, then I say that is being very unreasonable. The fact is that you could be promoting that business and others like it. I just chose one, but I could have chosen others and they would have been the same way.

I would agree that 10 per cent would probably be unrealistic, but there has to be some kind of judgment, if you like, made at the time of the tender, to decide where that business should be going.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I would just like to make a quick remark on that. We use some flexibility in these cases, but generally the rule is the low bidder is chosen, provided that he can supply proper equipment or material at a satisfactory price.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I would be interested in knowing what kind of judgment is used and where you draw the line and how you accomplish that kind of policy. I'm going to let someone else get in with another subject and I'll be coming back with other points in a few minutes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Call an election.

MR. THATCHER: — I would love an election; I can't think of anything I would rather have more, than an election. The only thing I would like better would be to have you come to Thunder Creek and run against me, because I'm tired of campaigning. I would love an easy campaign. I'm used to tough campaigns, but I'd be delighted to have you come to Thunder Creek and I could go and campaign elsewhere.

Mr. Minister, you may get Thunder Creek but you'll never get North Palm Springs.

Mr. Minister, Bill No. 53 was dropped upon us. I don't intend to go into it because this is not the place, but you are going to be the collector of that bill. There's a very ominous item there and I'd like to look at it in the perspective of the taxing of fuel. This bill is known as The Fuel Petroleum Products Act. I note that (Mr. Chairman, before you draw me to order I'll return to the point very quickly) clause 5, section 19 amended reads:

One of the proceeds of the tax collected, pursuant to (etc., etc.) And deposited in the consolidated fund, an amount not greater than 20 per cent of the net revenue from that tax shall be:

(a) designated as premium moneys paid by owners of motor vehicles registered in Saskatchewan under The Vehicles Act.

I think it's ironic that it happens to come at this point in time. On the other hand it's fortunate because the minister doing revenue right now is also the minister in charge of SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). Perhaps it's a good opportunity to talk about this particular bill under the provisions of revenue, since you will be collecting that tax, and we have the scandalous admission that SGI is in even worse trouble than any of us dreamed. Now it's not enough to bilk every person who has a driver's licence and every person who has a car; it's not enough to take them to the cleaners directly. Now we're taking the most devious, underhanded, despicable road a government can take. Every time a driver puts a gallon of gas into his car, every time the dial at that gas pump goes clickety-clickety-click, he's now paying his premium to subsidize that horribly inefficient, disgracefully run Crown corporation known as SGI.

I think it's ironic that the minister in charge, who has led SGI down that path to financial blunder and incompetence, is the same minister who has introduced this devious, underhanded, almost dishonest bill. You know, the pathetic part of it is that the people on that side of the House would probably stand up and say, "It's good legislation. Three cheers for SGI. Three cheers for The Fuel Petroleum Products Act."

Mr. Minister, I want you to tell us by what convoluted logic, by what twisted, distorted philosophy you people can justify subsidizing SGI with a tax on fuel? Every time a person sticks that gas nozzle into his car (with that junk that we're forced by law to drive now, that's pretty often), he is now going to be subsidizing the Taj Mahal across Lake Wascana.

Many times in this Assembly I have made the comment that the SGI building is so aptly named. This bill today just further fortifies the argument that the deviousness, underhandedness and everything that's slippery, corrupt and dishonest is named after the right individual – one C.M. Fines. I sincerely hope that he is recording this as he sits comfortably in Gryphons Walk doing the history of the Canadian Co-operative Federation, or if he is not there, whenever he arrives.

I want to ask the minister to explain the convoluted logic and the twisted philosophy that somehow makes every individual, as if he isn't being extorted enough in the price of gas now, be blackmailed by SGI. It isn't enough that he is virtually held up at gunpoint on his insurance premiums, or his licence. Now he is going to be robbed at the gas pumps. I want the minister to explain how a once reputable minister has allowed himself to fall to this terribly low ebb.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, after that second tirade the member hasn't removed himself from the Chamber, so I'll reply. There has been a tax transfer of 3 cents per gallon out of the 19 cents per gallon (and not in addition to, as the members opposite keep saying) since 1974, and the rationale behind it is this: the more miles you drive, the more probability there is that you will have an accident. That's a fact of life. That 3 cents per gallon worked out to 16 per cent of the gas tax. The ad valorem tax

changed in the fall of 1980. We went from 19 cents per gallon to 20 per cent of the ad valorem, or the value of the product. Was this designed to raise more revenue? Yes, certainly, as in Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and British Columbia.

