

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 30, 1981**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly, 10 grade 6 students. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They have journeyed to Regina from Hazlet. They are accompanied by their teacher, Cheri Severson, as well as parents, Jennifer English, Amy and Ralph Sloan, and Dawn and Elvin Forbes. I do hope the children enjoy the proceedings today. I will be meeting with you for pictures and drinks about 3 p.m. Perhaps after question period, you might have some questions you would like answered. I would ask all members to join with me in welcoming the students here, and wish them an enjoyable day and safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, through you, I would like to welcome 50 grade 8 students from Martensville in my constituency, as well as the 11 adults who have accompanied them. They are seated in the east gallery, I will be meeting with them later to answer any questions they may have about what happens in the House. I ask you all to join with me in welcoming them here today.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Western Power Grid**

**MR. ANDREW:** — My question is to the Attorney General, in the absence of the Premier. At the western premiers' conference which has just concluded in Thompson, Manitoba, it would appear that the Government of Saskatchewan has once again short-circuited the western power grid potential to develop. Would the Attorney General give us any indication as to when we might see a decision from this government with regard to the whole question of the western power grid. I understand both the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta are prepared to go with it.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's question is predicated on an incorrect statement of facts. I would refer the hon. member, as I would all members, to the communique on this particular matter. The communique reads as follows:

Premiers Lyon, Blakeney and Lougheed, noted that since the agreement of 1978 conference to undertake a conceptual study of a western power grid, significant progress had been made. (Then it goes on to talk about detailed feasibility.) The premiers instructed their ministers to give the highest possible priority to complete the internal analysis and joint financial studies

now available on the western power grid, and to advise the premiers, on the earliest possible date, of the recommendations.

That, Mr. Speaker, sums up the decision taken by all three of the affected premiers, from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba: the recording of progress and the instructions to their ministers to give high priority to the internal analysis and joint financial aspects of this matter. That is the position of the Government of Saskatchewan in concert with the other governments.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Supplementary question. The press statements today out of the *Globe and Mail*, would seem to indicate that Saskatchewan is again holding an opposite fly in the ointment, if you like. Is it not your understanding, Mr. Attorney General, that Alberta is ready to proceed with the power grid. Of course, Manitoba always has stood ready. Is that not the position of Alberta that it is ready to go and that Saskatchewan is really holding up any negotiation at this point in time?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to presume to answer on behalf of the province of Alberta. It obviously is in a better position and is properly the government which must answer for its own decisions. But I do want to indicate to the hon. member opposite that this is a communique issued by all three of the premiers - Lyon, Blakeney and Lougheed. I don't care what the *Globe and Mail* or any other newspaper might say about the matter. It is very difficult to go behind the three provinces' agreement. The three-province agreement says, as I have articulated, that there is progress and that they have instructed their ministers to give the highest possible priority to completing the internal analysis and joint financial studies of the material now available on the western power grid, and to advise the premiers at the earliest possible date of their recommendations.

Those are the exact words of the communique by Lyon, Blakeney, and Lougheed. I don't know what could be plainer than that, what could be more straightforward than that, and for the member opposite to draw a long bow, putting it bluntly, somehow putting it on the shoulders of Saskatchewan, I think, is playing pure politics with this very important matter.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — I think the Attorney General would agree that obviously the communique is a compromised statement. Is it not in fact true, Mr. Attorney General, that the policy of the provincial government is the same as I've set out before - what I would call the poli pause, if you like - that there will not be any agreement on the western power grid until after the next provincial election in the province of Manitoba? And that's because of the province of Saskatchewan.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kindersley may know, or pretend to know, when the next Manitoba election might be, I, for one, don't know that, and neither does the minister in charge of the power corporation in Saskatchewan. It could be as early as June or October of 1981, or as late as October of 1982. I think to drag politics into this matter, as the hon. member continually does, is indeed a very shameful and partisan operation by the Conservatives opposite. The members opposite laugh, and they can laugh if they want, but I want them to explain to me why it is that this communique by the three premiers, including Premier Lyon - the premier who, supposedly, these people are the spokesman for in this House, as opposed to the interests of the province of Saskatchewan, and for the taxpayers of the

people of the province of Saskatchewan - why these three premiers agreed to this position take on the western power grid? Now it is either truthful or it isn't truthful. And I'm submitting to the hon. member opposite that it is indeed an accurate reflection, and I would ask him and the Conservatives opposite to stop playing politics with this very important project, and let's get on with the job of analysing it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **Overtime Dispute in Correctional Camps**

**MR. HARDY:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labor. Mr. Minister, for the last two, three, or four weeks I've been bringing up to you the problems of SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association) employees in Saskatchewan with regard to wilderness camps. I guess I should ask the question: has the audit been completed? If so, what were the results and what will your recommendations be to the public service commission?

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — Well, I think it's accurate to say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the final assessment was completed for the permanent and the non-permanent employees as late as yesterday afternoon. The labor standards people in the Department of Labor are in the process of preparing what they refer to as the instrument, or the memo, or the letter, which will refer the findings to the employer, in this case the Department of Social Services and the public service commission, for this adjudication. As in other circumstances where there is a difference of opinion between the employer and the employee, I don't propose to stand in my place and offer figures, because they are dependent upon a number of allegations and suppositions. Accordingly, I think it would be most inappropriate for me to be delivering up figures that have been arrived at at this time. This will be done in the immediate future. I understand the instrument to transfer to the public service commission this information, and the rationale for the judgment made, is in the process of being prepared and will be forwarded to the public service commission and the Department of Social Services directly.

**MR. HARDY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, was this overtime taken back to 1978 or was it just followed back to June of 1980?

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — Well, the statutory provisions allow the Department of Labor, through the labor standards branch, to go back as far as three years in any adjudication which they undertake. I said before, the current collective agreement became effective in July 1980, that is, a year this coming summer. At that point in time there was a decision made, when that collective agreement was signed, that these employees would be regarded no longer as field employees. The Department of Labor does not intend to attempt to justify or interpret the collective agreement, and whether those employees were field employees prior to July of 1980 or not is not for the Department of Labor to decide. That should appropriately be the subject for negotiation between the parties and could, I suppose, properly be resolved by an arbitration tribunal. But for me to provide any further details would be irresponsible. I think this would be more appropriately decided by the employees and their employer, in light of the deliberations and the adjudication done by the Department of Labor in the labor standards branch.

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Minister, it was drawn to my attention (and I think to yours, too) that actually this problem originated in 1978, and, in fact, I think you were asked to look as far back as 1978. I also would like to ask you: have you taken into consideration the

training staff and the casual workers who have been working part-time there, too? They would also be entitled to this overtime. Has your department looked into this portion of the work?

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — In answer to the hon. member's question, I'm sure that the labor standards people have looked at all of the elements and requirements, and the decisions have been rendered on the basis of the records that have been provided to them. Obviously, there has been a determination made for not only the permanent employees, but, as I indicated to you yesterday, a judgment has also been made more recently on 18 non-permanent employees. I am not going to detail the investigation and adjudication that has taken place over a number of weeks. I'm sure the member will appreciate that I don't spend my afternoons and evenings sitting around with the labor standards people who have been examining records and making their judgment on the basis of fact.

I can't give, nor should I offer, any more information to the hon. member than has been provided to this point.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Final supplementary.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, my understanding of The Labor Standards Act indicates that, if an employee asks you to check the code to make sure he was paid for his proper hours back to 1978, which is fewer than the three years, it is the duty of your department to confirm back to that date whether he deserves overtime. You indicate you are only checking back to when the new agreement was signed. Why are you not checking the additional portion?

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — I'll do it again slowly and carefully, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I did not indicate that the department was only doing its adjudication back to July 1980. I said there was a difference of opinion between the employees and their employer as to the status of the employees prior to the date of the signing of the last collective agreement. The adjudication has been done for back over a period of time, as required by the provincial statute. Certain assumptions have been made, with the final adjudication not ours to make, with respect to whether those employees were or were not field employees. But an adjudication has been made. The determination of the status of those employees will have to be a judgment made by someone else. Certainly not the Department of Labor.

**MR. HARDY:** — I have a question for the minister responsible for the public service commission. Now that the Minister of Labor has said that this audit on the overtime has been completed, is your department now prepared to pay this overtime due to the employees? And how long will it be before they can expect reimbursement of their overtime pay? Thirdly, when can these employees expect to get back to the negotiating table (I understand they have been out for over two weeks) and finalize this contract? While they are finalizing it, would your department not consider an averaging-of-hours contract to be a good idea?

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to negotiate in this Assembly; there is a more appropriate forum to do that. I am unable to indicate what the disposition of the matter being dealt with by the Department of Labor is going to be, until we have received a report with its recommendation. I think, as the Minister of Labor has indicated at least twice already this afternoon, that report, and the decision has not yet been completed. When it is completed, we obviously will act accordingly,

and I should indicate to the member that there is no doubt about that.

The public service commission has always been ready to negotiate with the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association to resolve this issue, has been ready and willing to negotiate since the beginning of the present agreement, and continues to be ready to negotiate, as is indicated by the fact that there is, on the part of the government, an offer to increase the camp differential from \$20 to \$45 per day. This, I think, is a pretty sincere indication of the good faith in which the public service commission has carried out the negotiations.

### **Increase in Water Pumping Equipment Rental Fees**

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the abnormally low spring run-off, many farmers and ranchers are replenishing their supplies from alternative sources such as dugouts, sloughs and creeks. Last year, the rental for pipes and pumps owned by the Department of Agriculture was \$125 per mile for 24 hours, and \$210 for two miles. How do you justify a 20 per cent increase for the rental of this equipment this year?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, it is simply an analysis of the experience from last year and applying that analysis of costs to the situation this year.

**MR. PICKERING:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That is all well and good, but would the minister not admit that your government continues to gouge the producers on ever-increasing rents for this equipment, which is owned by the department and was purchased from PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration) for the measly price of \$1 some years ago?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will provide the information with respect to the capital costs for the hon. member, I point out to him that there is an overall program relating to drought, of which the pumping program is one small part. I think if the hon. member considers what we have announced and what we will be announcing shortly, he will see that this government is moving to assist the farmers within this government's capacity, in fact, to do so.

### **Removal of Enclosed Telephone Booths**

**MR. HAM:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for Sask Tel. Mr. Minister, it has come to my attention that Sask Tel is removing the enclosed pay telephone booths throughout the province. These booths are being replaced with a single-pole open pay phone. Can you tell me why this is happening?

**HON. MR. CODY:** — Mr. Speaker, we always look at various services to the public, and if we think we can increase those services, we do just that. As far as I'm concerned, the service which is now there is not being decreased in any way.