Alberta has enough tax on our fuel. You left before I gave the figures. We pay more royalties to Alberta, in terms of their fuel, than we pay in gas tax in Saskatchewan. There's nothing hidden about it at all. It's been said all along that this 3 cents per gallon transfer was to the automobile accident insurance fund, because it was related to miles driven. In addition, many tourists driving through the province are involved in accidents related to Saskatchewan cars, causing damage and cost to the automobile accident insurance fund. They buy some fuel and therefore make some contribution to that fund, which makes good common sense.

We are not supposed to be talking about the bill; I have no intention of talking about the bill. We'll talk about that at the appropriate time. The fact remains that all this says is "up to 20 per cent of the 20 per cent," which, if you work it out, is roughly one cent or a little more than was transferred previously. Of course it will be more, the same as it will be in Manitoba, Prince Edward Island and all of the other provinces.

It's designed to raise more revenue to meet the costs of building and maintaining highways. I should point out that the 3 cents per gallon only covered 19 per cent of the cost of the automobile accident insurance fund, and that dropped to about 11 per cent because of the fact that we were receiving a static amount, and the cost and the number of automobile accidents were rapidly declining.

Those are the only comments I can make on it. I can point out to you that that tax, in relation to the claims, dropped from 19 per cent to 11 per cent. This proposal will take it back up to about 15 per cent. Now, the members opposite can't have it both ways. They argue that the rates shouldn't go up. They are obviously going to go up when there is a high degree of accident frequency and the cost of repairs is increasing. They know that. All this does is maintain a reasonable relationship between the transfer of motor fuel as a premium, the automobile accident insurance fund, and the accidents that are occurring and the costs related thereto.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I just want to bring to the attention of the hon. members the fact that a discussion of a bill before the House is not in order in committee of finance. Certainly, discussion of the gas tax is in order, and the idea of part of the gas tax going to the automobile accident insurance fund is in order, but discussion of the specifics of any particular bill which is before the House at this time is not in order because, of course, you will have an opportunity to discuss that when the bill is before the House.

MR. THATCHER: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you for those remarks, and any comments I have will be of a very general nature. But, respectfully, Mr. Chairman, I cannot account for the minister. Mr. Minister, the tax which you are going to collect — I think the 20 per cent on gasoline is horrible and despicable, because everybody in this Assembly knows what the price of gas is going to do. You don't need to have Ph.D in economics to know that the day is not very far off . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! The hon. Member thanked me for my ruling and, I thought, concurred in it. And now you're talking about a 20 per cent ad valorem gas tax which is in a bill that's before the House.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, with all due respect I was referring to the 20 per cent

gas tax which is presently in existence and which this department . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Oh, tremendous! I'm sorry I cut in on you, then.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, I assured you I was going to abide by your ruling and I thought that was the end of the matter. But everybody in this Assembly — anybody anywhere — knows that we're looking at \$3 for gasoline not very far down the road. The original 20 per cent tax on that is disgusting in itself . . . The 19 cent tax which you originally had on was bad enough, but when you tacked on a percentage — that was cheap, underhanded and disgusting. Shortly you will be taking 60 cents a gallon on gasoline, when it hits \$3 within probably the next 18 months . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You most certainly will.

On top of that, out of that, after we get our \$3 gasoline . . . Does anybody want to argue that we're looking at \$3 for gasoline in about 18 to 24 months? I don't think many people are going to argue with that. At that point in time 12 cents of that will be going to SGI, 12 cents of what you're going to be taxing. I think it is disgusting that you cannot control your expenditures any better than that. If consumers aren't being taken to the cleaners by gas prices now, you're aiding and abetting that process.

The pathetic part is that this 20 per cent illustrates a point which has been made by a number of oil companies. The oil companies say, "Sure, we're making record profits in the oil industry, but do you know who is doing the main gouging in the gas business? It's our governments — federal and provincial." And you lead the way. The bulk of the gouging of the consumer is being done by the government, and you're front and centre in this process.

I'd like the minister to tell me why he felt it necessary to go to a percentage instead of an absolute price. The 19.5 cents or the 20 cents that we're getting was rough enough. But why did the minister feel that you had to go to a percentage? Simply because by going to a percentage, when you want to up it you don't have to introduce a bill into the legislature; you don't have to take the public flak, so very sneakily and very slyly, you introduced a 20 per cent tax on every gallon of gasoline — or every litre of gasoline, as it's now affectionately known.

But that's not enough. We have SGI, a company which under your stewardship has been a total disaster. It's a company which has been mismanaged for how many years? I guess we won't know until we win the next election and have an inquiry into it. It's a company which was so hard up to account for its difficulties that it had to fire 13 innocent scapegoats — 13 innocent people — to cover up the nonsense, the incompetence of the people at the top of SGI and of the board of directors.

The extent of SGI's trouble is just now starting to sneak out. It's not going to sneak out in Crown corporations but in prospective legislation . . . I'm sorry, I thought I heard you say, "Order."

The extent of the difficulties of this Crown corporation are now made evident by prospective taxes which you are going to be collecting shortly. In fact, you probably are collecting them right now. When you put the road tax to 20 per cent . . . When you fix that percentage on to every gallon or litre of gasoline, it is just absolutely beyond any aspect of common decency.

I don't know of any other government which has gone to a percentage in taxing. Does

anyone else know of a government taxing by percentage? I gather that your official has come up with one, so I'll let it stand at that and give you your moment of glory. You can thunder back with the right answer and I'll go through the muted horror of this.

It is a cheap, shoddy way to cover up problems in revenue intakes, and an indirect tax for a Crown corporation which your government refuses to take necessary action, a Crown corporation which your government simply feels can solve its own problems by generating more money out of the people it pretends to serve. But putting in legislation like this . . .

It would be interesting to know who thought that one up. It's clever. Perhaps because you are the minister of both, that is where it originated. It's an extremely clever tax on the drivers and the operators of this province. It's one that will bring in . . . Well, you tell me how much revenue it's going to bring in. It will bring in a lot of revenue. As gas prices continue to escalate dramatically, every driver, regardless of what he is already paying, can look forward to paying into this SGI fund.

I suggested to you, Mr. Minister, your logic does not necessarily hold up that the number of miles you drive automatically increases your probability of an accident. Respectfully, I think it's where you drive. Obviously, if I drive 100 miles on the Trans-Canada Highway, my odds are a heck of a lot better that I'm going to do that 100 miles than if I start on the south end of Regina and try to go up Albert Street a couple of times a day. Obviously, I've driven only 10 miles in the course of that procedure, but my chances of being hit are vastly greater than in driving from Regina to Saskatoon or Regina to Moose Jaw, etc.

So the number of miles are not necessarily indicative. I think the figures you see on cable television from All-State Insurance Company are pretty interesting. They say, "We're going to lower your rate if you're rural." Perhaps, Mr. Minister, you might lower yourself and watch television sometime to find out how the rest of the world lives. In the meantime, I'd like an answer to how much money you propose to raise for SGI under this bill.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, first of all I think I should briefly respond to the member. He said it was a devious, slippery, sneaky way and very clever. He should know the first one to think of that was the Prince Edward Island Conservative government. The second one was Manitoba, with a Conservative government. Seven governments in Canada have that kind of tax. I don't know whether this is relevant or not, but the British Columbia government the other day indexed health premiums to the rise in the cost of living on an ad valorem basis.