**MR. HAM:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. During inclement weather such as storms, dust storms and snow, etc., many Saskatchewan citizens and others make emergency phone calls. Do you feel that you are providing a service to the public when an individual has to make a phone call during a snowstorm in an open booth, or with the lack of a booth?

**HON. MR. CODY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly haven't been out in the country to see where these phone booths have been taken away. I don't know of one in my area that I can identify as having been taken away. If the hon. member would like to give me the information as to where the phone booth has been taken away and a single booth put up, I would certainly be more than happy to look at the situation. I can't identify them, obviously, but perhaps he can.

**MR. HAM:** — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister telling this House that they are not installing these one-pole telephone stations?

**HON. MR. CODY:** — I didn't say they were not installing one-pole pay stations. of course, not. we have all kinds of them throughout the province, and that is not the suggestion at all. I'm just suggesting to you that I do not know of any that have been taken away and a one-pole phone installed in its place.

### **Grasshopper Poison**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — A question to the minister of Agriculture, Mr. Minister, I notice on March 20, under a question from my colleague for Thunder Creek about the prevention of a grasshopper infestation, that you are providing grasshopper poison at \$1.50 per pail to the farmers. Be that as it may, that is only a portion of controlling the grasshopper hatch that may infest this province this year. What plans do you have to control the hatch of grasshoppers on Crown lands?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of the question.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — While you are taking notice then, Mr. Minister, take notice of the fact that many of the Crown lands, the ditches, the community pastures, roadsides, abandoned railroad lines are the places where the majority of the hatch takes place — not the farmer's fields. Will you look at a program using aerial spray to control the grasshopper infestation on these publicly-owned lands?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I agree with the hon. member that we need to be prepared for a grasshopper outbreak. I indicated to the hon. member in a statement in this House some time ago the efforts that are being planned. Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we can go about preventing the hatching, but if there is some scientific knowledge that I am not aware of which will prevent them from hatching, we will look into it and attempt to respond to the hon. member with respect to it.

I will provide for the hon. member the policy with respect to Crown lands. He raises the issue of other lands, railway rights of way, road allowances, etc. I'll indicate to the hon. member the programs for those particular area. I doubt that we would provide the spray free of cost to the CNR or the CPR. If he suggests we should do that, I don't think we will do that. I think we need a program in case of an outbreak and I would be prepared to announce such a program.

### **Kamsack Refinery Report**

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the minister could tell us whether or not he has come across the report that we were asking for the other night in estimates, dealing with the study of the refinery property and the consequences of the closure of the refinery in the town of Kamsack.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I made the statement during estimates that I would bring any documentation that we may have during estimates and I'm prepared to do so.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. If the minister has the report, I wonder if he wouldn't consider sending it over before orders of the day so that we can get through your estimates with some expedience instead of playing this silly little game that you insist on playing and causing delays in carrying out the functions of this House.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Speaker, the documentation that the hon. member was looking for was asked for during the estimates and I said that I would table it during the estimates. I don't know whether I'm bringing the right ones or not, but I'm bringing everything we have and I will be prepared to lay it on the table during estimates.

### **Advertisements by Personal Services**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Question to the Minister of Labor. Mr. Minister, on April 28, you received a letter from Manpower Temporary Services referring to ads that are being placed for placement services in Saskatchewan by personal services. That type of service is illegal under Saskatchewan law. What have you done to inform these people that they are breaking the laws of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — In answer to the hon. member's question, I received a number of communications from the same source over the last number of months related to advertisements in a Saskatoon newspaper, I believe, in which a certain agency purports to be a personnel agency or an employment agency. The act is explicit in that The Employment Agencies Act provides that there shall not be a direct charge to an employee by any agency or any body which purports to find employment for these employees. The application of the act is awkward, I presume, because it becomes a very real problem of adjudicating who indeed is the employer. A properly functioning agency, apparently, is one which employs people and sends them out to yet another employer. That employer pays the agency, which is essentially the employer for these purposes, while the contracting agency provides the unemployment insurance, Canada Pension and other deductions.

Accordingly, the strict enforcement of the act is one which has been attempted by the department. I believe, at this point in time, there has not been, to our knowledge, a violation. Quite frankly, I have some real concerns and feelings about so-called employment agencies; if the choice were mine, I would outlaw them all. The choice is obviously not mine, and some difficulties arise in a very major way in the application of the law. But, as far as I am aware, at this time we have not discovered that there has been a violation of The Employment Agencies Act. That is subject to investigations which are being conducted or inquiries that are being undertaken at this time as a result of the latest information provided to us.

### **Investigation of Albertino's Enterprises Ltd**

**MR. LANE:** — A question to the Attorney General. A statement of defence was filed by SGI and one of the grounds for defence in an action brought against SGI by Albertino's Enterprises Ltd. Was that the plaintiff had a criminal background. I wonder if the Attorney General, in light of the facts that SGI and the government possessed, commenced any investigation or caused any investigation to be made into the

operations of that company and the individuals concerned?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, the department, to the best of my knowledge caused no investigations to be conducted. And, as the hon. member would know, no investigations in that regard normally take place. If there are investigations involving this company or any other company, they would of necessity flow from either a citizen's complaint or from investigation by the RCM Police or appropriate policing agencies. That is the way the procedure has taken place. I don't know whether there has or has not been such an investigation. It is not my practice or policy to check into police files on various matters.

**MR. LANE:** — In light of the statement of fact alleged by Saskatchewan Government Insurance in its statement of defence, was the Department of the Attorney General aware of the allegations of criminal background of the plaintiff corporation, or those controlling the corporation? If so, why was that information not passed on to SGI?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge the department was not aware. I want to say that there may or may not have been a report in the prosecutorial branch; I don't know. I just simply don't have that information. I indicated to the hon. member before, and I repeat again, the policy since I've been Attorney General has been very simple.

Prosecutorial decisions are taken exclusively by the chief prosecutor of the department on the advice of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Now, the hon. members opposite, I gather, are alleging that everybody knew about this company except SGI (including the opposition). Why didn't the hon. member bring it to the attention of the RCM Police if he had this information? If the hon. member has information, I ask him: when was the last time you spoke to the assistant commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police about it?

**MR. LANE:** — I wonder if the Attorney General can advise this Assembly why the RCM Police, criminal investigation division, was advising those involved in real estate in the city of Regina, approximately two years ago, as to the activities of this particular corporation? And, can you advise us why, given the advice by the RCM Police to those involved in real estate, the Department of the Attorney General either was not aware of it, as he has just indicated, or if he was aware, why did he not advise Saskatchewan Government Insurance?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, members of the Department of the Attorney General may or may not have been aware — I don't know, in the broadest sense of the word "aware". That is surely not what the hon. member is getting at. The hon. member, uses the word "aware," in the sense of our function as the Department of the Attorney General to launch some form of prosecutorial action against an individual, a group of individuals or a company. Whether they were aware or not, I don't know. All I know (at least I believe this to be the case; I should check the records to make sure that I'm absolutely solid on my facts) is that no charges have been laid by the Department of the Attorney General. Any charge which would be laid would be determined by the RCMP. The RCMP would prepare such information, forward it to the Department of the Attorney General, and decisions to charge would or would not be made. Whatever and whomever the RCMP was advising, obviously (I'd like to check my facts to be absolutely sure) it has not resulted in a criminal charge. In that sense, there was no "awaring".



I want to indicate to the hon. member that I take the point of view that the Department of the Attorney General is a unique department in government. It stands as a member of cabinet but separate from cabinet. It's our job to administer criminal justice against everybody to whom it may apply. It's not our job to be alerting SGI or any of our colleagues about the aspects of the law. It's their job to follow the law. Our job is, on the advice of police and proper complainants, to prosecute where necessary.

## **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

### **Bill No. 89 — An Act to amend The Marriage Act**

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Marriage Act.

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

### **Bill No. 90 — An Act to amend The Department of the Environment Act**

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Department of the Environment Act.

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

### **Bill No. 91 — An Act to amend The Provincial Court Act (No. 2)**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a bill to amend The Provincial Court Act (No. 2) be now introduced and read a first time.

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

### **Bill No. 92 — An Act to amend The Intestate Succession Act**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a bill to amend The Intestate Succession Act be now introduced and read a first time.

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

### **Bill No. 93 — An Act to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a bill to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act be now introduced and read a first time.

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

## **MOTIONS**

### **Bills Referred to the Non-Controversial Bills Committee**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Before orders of the day, I wonder if I might, by leave of the Assembly, introduce four motions dealing with Bills 75 to 78 inclusive. These are social services bills which, I'm advised by my colleague, have been agreed to by their critic to go to the non-controversial bills committee.

April 30, 1981

I move, seconded by the Minister of Labor, by leave of the Assembly:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 75 — An Act to amend The Family Services Act, be discharged and the bill referred to the non-controversial bills committee.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labor, by leave of the Assembly:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Assistance Act, be discharged and the bill referred to the non-controversial bills committee.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labor, by leave of the Assembly:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 77 — An Act to amend The Rehabilitation Act, be discharged and the bill referred to the non-controversial bills committee.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Finally, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labor, by leave of the Assembly:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 78 — An Act to amend The Housing and Special-care Homes Act, be discharged and the bill referred to the non-controversial bills committee.

Motion agreed to.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

#### **SECOND READINGS**

#### **Bill No. 60 — An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act**

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to speak on Bill No. 60.

Hon. members will recall that during the debate of the agriculture estimates, the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley and I had a discussion concerning the agricultural research program. I indicated at that time that the program would be dealt with in greater detail during the debate of Bill 60, and that we'd have an opportunity for fuller discussion at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Department of Agriculture Act before us differ

from the previous act in that they provide specific authority for the Minister of Agriculture to enter into agreements with another body — another department or agency of the federal or provincial government, or with the university — for the purpose of furthering agricultural research, testing, demonstration and production. In the budget of March 5, our government announced a five-year, \$25 million commitment to agricultural research sponsored by the province. The program will be called the farm lab program. Never before has the province embarked in such a large way upon direct funding for agricultural research. Never before has there been such a systematic attempt to have research undertaken on farms across the depth and breadth of this province to answer the production questions that farmers face.

The farm lab program will begin this year with an assured five-year funding commitment.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board has been telling us over the last several seasons that we have an opportunity to sell 50 per cent more grain on world markets by 1985 if we can grow and transport that grain. With investments and commitments of investment by federal and provincial governments, farmer-owned elevator companies and railways, and with the appointment of a public body to co-ordinate grain movement, we have begun to develop confidence in our transportation system. Much, of course, remains to be done in that system, but 4,000 new hopper cars which will come into the system in 1981 will help, and we know what we can do if we put our minds to it and co-operate, because we look at the experience of the last crop-year.

With some basis for confidence in the transportation system, farmers can turn their minds to the question of producing 50 per cent more grain - producing it in a way that does not leave the soil to blow away when we get a dry year as we have this year and we get some winds as we have had this spring.