The question was: how much money is going to be raised? Our estimate is right in front of him — \$111.3 million.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I think the question the member was asking was (we can read too, you know, the \$111 million in your budget): how much are you going to generate out of that sales tax for SGI? The answer to that would be, of course, \$22 million.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — It is \$20 million. It is right in the record.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — What record? It is \$20 million. A year ago it was just a little over \$11 million. So that is almost double the amount. Now, I happen to know from your SGI

general manager that you are in the black the first quarter of this year, according to a report from last week. But I am going to tell you why you are in the black. It is simply because of these extra revenues. You know, when you consider a 48 per cent increase in 14 months, an extra \$10 million out of the gas tax, and less benefits in the collision and so on – you have to be in the black. If you are not, then God help us. What I am going to say to you is that the gas sales tax that we are talking about now (that my colleague has just talked about; I guess he's gone) of \$111 million, within three or four years time, is going to double. In three or four years time, that is going to mean there is going to be around \$30 million to \$40 million coming to the coffers of SGI from the taxpayers of this province. That is what this bill is going to be doing.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member makes statements which are totally incorrect. SGI hasn't received any revenue in terms of this tax in relation to the current year to bring it into the black – not a nickel of additional money. The other thing we should note is – I am not supposed to refer to the bill, but it says up to 20 per cent. It has already been 16 per cent since 1974, based on the 3 cents and the 19 cents.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The fact of the matter is that you are going to be collecting three to four times as much money within two or three years time. You will be collecting and turning it over to SGI to keep them in the black at the cost of the drivers and the taxpayers of this province. You can't deny that and get out of it. You say that has gone from 16 per cent. That is correct. It was 3 cents out of 19 cents, which is roughly 16 per cent. Now it is 20 per cent. I have never seen any bill that has come into this House, or that you have in effect in this province today, that you haven't used the maximum taxation policies and laws that you are allowed to use on them. So you show me where you are going to be cutting down on that 20 per cent. I don't believe you.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, the member talks about a large number of additional revenues being raised, and that is specifically why it is done. We have said so time and time again. The cost of building and repairing highways is climbing and the cost of repairing automobiles in relation to SGI is climbing. It is part of the whole inflationary process. Therefore, you have to raise additional revenues to cover it.

One of the members over there (I think it was the member, the defenceman, from wherever it is) asked for the figures with regard to farm cost reduction program applications. For the year 1974 (if you would just like to copy these down), \$64,326; for 1975, \$61,695; for 1976, \$57,546.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, could you advise this Assembly how much of the sales tax collected by your department comes from other government agencies or Crown corporations, departments, or whatever?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — E&H tax?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Sales tax. It is not E&H; it is sales.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I am informed that we cannot provide that information because we do not segregate taxpayers who pay the tax. The government pays sales tax the same as everybody else, but I don't know what proportion it is of the total.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — How difficult would it be to get me that information? The government is paying it, so it must have records on how much tax it is paying.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — The point I should make, perhaps, is that the government buys from vendors and the vendors collect the tax in that particular instance. We would have to get information from the vendors, I suppose.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, you wouldn't. You could get the information right from your own departments because you're paying the tax to the vendors. I'm aware of that. There is no question about that; you pay it directly. However, it shouldn't be that difficult to determine how much you are paying.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Well, every department of government would have to check every single individual invoice to determine the tax paid on it, because there would be no other way of determining it accurately.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — To put you to that expense would probably be very irresponsible. I don't intend to do that. But, you know, I would be willing to bet that it's a fair amount of money that the government pays and collects. If you were to reduce or, as we have promised to do, eliminate the sales tax over time, in the first year or two, on a 1 per cent basis, it wouldn't make much difference to the coffers of the government, because of the saving that the government would have on the tax that they, themselves, pay. I would also like to ask: in conjunction with that, what would you estimate is lost in sales from the west side of the province in business loss to Alberta because it doesn't have a sales tax? Again, I wonder how much money you really are making by collecting the 5 per cent sales tax at the expense of the taxpayers of this province. How much more business would be generated in Saskatchewan if we didn't have the 5 per cent sales tax? We would save the money. We would keep it here at home and create more employment. I think it might be worth your while to investigate those two areas.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — We fully realize there is a problem being next to Alberta, but we have a lower sales tax than any other province in the country, with the exception of Alberta. Obviously there is some business lost, but we can't determine exactly what it is. We would have to put in a border patrol, I suppose, to determine it, and I'm sure my friends opposite would be the first to object to that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, last summer did you have inspectors out on the road, for the first time inspecting the gasoline in vehicles?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Yes, we did some field investigation with regard to purple fuel. That's been going on since 1930.

MR. KATZMAN: — I think for the first time your department had a group of individuals out, going onto private property and checking people's personal vehicles. In fact, you ended up in a court case in one of them by Langham.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — It's a process which has been carried out for many, many years. In 1978-79, there were 1,042 people who had to pay a fine for using purple fuel in their cars on the highway. In 1979-80, there were 1,029. In 1980-81 (that's to the end of March), there were 994. It's been going down a bit, but that process has been going on.

MR. KATZMAN: — Were these your inspectors, for the first time, and not highway traffic's as they used to be?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Yes, we have fuel petroleum inspectors. The RCMP also does

inspections, as does the highway traffic board and the municipal police.

MR. KATZMAN: — Was this the first year that you had the fuel petroleum inspectors on the road?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — No, we had them in 1979, 1978, 1977 and 1976.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I have one other question here. Do you not find that there is a bit of (for lack of a better word) smuggling of cigarettes, re: the Alberta-Saskatchewan situation, via the closed-in truck route because of the variance in price?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Yes, we believe that there is some of that going on, obviously. We are attempting to investigate. We have no way of identifying where cigarettes came from. The problem is worse for B.C. because they have a higher tobacco tax than we have. So, there would be more smuggling going the other way.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I understand that there is a considerable amount of it. You can actually buy cigarettes in Alberta at a retail outlet, if you want to, and resell them and still make a profit. You can actually sell them for less than what you buy them for in Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — There's no doubt that it's very profitable for somebody to smuggle cigarettes from Alberta where the tax is 8 cents a package, when ours is 33 cents and B.C.'s is 34 cents.

MR. KATZMAN: — I think the tax should be 80 cents a package.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Eighty? In Alberta?

MR. KATZMAN: — Any place in the world.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — I agree with you.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I have heard some of the people, who were involved last year around the province, suggest that your department was really making no effort to stop the practice.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Obviously, because we're in a federal state, we can't inhibit them and stop them from bringing cigarettes across the border. We're attempting to trace, through the manufacturer, wholesaler and retailer, where the cigarettes come from. We did pass legislation a year ago making a very severe penalty for it — a \$15,000 fine. We're in the process of attempting to track them down.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm just going to ask one question. I'll take the whole report, if Mr. Chairman agrees. You're increasing your staff by 21.1; 11 are out of audits. Why that much of an increase in staff?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — You were asking about the total increase in the number of employees. We have three transfers of staff of the minister's office. I was minister of consumer affairs and also of revenue, but I had my staff in consumer affairs. Of course, when consumer affairs went, I had the staff transferred to my office in revenue. That staff consists of a secretary (I have to have a secretary), my executive assistant (I only have one; that is all I have ever had), and a secretary to the executive assistant. In mail

and communications, we have three persons converted from temporary to permanent. The workload was growing and continuous. We have had nine transfers from photographic and art services. That was a transfer from the Executive Council into the revenue department. We have an increase of 10 positions for the corporation capital tax program which was a new program set up one year ago.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — In the farm cost reduction program, the people were temporary, I take it?

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I wonder if Mr. Chairman will allow me one question that has nothing to do with revenue, supply and services? I will ask of the minister, would he permit a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, we can't get into that kind of thing. Then we get into a debate. I know these simple questions.

MR. BERNTSON: — I have one question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the minister could indicate when the annual report of SGI is going to be tabled?

AN HON. MEMBER: — It has nothing to do with it.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, as he said, it has nothing to do with this particular report. I know we are very efficient, but we have never yet devised a way of tabling a report before we get it from the printer.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 5 inclusive agreed.

Item 6

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, that is a new department, I take it? Was it transferred from another department or from another area? Or what is this for? Photographic and art services is a new department?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — It was transferred from the Executive Council to revenue, supply and services.