Mr. Speaker, in a normal year in Saskatchewan, the average yield per acre of wheat across the province is 25 bushels to the acre. There's no doubt that farmers know how to increase their yield to 27 or 28 bushels to the acre and maybe 30 bushels to the acre. They will say that they're not farming as well as they know how to already.

In 1976, a year when we got lots of rain and lots of rain at the right time, we had a record crop. The provincial average that year was 31.13 bushels to the acre on wheat — the highest ever. The question is: how are we to increase that yield to 37, 38 or 40 bushels an acre on a consistent basis? The university professors and the scientists say that there is no problem. I suspect that if farmers would say, they would agree that if we got the kind of rainfall that we talked about during our estimates — two inches on May 1, two inches on the May 24 and then two inches on that nice June day — we would have no problem.

The professors say it can be done and they say: "We know how to do it. It's only a matter of the farmer's changing how he farms." Of course, Mr. Speaker, the farmer in that kind of a situation is fairly sceptical, and rightly so, because I seem to notice that even the university professors have been backing off this spring. Where last year we heard them saying that there should be a law against summerfallowing, this year we hear them saying: "Well, now boys, you had better be careful about planting that stubble."

When we ask the scientists for some specific answers on salinity, they say: "Well, there are many things we don't know yet," and there's no real blanket answer. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is out there; he's the one who has to make the hard decisions and

the one who has to make the whole thing work.

Clearly there are two things that need to be done. One, there needs to be basic research done on questions the farmers are asking for answers on; two, there need to be different things tried — combinations of things for each soil zone and each climatic zone in the province. If the farmers think that they make sense, they can find out what works in the real situation and not just what is theory.

Each year, farm lab will outline a specific set of priorities in practical agricultural research that will be the emphasis for that year. The government will sign an annual contract with the university to undertake the research work. Some of the work will be undertaken in the university labs, in the university facilities, because some of it is at that stage. But a great deal of work will consist of the scientists' working with the interested farmer to learn something more about production. The university will communicate with the farmer through a series of research committees set up throughout the province. Twelve regional committees will be established, made up of producers. The regional farm lab committees will invite interested farmers to let their interest be known; the committee will match interested farms with projects that fit within the priorities established for that year.

The agricultural representative, the scientist and the farmer will sit down, design the details of work to be done for a particular field or, in the case of animals, for a particular herd. An agreement will be drawn up with the farmer, signs will be posted, and the work will begin.

In addition to funds provided directly to the university to buy the time and skill of scientists for lab and field work, each regional farm lab committee will have an allocation of funds available to it. These funds will be used to help defray some of the research costs related to specific farm projects.

The local agricultural representative will serve as secretary to the regional farm lab committees. The ag. rep. will co-ordinate the visits of the scientists with the farmers. The ag. rep. will visit the farms and help take a weed count or a plant count, if that is necessary. In short, the ag. rep. will act as the staff co-ordinator at the local level for projects approved by the regional farm lab committee.

Each project will be identified with a sign. Farmers will be welcome to visit to take a look at what is happening. Field days will be organized. The emphasis of the farm lab program will be the production questions relating to crops, but there will be work done in the livestock area, because the livestock industry is an essential part of the farm scene in the province.

Over the five years of the program, we see farm lab projects under way in virtually every municipality in the province. Mr. Speaker, we propose that the priorities for the farm lab program in 1981 be as follows (and these priorities will be reflected in the contract signed between the Minister of Agriculture and the president of the University of Saskatchewan):

Dryland crop rotation. This would be the largest program or at least the program with the largest number of projects across the province, both in the first year and in the subsequent years.

Farmers might want to continue their present practice which might be crop, crop,

summerfallow; or might be crop, summerfallow, but look at different cultivation methods. In some areas, farmers might want to try longer rotations. This might be rapeseed, wheat, barley, sweet clover and summerfallow; or it might be wheat, rapeseed, pulse crop, wheat, barley and summerfallow, whatever is decided and whatever fits the area. Each area of the province will be different. What works in one soil zone will not necessarily work in another. What works in one climatic zone will not necessarily work in another.

How can we more successfully conserve the moisture that we receive in order to allow us to extend the rotation? How can we catch what snow does come in the winter? How can we handle the trash or avoid losing it all to run-off in the spring? Do we need special machines to do this? If so, what are they?

What combinations of fertilizers are most effective? Can we cut down the amount of fertilizer required, especially nitrogen, by using particular varieties of particular crops in a particular order? How do we account for the different fertilizer requirements of different parts of the field? Of the chemical fertilizers we use, how much is being absorbed by the plant and how much is being wasted?

What about weed control? How much weed control can we achieve simply by rotating the kinds of crops? How much do we still need to accomplish through the use of chemicals?

Some farmers will be interested in looking at all of these things together, willing to work closely with the scientist to determine the effects which changes in one of the areas have on another area. Some farmer will be more interested in one particular aspect of the rotation questions, and will only want to pursue that. Some may just want to try out different ways of conserving moisture to see what that does to his particular yield. Some may be interested in exploring different patterns of cereals, oilseeds, and legumes in rotations. Some may be interested in trying different methods of weed control on crops which they are already growing, different timings of tillage or chemical applications or in determining effects on yield and cost and even residue that is left in the soil.

The number of projects which could be undertaken in the rotation area is almost unlimited. Certainly, there is room for virtually every farmer who is interested. With projects that are well-marked by signs indicating what is being tried in that particular field. I can see us driving by and observing with a good deal of interest whether what is being experimented with is really working or not. If he is close to where I live and his conditions are reasonably the same, I might even try it. Some afternoon, we'll get organized. We'll all go out together in the community to look at it, drink coffee, talk about it and figure out what won't do on our own places.

I can see the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley and me, some spring morning, not appearing in the legislature for question period, because as we drive into Regina from our respective communities, we stop to look at a research project. I think that opportunity is an important opportunity.

Tillage practices. Tillage practices could well be included as part of the rotation program. But it has become such a major issue that they are worth spending a good deal of time and energy investigating separately. Surely, we should not be in a situation in 1981 where the ditches are full of topsoil after one day's blow. Is there something wrong with the timing of our tillage practices? Or is there something wrong with our

equipment or perhaps the way the farmers are using it? You know, Mr. Speaker, I see the double disc, the machine that was put in the fence corner as a result of the experience of drought and wind in the '30s, on machine lots and in farmers' fields. I thought we ran that into the fence corner, along with the two- and three-furrow plow and along with the old one-way and moved to the cultivator and the rod weeder. Sure, use the discer, but only use it for seeding if you are going to use a disc implement at all.

What happened to that experience? What happened to it? Was it a wrong experience and why are we going back to the use of some of that equipment that we threw away, back there in the '30s and '40s? we will do well to invest in research by Saskatchewan manufacturers. And goodness knows, Mr. Speaker, we have some of the best short-line machinery brains in this country — probably on the North American continent — here in Saskatchewan. Ask them to do research on equipment that is specifically suited to today's Saskatchewan conditions, because it is dry far more than it's wet. In tillage, as in all other aspects of production, the needs in the South and the North and the East and the West are different.

Soil salinity, Mr. Speaker, every rural member in this Assembly could name pieces of land in their own constituencies or perhaps even acres on their own farm which have gone to alkali and are producing much less than they used to, if they are producing at all. What will grow on these patches? Not only what will grow but also what will restore them to their former fertility? The university tells us that they want to do some work in determining what different kinds of salinity there are and how far the water moves, how fast and why. They tell us they want to record specific information on fields before and after certain crops are tried. Farmers are happy to make their field available for the scientist to measure salt levels of depth levels or whatever. But mostly the farmer just wants to know what he can do with the piece to make it productive again.

The 1981-82 contract will provide significant funds for salinity research — both for scientists to assist farmers in applying the best information available to date on how to handle saline spots and for monitoring the results and determining better answers.

Plant breeding has been the key to major increase in productivity on the prairies over the years. Mr. Speaker, the federal government has traditionally been responsible for plant breeding through its federal research stations. A sophisticated system exists to protect the purity of the varieties available to the farmer in Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, the federal government currently has a bill before the House of Commons to turn plant breeding in Canada over to private enterprise. The federal government says its new legislation will provide for more money spent on plant variety research in Canada; it will provide better access to foreign varieties for Canadian farmers. As the federal Minister of Agriculture says, "The federal agricultural research stations will soon be making money because of all the royalties collected on plant breeders' rights."

Mr. Speaker, I say, in this Assembly, that the day agricultural research becomes a money-making proposition will be a said day for Canadian agriculture, for the Canadian farm economy, and in fact, for the Canadian economy.

The members opposite may shake their heads. But I remind them and all the members of this Assembly that the Clark government also planned to introduce plant breeders' rights legislation in the House of Commons. There are two aspects of the problem of plant breeders' rights legislation now before the House of Commons. Firstly, plant

breeding is a long and costly process. It has a high risk, and private enterprise, looking at making a dollar, will simply not stick with it long enough to make the breakthrough.

Secondly, plant breeding, under this bill, could become a monopoly over which the farmer would have no control. Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from a speech delivered to a seminar in the agricultural economics department of the University of Saskatchewan by the former director of the federal agricultural research station in Saskatoon — a man with more than 30 years of research, a man with an international reputation in research and plant breeding, Dr. Ross Greenshields.

I am going to table his speech for all hon. members. I want to quote from the speech by Dr. Greenshields. He is referring to the legislation that is before the House of Commons.

There is considerable talk about more varieties being available. More varieties have always been available; but in western Canada, with its Arctic climate and short growing season, we have had to develop our own varieties. At any given time, not more than about 10 varieties of cereals and oilseeds cover over 90 per cent of the crop acreage in western Canada, and 99 per cent is produced in the institutions on the Prairies.

We don't need more varieties. It isn't quantity but quality that we need. Behind quality is often some long-term expensive research. In my opinion, no company would have been prepared to put the number of scientists on the project and to do the in-depth research over a long period of time, to achieve Canola rapeseed.

Remember that a bill like C-32 could change the basis of our whole system of plant improvement in Canada. This might not happen overnight. But if public institutions are essentially forced out, our farmer will end up at the mercy of the private companies and they will give us what they wish, not necessarily what we should have, and not what we want. This must not be allowed to happen.

Remember the experience with the monopoly of the line elevators in the early 1900s that resulted in the formation of the wheat pool. The line companies had a monopoly — a monopoly that was only broken by the farmers forming co-operatives. A private plant breeders' monopoly would be much more difficult to break because it would be enshrined in legislation.

Mr. Speaker, plant breeding is an essential service to the farmers, and can only operate in the farmers' interests over the long period, if it is operating as a public utility. I say in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, if the federal government is abdicating its role in public plant breeding, then this province has only the choice to enter the field in a significant way. This program will start us down that road.