Item 6 agreed.

Items 7 to 13 inclusive agreed.

Item 14

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I have a little question. Item 14 – the gasoline competition assistance program – what's that for?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Chairman, when the Alberta government removed its gasoline tax totally in 1978, there was a major problem for about 120 bulk stations and petroleum dealers along the border. We initiated a program to rebate 100 per cent of the gas tax in Lloydminster and Onion Lake. If the dealer was 24 kilometres from the

border or within that, he received a 50 per cent rebate, and 25 per cent if he was 24 to 48 kilometres away, approximately. I'm using figures now in relation to percentages, but it was on the basis of so much per litre.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Why would that be going up 80 per cent, and your revenue is only up 22 per cent? That doesn't make too much sense to me.

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Our estimate a year ago was low. It was the first year we had done that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — What was the actual figure?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — We will get it for you. I'm sorry that we can't locate it at the moment.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Would I be close in estimating that it would be over \$1.5 million?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — It was about \$1.48 million. Mr. Chairman, we have the figure now. He was just giving it from memory and he was a bit high on his calculation. It was \$1,357,572.94.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — That's about a 45 per cent increase from your actual to your estimate, but your revenues only estimated totally at 22 per cent. So if you are going to use last year as your base year, then I suggest that you are too high at \$1.8 million. No, it's about 35 per cent, which is much higher than the 22 per cent you estimated for increased revenue in that tax.

Mr. Chairman, rather than delay these estimates, you can give me that answer some other time. I'm prepared to go along with this.

Item 14 agreed.

Vote 18 agreed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW (SUPPLEMENTARY)

REVENUE, SUPPLY AND SERVICES

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 18

Item 1 agreed.

Item 2

MR. ROUSSEAU: — On both of those amounts, why are they being handled through your department?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — Well, I'm the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Council of International Co-operation. We're matching grants. So that seemed to be the logical place for it. These requests come from the Red Cross. I take them to government and they are allotted in here as supplemental payments.

Item 2 agreed.

Vote 18 agreed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW
DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 39

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The next piece of work is the estimates of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. I would ask the minister to introduce his officials.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Mr. Frank Bogdasavich, deputy minister, to my right; Mr. John Burton to my left, associate deputy minister; Mr. Ron Stengler, behind and to my right, assistant deputy minister; Mr. Lyle Lensen, director of regional services operations; and Ms. Mae Boa, director of administration.

MR. THATCHER: — I have to say at the outset to the minister that I warned him. I gave him every opportunity . . . I guess it would be a fair comment to suggest to you that you are one of the . . . I'm just wondering how to put this in as gentle a fashion as possible. I guess the best way to do it is to say that the former minister of mineral resources was known as "Flying Jack Messerschmitt." You haven't done all that badly yourself.

I guess it's a fair comment to say that as Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources you have done a pretty good job in, shall we say, travelling around the western hemisphere checking out potential places of leisure and recreation. Now, I know you've done it all in the line of duty. I know in every case they dragged you onto the airplane, kicking and screaming. And, as you went to that boat show in Florida, I know you were saying, "I don't want to go." The fact that it was 40 below here didn't make any difference. I know you said, "I want to stay here and look after the people of Saskatchewan's parks." But, reluctantly and begrudgingly you went to the boat show. Would the minister tell us whether he thinks that just because he's a new minister, it is fair for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to have to send him to inspect every national park in the western hemisphere? Is it necessary, or, do you think if you missed one or two, that perhaps the park season could start and go through a season without you inspecting every park in the western hemisphere?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member makes mention of some boat show in Florida. I've never attended a boat show in Florida; I don't know what he's talking about.

In regard to the comments about seeing every national park in the western hemisphere, I think the only national park I have ever seen is the one to the south of us, right across the border. The name escapes me right now. Yellowstone – it's Yellowstone National Park. So I don't know what he is making reference to in his comments. I don't know anything about a boat show in Florida.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, are you telling me that you have never been to Banff National Park?