Animal research. As Saskatchewan and all of Canada struggle to maintain a beef industry which is competitive in the international situation and as we face a growing world demand for protein for human consumption, the livestock industry may look away from the traditional wheat and barley to feed cattle. It may, as well, work to develop animals which we produce as effectively and efficiently as possible. This means that we work on both the animal and the forage to match the lower cost feeds with a digestive tract which can handle them. We work on the nutritional content of

various feeds, the digestibility, how to make them attractive, and determine what adjustments can be made. Additionally, work is required on the effect on the health of cattle and pigs of the trace minerals and vitamins which are either present or lacking in the water or feed in different parts of the province.

These kinds of studies will be included in this year's animal agricultural contract with the university. A great deal of work will be done in laboratories but, where possible, work will be done on the farms.

Production and cost studies. One of the difficulties which often arises in research work is translating something which may have been economic to do in the laboratory or in a small-test situation to the real world of the field and the farm. The costs of any practice must be carefully recorded and calculated, as they will have a major bearing on its general use. Our contract with the university will include provision for cost studies on the projects undertaken in the field.

Toxicology and biotechnology. These two areas are restricted to lab work. Toxicology performs an important service in determining residues in soils and plants from the use of chemicals. Biotechnology works in the biology area rather than the chemical area of controlling pests such as grasshoppers. It addresses that issue — the issue which was raised by the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley this afternoon. A product currently used to control tent caterpillars may be able to be extended to control other crop pests, if it's pursued.

Mr. Speaker, these are the projects which will be the priorities for research in the 1981-82 farm lab program. I report to this Assembly that we have formed a farm lab advisory committee. It consists of representatives of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the National Farmers' Union, the Saskatchewan Stockgrowers' Association and the Western Canada Cow-Calf Association, as well as membership from direct producers. The committee has met to review the concept of the program. The committee will be the provincial body advising on annual program priorities in the farm lab program — priorities which will, in turn, become the priorities in the contract with the university. The farm lab committee will keep a close eye on whether the program is really doing what we intend it to do at the farm level, and will advise us if changes are necessary.

At the local level, the regional farm lab committees will consist of representation from the existing agricultural district boards and the regional councils, as well as individual farmers. These committees will invite farmer participation. They will approve projects and the locations of those projects within their given regions. The projects approved will fall within the approved provincial priorities, but the mix and the emphasis from region to region will almost certainly be different.

Mr. Speaker, the farm lab is an important program of agriculture in the '80s, probably the most important program in the budget this year. It is a program for the University of Saskatchewan and the scientists and the expertise which they have, and they are excited by it. It is a program which is going to require a lot of work by our agricultural representatives — work which they really haven't been involved in as directly as they will be involved in this program. Imagine the challenge of the ag. rep. to get the expert on the farm and the expert at the university sitting down together to resolve and to answer some of the questions which are moving about the agricultural community with respect to productivity.



But most important, Mr. Speaker, it is a program for Saskatchewan farmers, for their expertise. There is no question that Saskatchewan farmers are experts. They have a reputation as being the most efficient and the most productive of any farmers or any business group in this country. Certainly, farmers have increased their productivity over the years more than any other business. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, farmers take risks that urban people simply would not tolerate.

Mr. Speaker, as Jonathan Swift said in *Gulliver's Travels*:

Whoever could make two ears of corn and two blades of grass grow upon a spot of ground, where only one grew before, deserves better of mankind and do a more essential service to this country than the whole race of politicians put together.

I am proud to move second reading of Bill No. 60.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Minister of Agriculture bring forth his plans on bill No. 60, as he said he would under agriculture estimates. I don't know whether I would go back to *Gulliver's Travels* to start on our debate, or to the 1930s and the devastation which the minister so often reflects on in his speeches.

I would point out that I think it has been a long time coming. I think the farmers of Saskatchewan have been wanting research for some time and I would wonder why the government opposite, which has been in power through the decade of the '70s, has waited 10 years to bring in this very needed program for Saskatchewan agriculture. So I would say, it is here now; it is what we want; thank goodness, it finally got here. I think that is what the farmers of Saskatchewan would say.

The thing which concerns me in regard to this (and I want to make it very plain at the outset of my remarks) is that we, on this side of the House, favor agriculture research. We have called for more research to be done in many fields in this province. Certainly, research and development, as my colleague says, is the concept which we stand for. Certainly, in a province in which agriculture is the backbone of our economic activity, I say it is about time that the government in power did come along with a research and development program.

I think the concept of research and development is supported by both sides of the House, and I believe it is supported by farmers in Saskatchewan. What concerns me, to a certain degree, is the implementation of these projects. As I listened to the minister, it seemed to me that he was talking about the university; that is the area with the agricultural expertise, the theoretical knowledge that can be linked with the practical application on the family farm. That, to me, seems to be a worth-while objective, if that is what we are heading toward without impediment, restriction or control by government agencies. There is the crux of the problem which worries me in this type of program.

I listened to the minister talk about cultivation and cultivation practices. Maybe we're using certain types of machinery that are not best suited to the drought conditions that we are in today, Mr. Speaker. I accept what he says. He has been in agriculture longer than I have; he lived in the '30s. Maybe that is correct. I don't dispute that.

He talked about soil salinity. I think anyone out there in Saskatchewan who has this problem on his farmland would agree that this is a worth-while objective — to solve the problems of soil salinity. He then went on to talk about plant breeders' rights, as I understand, and then on to animal breeding research. At that point I began to sit here and wonder where the control factor would come in because I know the government opposite has a bill in called The Natural Products Marketing Act which, if enforced, could restrict what is grown and distributed in this province.

Now, if it is to improve the varieties of grains out there, if that comes from the grass roots with producer control — that type of research — I don't see too much wrong with it. But what if this is a design whereby one is to qualify for these grants. I don't know how much money an individual can have; the minister said \$25 million over five years, I think. The agricultural estimates seem to discover about \$2 million for this year. It was hidden around in different places, and there may be more. I would ask, then, if the minister in his closing remarks would indicate what the expenditure may be for this coming year in this new research.

Getting back to this problem of the projects selected, he pointed out that there would be boards developed. I forget the name of them. The regional farm life committee — I think that's what he called it. I have another question: were these elected or appointed boards? When you start appointing boards by governments in power, sometimes you get different objectives from what is really intended by the legislation. I wonder why we have to have these extra boards, Mr. Minister, because as I understand it (I think you made reference to them) each R.M. now has the power to have an agricultural representative or an agricultural district board. It would seem that these are people appointed by the R.M.; they are choices of the local electorate and these are the people who should probably administer these start-up grants or these research projects, rather than bringing in a whole new board.

I hope that the desire and concern here is to improve the varieties of plants and animals that we have. I question the animals. I think that Agribition here in Regina indicates that we in Saskatchewan and in western Canada have probably some of the most superior breeding stock in the world. That superior breeding stock in beef and dairy cattle was developed by the good old means of private enterprise. By risking your dollar to go out and buy the best bull and get the best semen that you can have to produce the best offspring that are going to bring you the biggest dollar when you sell them. That's the way we came to be the leader in livestock in Canada, I believe. I think Agribition supports what I say. We're the leader in livestock in the world in many cases, because we have some of the best stock here.

Now, I would agree that you can't rest on your laurels; you always want to be improving. We want to be getting the maximum production that we possibly can out of our agricultural activities. But I say, good old private enterprise has certainly produced it in the animals, and that wasn't with any special advisory committee or any special research grant. However, I will agree that there are projects that need research.

There was one thing that I jotted down as I was listening to you. It always amazed me in all my years of teaching. When I worked with students at science fairs, I tried to get them to do this topic. I throw it out to you, and I think you hinted something about it too. We live in this country where (this year it was a little different) there's a great amount of snow. I don't think there is anyone in Saskatchewan (I don't know if there is anyone at the university) who understand the way snow drifts. There is a whole study out there on snow, and the controlling of snow, that could be a source of moisture. There would

be one project that would be very valuable to undertake, because we've lived in this country all our lives and we don't understand it at all.

You went on about your farm lab and its advisory committee. I think there may be merit in a farm lab. Again, there is a special committee being set up. as I say, I would like you to tell us how these committees are going to be established. You mentioned certain farm groups that you have had representation from and discussion with. I would think that in the main, Mr. Minister, the people of Saskatchewan and the people on this side of the House do not in any way, shape or form go against the concept of research and development — worthy objectives. But the thing that I want to see, and the proof in the pudding, is going to be true, independent, locally developed research projects. I would be very hurt to see a situation where a farmer couldn't undertake a project because some bureaucrat who is administering the program said it's not really what you want. I would hate to see a farmer limited. I think you said there could be a farmer in each municipality. There are a lot of good ideas out there. A lot of these can be developed by research and development, but let's let it be true and independent research — the type of research that we see in universities where it isn't being manipulated by some bureaucratic organization which may have some political end.

Just on ending, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to the minister. I don't know if your signs are designed yet or not — the signs you are going to put up at each one of these plots. I agree with you; I'll drop in and have a cup of coffee and talk about these things. I think that's worth while. But if you are designing these signs, I would say this; this would be a break with tradition — let's highlight the project, let's put: "Joe Black, Project to Improve Rapeseed," big letters; and down in the bottom — "Sponsored by the Government of Saskatchewan," and then you say what they're doing. Let's give credit where credit is good on these signs, and focus on those farmers, innovators, developers, men that are really the backbone of agriculture.

**MR. BANDA:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to get into this debate until I heard the new agriculture critic proposing how he's going to collect snow, and whatever, in southern Saskatchewan. I hope that the member, in his studies to collect snow, will remember that the snow comes from above, and we have to have a little snow in order to collect some for moisture in Saskatchewan.

But it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that the member criticizes the government for not bringing in more research moneys earlier. I want to remind the members opposite that it's because of the good planning of the members on this side of the house who have planned the resource revenues, and the activity in the resource area, that have brought more moneys to the people of Saskatchewan. Because of that, we are able to do many of the things that we should be doing out in rural Saskatchewan, and this is no exception . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if the member will listen (I know he doesn't like being reminded of this).

Members continually criticize us for getting into potash, into oil. If members would just realize that those revenues coming forth are providing programs like beef stabilization and research. It would be interesting to know Mr. Speaker, how members opposite would bring in these programs when they are totally against millions of dollars in resource revenues coming to Saskatchewan, when they would sooner give it to the multinational corporations . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, since members opposite don't want to hear what I want to say today, I'll prepare a few more remarks to get back at the remarks the member opposite made. So, I beg leave to

April 30, 1981

adjourn debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 85 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of  
The Jury Act, 1981**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise to move second reading of The Jury Consequential Amendment Act, 1981. the provisions of this bill contain amendments to various statutes required if The Jury Act, 1981, a bill presently before this House is enacted.

The Jury Act, now before this House, directs that all but a few classifications of persons, who are those engaged in the administration of justice, shall be eligible to serve on juries. Others will be permitted to apply for relief from jury services in certain circumstances. Previously, members of a number of professional associations and organizations were automatically excluded from jury service by virtue of The Jury Act, or the specific professional society act. Sections 2 to 5 and section 7 of this bill remove these automatic exemptions.

Section 6 of the bill makes amendments to The Queen's Bench Act consequential upon the removal of certain jury provisions from that act to The Jury Act, and allows the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to set the fees payable to jurors as provided by the proposed jury act bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Jury Consequential Amendment Act, 1981.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, the critic is preoccupied at this point in time, and I think he has a few things to say. I don't see any problem with the legislation presented but, so he has an opportunity to speak on this matter, I would beg leave to adjourn debate on this question.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 87 — An Act to amend The Unified Family Court Act**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Unified Family Court Act. This amendment will increase the scope of the unified family court by permitting it to exercise the jurisdiction of the court under The Attachment of Debts Act and The Dependents' Relief Act.

In many instances, matters before the unified family court also involve matter under these two acts, and I think it is appropriate to enlarge the jurisdiction of the court in this manner. I do not need to remind members of the success of this special experimental project in the city of Saskatoon. It has proved to be a very popular court which handles family law matters in an efficient and sensible way. I am pleased that this court will be set up in Regina in 1982-1983.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to Amend The Unified Family Court Act.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, the amendments to that particular act have more

ramifications than are indicated in the bill. Certainly, it could be possible that the whole unified family court act has to be looked at. It's not so long since it was brought in, and I think that it's fair to say that now that we have been through a few examples in court, it has raised enough questions in the minds of the people who have had to deal with that particular court that there could be some very constructive amendments which could be proposed in the House. It might be appropriately placed before the House at this particular time. In light of that and in light of the fact that we are taking a look at some amendments which we may introduce, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 59 — **An Act to amend The Provincial Lands Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this bill has regional consequences that one has to look at. I think in some areas of the province, where there is adequate habitat for wildlife, perhaps the movement to sell leased land to people wanting to purchase it is the correct way to go.

In the southwest corner of the province, where there are a lot of leases, probably many of the people would want to purchase the leased land and should be given the opportunity to do so.

So, I don't think we can oppose the concept of purchasing leased land, but there are a few concerns I want to express. These pertain more to the southeast portion of the province. There, some of the Crown lands which may be up for purchase as a result of this bill are areas where the native habitat is still in place. I think we have to take a serious look at this. If we destroy all the native habitat in the southeast portion of this province, we are going to lose the wildlife and it will be very difficult for us to ever bring it back for successive generations.

We have to take a serious look at this situation. I think where there are very marginal Crown lands, where the ability to turn them into productive grain-growing areas is very marginal and questionable, that it might be wise to retain some areas as Crown land to provide a habitat for wildlife.

We have to realize that if people are going to purchase these lands, they're not going to purchase them, at today's prices and high interest costs, to run stock on. The profit factor isn't there in southeastern Saskatchewan to do this. So if this land is purchased, it's going to be purchased with the view to breaking it up, clearing the bush and draining it. That will result in a vast depopulation of the flora and fauna which is already being depleted because so much private land is being cleared of bush and drained of sloughs.

You will all realize that I urged the Minister of Agriculture the other day to use his good offices to try to bring about reforestation, the planting of windbreaks, and things of that nature, in southeastern Saskatchewan because of this very fear of the native vegetation

and brush being taken off this land. So, I would just say in debate on this bill that the basic concept of people being able to buy Crown lands I do not oppose, but I do suggest to the Government of Saskatchewan that there is a need to seriously assess this situation in southeast Saskatchewan.

I understand in the North (from my colleagues in the North) there is ample habitat and there probably always will be ample habitat. Therefore, it isn't quite as serious a problem there. But in the areas which my colleague for Moosomin and my colleague for Souris-Cannington, and I represent, if the bush cover is all taken out and all of the sloughs drained, we could be in a serious situation in terms of wildlife which I enjoy so much. I want that wildlife to be around for my children and succeeding generations to enjoy.

The other thing which I want to draw to the attention of the Assembly (and the minister can probably clarify this) is the regulation of having to give up Crown lands at 65 years of age. It says:

. . . lease provincial lands to an individual or individuals for a term not exceeding the lesser of 47 years, or the last day of the year in which the lessee, or the oldest lessee (where there is more than one individual lessee), attains the age of 65 years.

Now, in our provincial parks which are Crown lands, there are people who have cottages who lease those lands to have their cottages on, and I certainly hope it isn't the intent of the government opposite that after 65 years of age you can't lease any Crown land. I hope there is something which says cottages are exempt from this. I think that would be a terrible thing, and I think it is probably an oversight if that is the situation.

I want to point out a bit more about the problem which exists in southeastern Saskatchewan. I'd like to read from a letter from the Saskatchewan Natural History Society, an organization involved in protecting the flora and fauna that we enjoy in southeastern Saskatchewan. It says:

Bill No. 59, if passed and implemented, could cause significant changes to the face of Saskatchewan. In referring to the Department of Agriculture's annual report of 1978, grazing leases consist of 7,000 parcels of land containing over five million acres. In addition, there were 800 hay leases.

Getting back to the rapid loss of natural habitat in southern Saskatchewan, only 25 per cent of the land in southern Saskatchewan remains in native vegetation and much of it is heavily grazed.

That's from the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources report "Saskatchewan Game Bird Management Objectives and Strategies for the '80s" of June, 1980.

It is estimated that 40 per cent of the original wetland habitat on the prairies has been lost.

The source, again, is the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources report.

Another DTRR report estimated that between the years 1965 and 1975, we lost 6 million acres of native habitat in southern Saskatchewan. Another estimate states that

we continue to lose natural habitat at a rate of 20 acres per hour, or three quarter sections per day.

In light of these alarming statistics, we urge the Government of Saskatchewan to retain its provincial lands which are leased for haying and grazing under provincial ownership. Important but vanishing native habitat can be maintained, while at the same time provide a valuable and often compatible service to the public in the form of haying and grazing leases.

The loss of these natural lands will have a significant effect on our dwindling wildlife resources. Unfortunately, once we lose wildlife habitat, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to restore it.

We must save a major portion of the remaining 25 per cent of native habitat in southern Saskatchewan, if we hope to retain our unique natural heritage, which includes birds, plants and animals. We are obligated to preserve significant amounts of our natural heritage for future generations.

That is just a little bit from a letter from the people in the Saskatchewan Natural History Society. Mr. Minister, I hope the government opposite will take these concerns into consideration when making lease lands available for purchase. I would reiterate that the most marginal lands, the ones there is opportunity to make into profitable agricultural and economic units, perhaps would be best held by the Crown to provide this natural habitat which is fast dwindling and very scarce in that part of the province.

**MR. PREBBLE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to speak briefly on this bill. I want to say that, while I don't often agree with the members opposite. I think the member opposite raises a legitimate concern on this point. I don't want to repeat remarks made by him because I thought he put it quite well.

I think there are two points which we might consider as a government that could come in conjunction with the introduction of this bill. The one thing we could do that would make the bill much more workable is to add a section that would allow the wildlife branch of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources to veto the sale of any particular piece of Crown land if it thought that its value for natural habitat was extremely high and that it ought to be preserved. I think provision should be made for that in the bill.

The second thing we could do, which would not necessarily have to be part of the bill at all but should be a budget item, is establish a program whereby some sort of tax break or financial incentives are provided to rural municipalities for each mile of shelterbelt planted in that R.M. I think that kind of program would be very well received by the farmers of Saskatchewan. I also think that kind of program is in the long-term ecological interest of the province of Saskatchewan. I hope that the minister and the cabinet would seriously look at introducing those programs in conjunction with this bill. Thank you very much.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Several members on this side of the House wish to have input into this debate. Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr.

Tchorzewski that Bill No. 74 — **An Act to amend The Income Tax Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I will not take very much time speaking on the amendment to The Income Tax Act; however, I do want to make a few comments.

The main purpose of this amendment is to decrease the personal tax rate in Saskatchewan from 53 per cent to 52 per cent for this year, and subsequently to 51 per cent. The government opposite has always prided itself on and bragged about the credits and benefits of their plan and program. I did some rather interesting calculations recently, and I have come up with some revealing figures that surprised me, but will not surprise the minister. The credits, I believe, called the Saskatchewan basic credit, or the Saskatchewan income tax reduction and the calculation of Saskatchewan mortgage interest tax credit . . . Just to give you an example of what I mean, I looked at some returns of individuals who allowed me to do so. The government members opposite have always indicated that these plans and programs are to assist those who need them most.

First of all, let me say that the poverty level in Regina and Saskatoon, I am advised, is about \$5,300 per year. I don't think anyone will argue with me, and I'm sure that the Minister of Finance will admit, that by today's standards, an income of \$10,000 per year is not something that one is going to get very wealthy on. I took a look at a tax return of an individual who had earned a gross income last year of \$9,800. The Saskatchewan tax reductions plan of \$160 is supposed to be of benefit to a person like that. The minister should know that calculating it like that, the individual only benefited by \$50. the gross income was \$9,800. Deducting from that the employment expenses of 3 per cent, which amounted to \$294 and left \$9,506, deducting (and I used an approximate figure here) unemployment insurance and Canada Pension Plan of \$250, and deducting the basic exemption, the standard deduction allowance, left a taxable income of \$6,266. The federal tax payable on that amount was \$792 and the Saskatchewan tax payable was \$475.70. When you look at the arguments the government has used, they say, "Well, that's \$475 but we have a \$160 credit that comes off that." The fact is it doesn't. the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this individual only had a \$50 credit because of the method of calculation.

I would ask the minister this question: how many people in the province of Saskatchewan would really benefit from the full \$160 that you show in your tax form? I dare say that there wouldn't be too many, with the exception of those 150,000 people who live on the poverty line in Saskatchewan. I am sure that most of those would not pay anything at all, but that's the poverty level. But when we get to that level of \$9,800 or \$10,000 — or even use \$9,000 — there is no \$160 available to these people.

I want to give a couple more examples, and then carry on with the balance of my remarks. Another individual would earn \$12,000 — that is \$1,000 a month. I am talking about a single individual earning \$12,000 a year in Saskatchewan today. Again, Mr. Speaker, one is not going to get very rich or put aside very much money. A person earning \$1,000 a month today (gross income less the deductions), having to rent an apartment and buy his furniture, food, and clothes, operating an automobile (by today's standards, I think, one is allowed that) and buying the licence, paying the high cost of insurance in Saskatchewan and the high cost of gasoline tax, is almost, in my books, living at the poverty line . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I am sure if I was earning that, I would have to quit smoking, Mr. Member for Regina Rosemont. You could afford it; I



could not, at \$1,000 a month.