Mr. Minister, would you tell me what you were doing . . . I suppose I should preface this with the question: do you ski? The second part of that question is: what was the function of a trip that you took to Banff where you spent some time up at the Sunshine ski resort? The purpose of the trip, in the return, is listed as (and we're getting the return, incidentally) destination – Calgary and Banff; purpose – study of snow grooming techniques at Paska Poo and Sunshine ski resorts to assist in resolution of icing problem at Blackstrap.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Names of accompanying people — V. Godenir — is he here by any chance? Total cost of the trip — \$1,332 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And yes, to the member for Assiniboia-Bengough, I go skiing a fair amount. I pay my own way; I pay my own airfare; I pay my own trips up the tow; I pay all my own bills as I always do when I travel. Can any of you people over there say that? How many of you can say that you've always paid your own way?

Would you tell us what you learned about snow grooming techniques? How long were you there? Then, we'll move to on the boat show.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member wants to know what the purpose of the trip was. The purpose of the trip is outlined in the return. I think the problem we've had in Saskatchewan over the years, one of the biggest problems we've ever had in the ski operations, is that we have a very severe icing problem. I have never been convinced by anybody that we couldn't overcome that icing problem. As a result of that trip, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we ran across equipment that will solve our icing problem in Blackstrap to the point that we have actually purchased the equipment, and it is going to turn that hill around. And it will turn other hills that are in operation by our government around because of that inspection. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the board of trade in Saskatoon will advise you — and the name slips my memory as to the person on the board of trade who has been one of the active promoters in making sure that we go up and look at that. What's his name? Ed Sebastian is his name. He has been convinced for years that we could do a much better job of grooming the Blackstrap hill. The Blackstrap hill has become known as an ice hill over the years, and everybody was of the belief that you could not improve that situation. Ed Sebastian, one of the members of the board of trade in Saskatoon, had made many requests that somebody take a look at better grooming techniques in regard to Blackstrap hill. This was a follow-up to his request to see if there was such a thing as better grooming for the Blackstrap hill. He convinced us of the fact that there was a better way of doing what we were doing at Blackstrap. Because of his input, we have changed the technique of grooming on the Blackstrap hill. As a matter of fact, not only Blackstrap hill, but White Track as well, will fall into that category. He's convinced not only me, but also my officials, that it's a better idea.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, I want to know the details on the equipment which you purchased. You can tell us. You're the expert. You're the one who's there. You don't need your officials for this one. I want to know about the equipment which you purchased and the equipment which you looked at. I want the serial numbers . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I don't care about the serial numbers, but tell me what you purchased.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the equipment was a snow crusher. We'll forward the exact serial number, the exact model number, and the list of the other pieces of

equipment to the member opposite so that he will know exactly what he wants to know.

MR. THATCHER: — My friend, you didn't send your department along. You tell me who the manufacturer is. Don't ask him. You tell me. You're the expert. You drove it around.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the names of the equipment which we looked at are Fycol (?) and Bombardier. The exact name, model and serial number of the item which the member wants to see will be forwarded to him, because it's a list which we don't have with us.

MR. THATCHER: — What did you buy? You said that you bought something and you put it at Blackstrap. What was the make?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the name of the item is a snow cruster. It's a machine which you pull behind a ski hill tractor. It breaks snow and does a very professional job of grooming a hill — much better than we've ever seen done before in the history of our system.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you indicated a minute ago that you went to Banff to investigate a Bombardier snowmobile. When I was a dealer for snowmobiles, I sold several of those to your government right here in this province. I don't know why you had to go there to find out how they work.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member, as usual, doesn't know what he's talking about. We have never owned a snow cruster before. The only such equipment operating in western Canada was at Calgary. The only equipment which we knew was in operation was in that area. We went out and looked at it to confirm or deny the suggestions made by Ed Sebastian. We checked it out. When I say Bombardier, I'm saying that it's pulled by a Bombardier or a Fycol machine. The item which we purchased was a snow cruster. It's a spike-toothed machine which goes behind a Bombardier or a Fycol.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, I would love to have a look at the vouchers which accompany that trip because I wonder how many tabs come from being in front of that comfortable fireplace. It's a great place; it's a wonderful place. I compliment the minister on his choice. One thing about it is that nobody can accuse him of going second class.