When one looks at the calculation again, on that individual earning \$12,000 a year or \$1,000 a month, the \$160 does not apply to that person at all. Not one cent of that \$160 credit is applicable to that individual. As a matter of fact, according to my calculations, the saw-off on this figure would be somewhere around \$11,500, substantially less than \$1,000 a month. However, that is for a single person.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that, by today's standards, a married person, raising two children, attempting to own a home, and with all the expenses, would need a minimum of \$1,500 a month to live on. That is what I would say it is by today's standards. I would like the minister to disagree with that assessment — that an individual, married with two children would need \$1,500 a month to live on. Assuming those two children were born before the year 1963, that would give them the full benefit of the \$990. that is giving you full advantage, Mr. Minister, in the calculation; otherwise, it would be \$500 and some credit. So I am giving you the full benefit of the credit. It is \$990, so for two it is \$1,980. That person, again, Mr. Speaker, does not qualify for the credit of \$160.

One would not have to go to \$18,000. One would only have to go to somewhere in the range of \$16,000, before that person would not qualify for the credit of \$160 a year. What are we attempting to do with these kinds of figures, Mr. Minister? Why not recognize the needs, by today's standards, of these people and change your formula so that the credit applies to those people who live on the very bare minimum?

I'll move on to the next benevolent gift that the Government of Saskatchewan prides itself on including in its calculation of taxes in Saskatchewan, and that is the mortgage interest tax credit. That's a very interesting one. I'm going to talk about the same person, who had an income of \$18,000 and a taxable income of \$9,675.

His tax credit for mortgage interest would amount to only \$156.50, not \$250 as claimed, advertised and expounded by the government. However, an interesting note to make here is that, if that person could afford to buy the house, he would receive a \$156.50 return in a year. I don't think anyone will argue with me when I say that a person earning \$18,000 gross a year, with two children and a wife, owning an automobile and needing food and clothing, could not afford to buy the house.

If we move into the higher income bracket, then it becomes a minimum. I'm not sure where that level becomes a minimum — probably around \$21,000 or \$22,000. in that area, it doesn't matter because the minimum is \$100, not \$250. in other words, the person who is in the \$20,000-a-year bracket may benefit from the \$100 mortgage interest tax credit, but he cannot, first of all, afford to buy the house.

The person earning \$60,000 or \$100,000 would still receive the same \$100, but he can afford to buy the house. I don't know whether that makes very much sense or how you are going to encourage the purchasing or building of homes with that kind of a formula.

The biggest announcement of the budget was that the government was reducing income tax. No mention was made of the fact that they had originally raised it to 58 per cent. They were quite proud of the fact that they lowered it from 58 per cent to 53 per cent, and now, to 52 per cent.

There are always a certain number of people who are removed from the tax roll.

Unfortunately, I noticed that the minister had omitted that figure this year in his budget, so I don't know how many people are excluded or added to the tax roll. It is interesting that they could reduce the tax by 1 per cent (I'm speaking of individual income tax) and yet increase the revenue to the government by \$43 million. That has to be some kind of magic. Probably, as I said in reference to a Crown corporation of this government which is expert at this, it is "creative bookkeeping."

Needless to say, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan (the individuals) were not blessed with a 1 per cent reduction in income tax payable, but rather, received approximately a 15 per cent increase in total taxes paid to the government this year. How did they do that? How do they reduce 1 per cent and then increase their revenue by \$43 million, or something in excess of 13 or 14 per cent. That's very interesting! I'll tell you how it was done. They took away the 1 per cent and then they added 2 per cent to the surtax. Well, I suppose for people who can afford it, no one is going to argue; they are the ones who will have to pay. So anyone who has a tax payable in Saskatchewan of \$4,000 will be nailed with another 12 per cent now, because of the 2 per cent increase.

But I wonder why the minister omitted to index that figure? Would the minister not agree that an individual in that income bracket is a middle-income earner? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I would call that middle. But no indexing was done in that area. That's where the additional revenue comes from, certainly not from the added employment in the province, as we have seen from other statistics the government has provided us, and certainly not because they reduced 1 per cent, because that's really taking away. So that's the only other place that I can see where the money would come from. There are a lot of people today in this country, in this province, earning in the \$35,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000 bracket, which is really not considered high income. A large percentage of government employees are in that range, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that unfortunately has a double-edged sword in it, because it reduces taxes by 1 per cent — as little as that means to the average individual. If I recall the figures correctly, it's going to make a difference of about \$15 this year for the average individual. To vote against that bill would be wrong simply because you are not attempting to lower the taxes to the individual. To vote in favor of it is really a joke — no, no, we are going to support it, Mr. Speaker — support a bill that is in fact a joke. It is simply ridiculous to be able to come out with a bill like this that would give a 1 per cent reduction, amounting to \$15 a year, to the average individual. And yet, the government will collect some \$40 million more, well over 13 or 14 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the creative bookkeeping of this government is going to take another government some time to clean up and straighten around. I will say this in the fact that we are supporting the bill, we are supporting it only because it adds a little bit (yes, it's a joke, there's no question about it) to the individual's net income. But it could have added, if the minister had used a bit of common sense and a little compassion for the taxpayers of this province, ten times that much. But he couldn't see that as being the possible thing to do.

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I will not take a great deal of time in responding to the member opposite. I just want to say one thing. I want to commend him, first of all, for responding in this adjourned debate as quickly as he has done this afternoon. We introduced the bill last week, and he obviously was ready to respond. That is particularly significant when we have seen, in the order paper under adjourned debates, a whole list of legislation which has been on the order paper for weeks upon weeks, and members opposite have just stood them and adjourned them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that really does not say a great deal for the productivity of the opposition and their preparedness to do any work on the legislation here before us. The member opposite has not done that with this particular piece of legislation and I thank him, because I think the business of the House should go on.

One the other hand, I would have to say that hearing the critic of finance speak to these amendments to The Income Tax Act left me at a loss to understand the logic that was being applied. As a matter of fact, I have to really wonder where the logic was. When we introduced this bill in second readings the other day, he gave me to understand that he was not going to be selective in some of the examples he used and that he was going to give a general critique of the legislation. I want to remind him that he made that commitment and I express my disappointment that he did not carry it out.

He talks about people in Saskatchewan who are low-income earners. Well, I also want to talk about them for a while. I want to compare what we are doing in this province with what the opposition members are proposing we do.

They constantly say, "You have to have an across-the-board tax cut." Well, Mr. Speaker, that sounds good and it sounds simple, and it's the kind of thing that people might be attracted to if they don't stop and think. But the people of Saskatchewan do stop and think, so they're not attracted to it. What will an across-the-board tax cut do? It would benefit predominantly only those people who have large incomes. It would do nothing for those people the member for Regina South has just spoken about. An across-the-board tax cut simply is on a percentage basis and the higher your income, the higher your benefits.

We make our tax system in Saskatchewan a lot more progressive than that. We have provided an across-the-board tax cut of 2 per cent this year, but at the same time we have increased the surcharge on high incomes. Even though we have increased that surcharge, as the member mentioned, from 10 per cent to 12 per cent, everyone in the province under this tax cut is going to get a tax reduction. People whose taxable income is \$33,000 are still going to get a tax reduction, so everybody is benefiting. I don't understand the logic that the member opposite is trying to use.

We have done more than that and we announced it in the budget, Mr. Speaker. There are people in this province who earn low wages, as there are in any society. If all that was ever done was simply the provision of a tax cut, those people would never be assisted. The member doesn't mention that in this province we have a family income plan which was very substantially increased in this budget to help those kinds of people. so we have once again balanced the effect of what we're doing.

It is really mystifying to me that every time there is an increase in the minimum wage, the first people to complain about it are the Conservative members of this House. The first people to complain about the minimum wage, which provides an increase to people who earn low incomes, is described by the members opposite as being atrocious, as if, somehow, it's going to destroy business in Saskatchewan. On the other hand, the members then get up in this house and plead on behalf of those people. the rhetoric is nice, Mr. Speaker, but it is what is done that really matters.

The member opposite mentioned the mortgage interest tax credit in Saskatchewan. I have already, on previous occasions, talked about our mortgage interest tax credit which returns about \$12 million to Saskatchewan home-owners who are paying

mortgages. The Conservatives have come up with their proposal, which would provide a return of only \$3 million. There is no doubt about it, the program which we have in place is a lot better than theirs. As a matter of fact, it was thought that the Saskatchewan mortgage interest tax credit was such a good program that the former Conservative government of Canada, led by Mr. Clark, was prepared to copy it and implement it across Canada. It's funny how things change all of a sudden. They took so long to implement any kind of a decent program that the people of Canada decided that they should turf them out because it could possibly never happen.

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate again, as I did in my initial remarks the other day, that we now have, with these amendments to The Income Tax Act, the fourth lowest provincial income tax rate in Canada. If we consider only that, then we have to say that it's only the fourth lowest income tax rate provincially. You have to consider, in all honesty, the effective tax which people have to pay. The effective tax which people in Saskatchewan have to pay is among the lowest in Canada. For low-income people, it is the lowest in Canada, in spite of the fact that there is a lower rate in Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. What is the reason for that? It's because they have hidden taxes — not quite hidden, but they don't call them taxes. We don't have a health premium which families have to pay. In those other three provinces, there is a health premium. As a matter of fact, as I indicated the other day, if the Conservative Government of Ontario showed any signs of being progressive, its taxation system would do away with the health premium of \$448 per family every year, and collect it through the progressive income tax system. The income tax rate in Ontario would be 56 per cent — a full five percentage points higher than what it is in Saskatchewan. So, the effective tax in Saskatchewan is lower than it is throughout the rest of this country.

Mr. Speaker, there are further examples I could give. You can take the example of the retail sales tax for the provinces which do have such a tax. Saskatchewan has the lowest retail sales tax in Canada. British Columbia, having just recently increased it, has a retail sales tax of 6 per cent; Ontario has one of 7 per cent; Quebec has one of 8 per cent and New Brunswick has one at 8 per cent, while Saskatchewan has its sales tax at 5 per cent.

It doesn't matter how the members opposite cut it, the people of Saskatchewan are benefiting a great deal from the good management and the resource development policies of this government, which have provided, in the last 10 years, reductions in the amount of taxation they have to pay, as well as a very substantial increase in the services which they get through the many new programs being introduced.

Let me deal with one more point which the member mentioned, because I think it deserves correction. He said that we are reducing our income tax rate by 1 per cent. It's 1 per cent for this year, but in the full year it will be 2 per cent. It is written in the legislation as 1 per cent because of the fact that it's being implemented on July 1. then he says that he can't understand why, having reduced the income tax rate, there is an increase in the revenue which will come to the province from personal income tax. The reason there is that increase in the revenue from the income tax is that the province is prosperous.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That's simply why; that's a good sign. That shows you, Mr. Speaker, and should show the member for Regina South that there are higher wages that people are earning and it also shows that there are more people who are earning

wages. That's why there is an increase in the total revenue from the income tax system even though the rate of personal income tax in Saskatchewan is being reduced.

Probably, I will have more to say on this when we get into committee of the whole. The member may ask some questions and therefore I shall conclude my remarks and welcome the fact that the members opposite will support the bill, even though they think it's a joke. It's a strange rationale for supporting the bill, but nevertheless I'm glad it's going to be unanimous.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Hammersmith that Bill No. 62 — **An Act to amend The Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

### **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

#### **Bill No. 57 — An Act respecting the Urban Municipal Administrators' Association of Saskatchewan**

Sections 1 to 14 inclusive agreed.

Section 15 as amended agreed.

Sections 16 to 27 inclusive agreed.

Section 28 as amended agreed.

Section 29 to 42 inclusive agreed.

Section 43 as amended agreed.

Section 44 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

#### **Bill No. 68 — An Act to amend The Securities Act**

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

#### **Bill No. 69 — An Act respecting Trust and Loan Corporations**

Section 1 agreed.

Section 2 as amended agreed.

April 30, 1981

Sections 3 to 32 inclusive agreed.

Section 33 as amended agreed.

Sections 34 to 57 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

**Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Wills Act**

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed.

Section 6 as amended agreed.

Section 7 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

**Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Executions Act**

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**Bill No. 67 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act**

**Section 1**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I wasn't here the other day when the bill was presented. Therefore, I have a few questions which I want to discuss with the minister in regard to this act. We could do it either under education estimates or here. Since this bill deals with superannuation, I think this would be the appropriate time to discuss it.

My concern, Mr. Minister, is about the 10-year lock-in clause. I understand it comes into effect at the end of June this year of somewhere around that time. I have had concerns expressed to me by a number of teachers in the field who look at perhaps leaving the profession somewhere after 10 years. As the legislation stands now, if they do not withdraw their funds by June of this year, then they are locked in until age 65. That money is theirs; it's money they contributed. Therefore, their concern is that they could investigate sources where they could invest that money to get a greater return than they could accumulate if it were left in the fund under age 65.

Another area of concern about the lock-in for the teachers is that it seems unfair, if they are no longer in the teaching profession, it is their money which they have contributed and they would like to have that money. I don't really see the need for the lock-in. For the teachers in the teaching profession — fine and dandy; their money stays there until they quit or retire. But these individuals who chose to get out after that period of time are really forfeiting that money. They can't put their hands on it until they reach the age of 65. What is that money going to buy for them at age 65? If they had it for that period of time after they left teaching, they could probably invest that in businesses or whatever. They could get a better return for their investment.

I would just like to hear your comments on that aspect of the automatic lock-in.

**HON. MR. McARTHUR:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, as I understand it, is raising the question of a lock-in provision with respect to the contributions made by teachers under the plan. I should point two things out to the hon. member. First of all, lock-in provisions are a very, very common feature of all pension plans. In fact, I am not aware of pension plans which do not have lock-in features. The discussions which are taking place in the pension field today, with respect to lock-in provisions generally, point toward favoring an even shorter period of service before lock-in takes place, that is, before the money is held there for pension purposes. The reason for that, as I understand it, is that these contributions are a contribution to pension. They are not savings plans; they are pension plans.

Pension plans are set up to provide income security for people when they reach an age at which they will enter into retirement, and when you have plans of that sort it is only logical that one should assume that the funds will be held there until retirement is reached. Some of the analyses that I have seen of pension plans with very long lock-in periods suggest that many, many people who change occupations frequently, or even not so frequently - let's say, three or four times in their lives — can end up without a pension, even though they have contributed to pension plans throughout their lives, simply because the lock-in provisions are of such length that the money is not there for them in pension plans when they retire. The ultimate aim of any pension arrangement should be shorter lock-in periods and greater portability. This is the thrust of many of the proposals that members on this side are making and that other people are making with regard to pension reform.

However, I would say to the hon. member that in addition to that, the teachers' superannuation plan is a negotiable plan. It is, therefore, really not for me to defend or criticize the teachers with regard to what they may wish to negotiate. If the teachers were to bring forward a proposition with respect to the change in the lock-in provisions, that's something that the trustee-government bargaining committee would have to consider. Then we would have to develop a position. I'm not aware at this time of any propositions that have been made during the course of bargaining with respect to changes in the lock-in provisions. I would be very interested to know where the hon. member is coming from with regard to his proposals, because if he is presuming to bargain on behalf of the teachers, I think he is bargaining in the work place at the wrong time.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Well, I'm certainly not bargaining on behalf of teachers. I'm expressing a concern that is out there. Whether it is reaching you or not, I don't know. I know many of the concerns in education seem not to get through the bureaucracy to you. There are a considerable number coming to every member in this caucus all the time, and these are coming from teachers.

Certainly, these are a minority of teacher. These are the ones who are quitting teaching and getting out. These are fellows who are making room for new teachers to come into the program, into the plan, and into the field of teaching. They are the kid of fellows who aren't afraid to get out and try something else in life, to go into business. You are telling them that they haven't enough brains to use their money. "We're going to lock it in because when you are 70 you will be broke." That's what you are trying to tell these people. these people are saying, "Those are my dollars. I'm getting out of teaching. I've spent 10 years at it. That's my money. Let me have that money and let me use it with my intelligence and my initiative to build my business, or to do whatever I would like to do."

I don't like the idea of locking people in sooner and sooner in our society. I think that's what many of you stand for on that side. I know the Minister of Labor would lock everybody in if he had the opportunity. Get them from day one, lock them in, hold them there, and keep them subservient to you. That's the kind of philosophy you have. It's evident every day in this House. Lock them in, suppress them, and hold them. That's your type of thinking. I know that. Maybe the Minister of Education isn't as indoctrinated and ingrained as you are, so we will discuss with him and ignore you, if you don't mind.

So what I'm saying, Mr. Minister of Education, is that this is coming from teachers. There are many teachers who will leave the teaching profession sometime with more than 10 years but before the 20th year — somewhere in that period of time. These fellows are expressing to me that they feel their money is being held and they would like that to be removed so that they could use those dollars they have contributed in the way they would like to use them. Then it would not be locked in. It isn't discriminating against the people who aren't teaching. The people who stay in teaching — fine and dandy, no problem.

I want to see a good fund for teachers. I agree with your bill, and I'm not opposing the most beneficial superannuation plan we can have for teachers. They deserve it. I think if you look in every paper you will find out about teacher burnout, and about the stress on teachers and so on. There's no disputing that. But I just want to draw it to your attention. I do not want to negotiate their package. I think you are aware of that. If you haven't heard of it, then you haven't been listening, because it is out there. I think some of the teachers on the other side, if they are honest, will know that their colleagues are concerned about this also.

**HON. MR. McARTHUR:** — Mr. Chairman, I will only reiterate perhaps, in a summary form, what I have said already. The hon. member is saying two interesting things.

Firstly, his view on pensions is interesting. I think that that has become clear and am not surprised by that. I certainly do not agree with his general view of pensions as he has been putting it forward. I think it is essentially destructive to the notion of pensions.

Let me deal specifically with this question. The hon. member says that my bureaucracy prevents me from hearing. The superannuation provisions with respect to The Teachers' Superannuation Act are negotiable items. The bureaucracy he must be criticizing is the bureaucracy, if you like, of the teachers' federation. It is that system (which I do not think has trouble hearing; I think it hears very well what teachers are saying) which must bring these matters to my attention. I am not saying that I haven't heard teachers say that. I am just not able (not because of bureaucracy) to step in and make those changes. If I were to do that, I would be doing exactly what the hon. member was criticizing the hon. member for Moose Jaw for what he purportedly does (which the hon. member for Moose Jaw does not do, but which the hon. member was claiming) — stepping in and doing something arbitrarily. I do not intend to do that. I will only respond to these concerns if they are handled through the collective bargaining process, which is where they belong. I think the collective bargaining process is a good one. I don't accept the attack which the hon. member is making on the collective bargaining process with respect to the teachers' activity. I think the teachers, when the



time comes to raise this question, will raise it if they feel that it is in their interest to do so. I don't think it would be at all appropriate for me to arbitrarily step in and change legislation which I have agreed, and all members of this side of the House have agreed, will only be changed on the basis of negotiation through the collective bargaining process.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I am interested to hear what you have been telling me, Mr. Minister. A few minutes ago, you said, "Where are you getting these things from?" obviously, you haven't heard of them. You just told me that it has to come through the teachers' federation. I am not against the bargaining or the teachers' federation. I am against the Minister of Education who says, "The only way a concern of a teacher out there is Podunk, Saskatchewan, can get to you is through the teachers' federation." That is what you believe. You say, "I don't bring in change; I listen to the teachers' federation."

I say that you don't listen to anyone. You bring in change on the ward system. You don't listen to the trustees. You stand in this House and say, "I don't interfere; I don't bring in change without it coming through these channels." Baloney! You bring in changes whenever you want. I am very interested to hear that there is no way for a teacher in Saskatchewan to express his concerns to the Minister of Education other than through the teachers' federation. You say that there isn't a bureaucracy which is keeping these grass roots teachers from you. I say that there must be if that is the only avenue, Mr. Minister, by which one can reach you. You just admitted it in this House not two minutes ago.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words on this matter. As one who withdrew his pension contributions a number of years ago (I can recall I was very happy when I was able to do that) and who also had to repay a little while ago. I feel that that 10-year lock-in deal is a good provision. This is because the only people who are now happy are the people at the banks and the credit unions where I had to go to borrow the money to repay.

The member for Indian Head-Wolseley is suggesting that they be allowed up to possibly 20 years. He also mentioned teacher burnout. The hon. member will probably not disagree that teacher burnout usually occurs after 20 years. So where would you set the number — at 20, 29, 30, or just where? A number of members on this side of the House are teachers and certainly have their ears tuned to the teaching profession. There is no doubt that the majority of them want it. Would you want to make exceptions and, if so, when, where and how? It just can't work any other way. I agree that there is a certain degree of validity to your concern, but there's nothing that the hon. minister can do about it.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I am very happy to see the member for Saskatoon centre get up as a shield for the Minister of Education on behalf of the teachers. I don't really think he needs that. He's asking me to say what year — 20, 22, 23? That's not my job; that's his job. If he goes out and talks to those teachers, he'll find out what they want. He's in the position to change legislation; he's going to do it on the ward system, even against the wishes of the people. So don't tell me he can't change it in the teachers' superannuation.