Speaking of going second class, let's talk about this boat show which you didn't attend in Florida. (We will come back to Sunshine.) I'd like you to tell me about your trip to Orlando, Florida. You went with a Mr. Z Douglas. Perhaps you could tell me what you did in Orlando, Florida. I think you indicated earlier that you weren't there. The cost to the taxpayers for you and Mr. Douglas was \$1,410. Would you tell us the purpose? What did you do? Tell us about that boat show that you didn't attend.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult to answer the member's question because we did not attend a boat show in Florida. There was (I know it was last year, but the exact date I don't have at hand; it was probably the year before that) a bus coach tour promotion of the entire association. It is known to be the biggest and best event in terms of bus coach tour promotion. It is a trade show attended by every province in Canada and sponsored by the Canadian government offices of tourism (the federal government). One day is devoted entirely to Canada. It was attended by

ministers from, I believe, Newfoundland, some other maritime provinces and Ontario (if my memory serves me correctly). It was the very first opportunity that Saskatchewan ever utilized to get into the bus coach business and in the promotional tourism business. Buses play a very big part. The biggest and fastest rising aspect of the tourism business game in the tourism industry itself is bus coach tours. That is the reason we went. A night was sponsored by our province and all of the other provinces at the show.

MR. THATCHER: — A question to the minister. Mr. Minister, when you went to Florida to that boat show (which you are on record as saying you didn't go to), would you tell us whether you travelled by bus all the way? In other words, was the mechanism you used to arrive in Orlando, Florida a bus, or did you travel there by some other means, and would you designate that means?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member wants to know how we got there.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How you got there?

HON. MR. GROSS: — How I got there. We obviously flew. I didn't have the name of the show handy. I will give it to the member now. It is called, or more well-known in the tourism business as the NTBA, the National Tour Brokers Association. It is attended by 400 major tourism promotional companies in the business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. GROSS: — It is attended and supported by every American and federal state government and Canadian and provincial government. We contacted (for the member's own information because he, no doubt, will be asking the question next) and met individually with 50 top-ranking tourism companies at the show. Because of that one major event which we attended and at which we did a lot of promotion, we estimate that our tourism business in terms of the bus coach tour trade has increased by 20 per cent from that one event — from recall business.

MR. THATCHER: — Oh, come on.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You will come back to it tomorrow; you have three minutes to go.

MR. THATCHER: — Be careful or I will call it you know what and we will sit tonight. Do you want to sit tonight?

AN HON. MEMBER: — If you want to take two minutes, I don't care.

MR. THATCHER: — Do you want to sit tonight? Then stay on your feet. That is the only time in history he will ever do what I ask him. Mr. Minister, we are at the conclusion (I must say I did warn you). You are a trifle defensive about this and you are pretty long-winded in your answers, particularly when you start out and say, "Well, I wasn't even in Florida, much less at a boat show." Then, "Oh yes, we were at a boat show, but it was a little further back. Yes, there was a boat show and it was as a result of a bus tour." The minister clearly gave the impression that he and his officials travelled that long way on that inexpensive bus route. Instead, he and Mr. Douglas flew there.

I think, Mr. Minister, this is the nub of what I wanted to comment to you. Mr. Minister,

you have a rather extensive list of trips which you have made since you've been minister. I may as well give you notice right now that we intend to spend some time on them tomorrow. We would like you to bring all the vouchers from every trip you've taken since you became minister. I wanted to give you notice of that. So, when you bring your estimates back, whether it's tomorrow or whenever, please bring all the information as to the travelling you have done. What I want, in effect, is the same as the wording in this motion for return: the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources on official Government of Saskatchewan business; in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip and the names of people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip, including air fares, hotels, meals, etc. I want it completed up to April 1, 1981. That is the notice I wanted to give. Thank you.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Again, I have to inform the member that there was no boat show, as he makes reference to. He mentions another name and I'm not sure who it is. With regard to the trip, it was a bus association tour. There was no boat show tour.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:02 p.m.