I'll give you a list of the teachers who are concerned, if you want. They'll soon tell you what they feel to be just. It's not up to me; I'm not negotiating for the teachers. I told them I wouldn't do that. I'm not going to say whether it should be 19, 18 or 15. it's not my role to do that. Let those teachers do that. But let those teachers be able to tell that to

the Minister of Education.

**HON. MR. McARTHUR:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is on record (he just said it) as supporting this government's introducing changes to The Teachers' Superannuation Act and those provisions which are negotiable, without those having been bargained. I want to just say to him that I think that is wrong and he should regret saying that. I believe that he should not be supporting that kind of position, because he simply says that the undertakings we have, with respect to bargaining collectively on the provisions of The Superannuation Act and the plan, should not be honoured. I say to him that they must be honoured. We have an agreement with the teachers to that effect and I think it would destroy collective bargaining if we were to do otherwise.

So I say to the hon. member that he is wrong on that point, regardless of the merits of his argument that it should be changed.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — That's not correct, Mr. Minister of Education. I'm not going to let you get away with that at all. The bargaining at the provincial level is tri-party bargaining. You know that as well as I do and as does everyone else in this Chamber. So don't say that you cannot bring things to that bargaining table, the same as anyone else.

Therefore, there are teachers who feel this way. Obviously you didn't know about this. You didn't know where they came from. I'm telling you that today. So don't say that you can't bring items and concerns to that bargaining table and that you can't make changes respecting many things in education in this province.

Section 1 agreed.

Sections 2 to 4 inclusive agreed.

Section 5 as amended agreed.

Section 6 as amended agreed.

Sections 7 to 11 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

### **Bill No. 81 — An Act to amend The University of Regina Act**

#### **Section 1**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Yesterday I asked a couple of questions regarding this bill, I don't imagine it would be fair to assume that you have had time to look at those. I'll ask them again. I have a couple of questions on these university bills. I see they're both the same so we'll deal with one, get the answers there, and they will both go.

Under your explanatory notes, number one, it says:

The board shall make an annual report of their transactions to the commission, and through the commission to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in which shall be set forth in detail the receipts and expenditures for the year ending on the preceding 30th day of June and such other

particulars as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the commission may require.

I notice, if I am correct, that in the new provision that statement “other particulars as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the commission may require” is not in there. I wonder why that was dropped out, and what those other things might be that you would require?

**HON. MR. McARTHUR:** — Is the hon. member referring to the repeal of section 68 and the replacement of it with the new section 68?

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I’m looking at the explanatory notes on Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The University of Regina Act — No. 4. Existing provisions, section 68 now reads — I’m looking at that first paragraph.

Then I look over to the next provision. This last line “other particulars as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the commission may require.” Is that included in the revised bill?

**HON. MR. McARTHUR:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is. If you look at the new section 68, which is section 4 of the amending bill, it is simply a rewording of those sections. You will note that under section 4 of the amending bill, becoming section 68(1)(b), it says:

containing any other particulars that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the commission may require.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — That’s fine. Thank you for answering that. My other question is: would this coincide with The Tabling of Documents Act?

**HON. MR. McARTHUR:** — Yes, indeed. In fact it makes it consistent with that Act.

Section 1 agreed.

Sections 2 to 4 inclusive agreed.

Section 5 as amended agreed.

Section 6 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

**Bill No. 73 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act**

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed.

Section 4 as amended agreed.

Sections 5 to 8 inclusive agreed.

Section 9 as amended agreed.

Section 10 agreed.

## Section 11

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, I haven't studied this bill. It wasn't mine to study. I want to ask you some questions on section 11. does it mean that no one now will be able to take out their funds if they resign from the service?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — They will not if they are eligible for an immediate pension.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If a person has been in the employ of the service for 15 years, is aged 45 and wants to leave for another job, will he be able to take it out?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Yes, he will under those conditions.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Could you explain the conditions which you are putting in? I'm not sure I follow it. Who does it apply to?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — It applies to persons of age 60 with 20 years of service, and to those with 35 years of service or more.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, I don't see that, Mr. Minister. Could you explain this to me? It reads as follows:

To prohibit the payment of a refund to an employee who is eligible to receive an immediate non-reduced superannuation allowance on termination of employment. Under existing legislation an employee can request a refund on termination of employment at any time prior to age 65, regardless of pension entitlement.

That's under existing legislation. Are you removing that from this explanation?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — We do not permit a refund to someone who is entitled to an immediate pension.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, a person who is 40 years of age is entitled to an immediate pension, is that what you're saying?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — No, a person of that age is not entitled to an immediate pension.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — That's what I asked you a while ago, and you said . . . (inaudible) . . . That's what I'm asking to you — a person who has been in the service for 15 years, is 40 years of age, wants to leave the service to start a business, or something, will he be able to take out his refund?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — He will be able to take out his pension money, but he will not be permitted to take out his pension money if he is 60 years of age, or over, and has 20 or more years of service.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, where in that act does it say that? You are saying that, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in a superannuation act or any other act, no employee who is entitled to an immediate superannuation allowance payable without diminution is entitled to a refund of contributions. Where does it spell out the age of 60 with 20 years of service? Where does it spell that out?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Section 8, subject to subsection (2) states:

An employee who has attained the age of 60 years and has served at least 20 years continuously may be retired at his option and shall, on retirement, be entitled to a superannuation allowance. No employee shall be retired under this section who has not been an employee for at least five years continuously, exclusive of teaching service, reckoned as service under sections 20, 21 or 22.

Anyone can take their money out if they have 15 years of service and are 45 years of age. But if he is 60 years of age, or more, has 20 years of service, or more, and is entitled to an immediate pension, he cannot take his money out in a lump sum refund.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, I will have to take your word for it. I'm glad you have it on record, because I don't interpret that from the clause that you have here or the explanatory note. However, since you have it on record, I guess I will accept that.

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could read this note to the member. I think this covers it.

This section refers to an employee's entitlement to a refund of contributions and the requirement to apply for a refund before it will be paid. This amendment will prohibit the payment of a refund to an employee who terminates employment and is eligible to receive an immediate non-reduced pension.

This is a very minimal lock-in measure, and will apply to employees with 35 years service and to employees aged 60, or over, with 20 or more years of service. It does not apply to deferred pensions, or to employees aged 55 but under 60 with 30 but less than 35 years of service, or to employees aged 60 with more than 15 but less than 20 years of service, since their allowance would be subject to a reduction.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I just have one question. How many civil servants will that affect at this point?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — 105 in 1980. we don't know how many there would be in 1981. it could be in that range.

Section 12 agreed.

Section 13 agreed.

#### **Section 14**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, the amount you're increasing it by, is that based on indexing or based according to the CPI (consumer price index)?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — It's a flat rate service applied to the individual on the basis of his or her years of service. This year, it's proposed to be \$16.50 for each year of service not to exceed 35. If the individual has 35 years of service, it amounts to \$577.50 or \$48.12 per month. Our reason for doing that is to protect the people at the bottom of the scale against the inflationary trend. They obviously need it more than people at the upper end of the scale. I'll give you one or two examples to illustrate this.

We have people who have pensions of \$500 a month. If they have 35 years of service, that increase applied to them will give them a 9.62 per cent increase. If they were at \$400 per month, that increase gives them a 12.03 per cent increase. If they're at \$300 a month, it gives them a 16.04 per cent increase. It's weighted, of course, to protect the people at the bottom or to help them more because they need the help. It's obvious that we have some people pensioned at \$2,000 a month. They get the flat rate increase, too. The percentage of that increase is not great.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I suppose I should have asked the question another way. The total amount you're going to be paying out (I'm talking about the supplementary amount — the increase), what will it amount to as a percentage?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — \$950,000 is the amount. You mean percentage of total payments? It's roughly \$1 million on the basis of \$17 million. If you take into account the fact that these increase have been going into effect each year. It's over \$5 million in that total amount which is added to supplemental payments to assist against inflation.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Your total amount for this year then represents under 6 per cent?

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — It's \$950,000 based on a pay-out of roughly \$17 million. It's about 6.3 per cent, that's right. But remember that it's incorporated each year so that if you take the total \$17 million payment that includes about \$5.25 million in supplemental payments which were not provided in terms of the pension, but have been added on an annual basis.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Inflation has been around for quite some time. Your \$5 million is not impressive, as far as I'm concerned, as a percentage keeping up with CPI or with inflation.

I'm suggesting to you, first of all, that your 6.3 per cent is incorrect. Six per cent of \$17 million would be \$1.2 million (or \$1.02 million I think it is), and you are talking some \$950,000. therefore, you are under 6 per cent — probably about 5.6 per cent or 5.7 per cent is your total increase. Inflation went up 12.2 per cent last year. You are only paying out half of the rate of inflation. I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Minister, that you are not looking after the people at the bottom end of the scale. You are talking 12 per cent or 16 per cent even. The amounts are getting well below (as you well know) the poverty line to begin with, so your total increase — as a percentage of your total package or the total outlay of pension funds of \$17 million which you talked about — is less than 6 per cent. I say that these people are falling behind, and you are falling behind in not keeping up with the cost of inflation.

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Mr. Chairman, what the member doesn't seem to understand is the way we weight it. The people at the bottom of the scale, from \$500 per month and under, are receiving a great deal more than the inflationary rate, and have been each succeeding year. That's why it is paid in that way. For example, we have a person this year who retired on a pension — sure, it is small — of under \$3,000. he will get, on the basis of 35 years, a 24.06 per cent increase in the current year. Admittedly the pension is small. That's why it is weighted that way. In total, it's 6.3 per cent. The people on the bottom of the scale are getting up to 24 per cent; those at the tope of the scale are getting down to 2 and 3 per cent. It's 6.3 per cent computed on the actual sum.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, \$17 million at 6 per cent would be \$1.2 million and you are talking some \$950,000. The minister doesn't understand that if he kept pace with inflation, his increase to the superannuates would be not \$954,000, it would be more like \$2 million. You look at the bottom of the scale and you tried to bring them up to a decent level — 24 per cent (I believe that's the figure you used) of nothing is still nothing. But if you put out the \$2 million, which would be keeping up with inflation, they might catch up some day. But not the way you are handling it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order. I wonder if the member for Regina South and the minister would like to turn the lights off when they leave because it's 5 o'clock, and the rest of us are leaving. Do you want to finish this bill now, or shall we leave it over? It's 5 o'clock.

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — Item number two. Here's an individual who was pensioned, admittedly a long time ago and on a very low pension, whose increases on a percentage basis since they stated nine years ago total 169 per cent. Divide that by the nine and you will find that individual has had increases way above the inflation rate throughout that period of time.

Section 14 agreed.

Sections 15 to 17 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.