

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**May 1, 1981**

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**NOTICE OF MOTION**

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move first reading of a bill, An Act to Establish an Environmental Magna Charta for Saskatchewan.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. HAM:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure and honor, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you, and members of the legislature, 29 special guests located in the east gallery. They are 25 students from Begg School in Swift Current in grade 4, accompanied by one parent, Judy Jeturakis, Anna Rayner, another parent; and their teachers, Greg Smith and Don Shinskie. I'll be meeting with them after question period for pictures and drinks. Will all members please welcome them to the Assembly today.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SOLOMON:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a large measure of pleasure that I introduce to you and to my colleagues in the Assembly this morning, 31 grade 7 and 8 students in the west gallery from St. Timothy School in the constituency of Regina North-West. They are accompanied by their chaperone, Mrs. Vicky Bonnell. I would hope that you enjoy the proceedings this morning. I will be meeting with you after question period to answer any questions that you may have regarding the legislature and the government. I hope that you enjoy your visit to the legislature, and I ask all members to join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and to the members of the House, a fine group of people from the Preeceville community. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. In the group we have 25 young men and women of the grade 8 class in Preeceville School. They are accompanied by their two teachers, Mr. John Mills and Mr. Ernie Gulka, as well as chaperones, Mrs. Alvina Morgan and Mrs. Carol Preston, who are two of the parents, and the bus driver, Mr. Curtis Strand. This trip to the capital city and to the legislature has been sponsored by the students themselves. They arrived here in the city yesterday afternoon, and visited the various highlights in the city. They went to the RCMP barracks, the Centre of the Arts, and the Saskatchewan Hall of Fame. They have also contributed to the economy of the city by doing a bit of shopping. I do hope that the group will have an enjoyable and interesting morning here in the legislature during the question period, and I expect to meet with them following their stay here.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**INTRODUCTION OF GUEST**

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, Mr. John Bannon, seated in the Speaker's gallery, the Leader of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia, and the Leader of the Opposition there. Mr. Bannon is visiting Saskatchewan. I am going to meet with him this afternoon, which I look forward to. He served in the previous government. He was first elected in 1977 to the House of Assembly there, was minister of community development, and later had additional portfolios, in local government, of recreation and sport. I hope all members will join with me in giving him a warm Saskatchewan welcome to our legislature.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to join with the Minister of Mineral Resources in welcoming our friend from Australia to our Assembly today. Our best wishes for an enjoyable visit to Saskatchewan. I am sure you will find it most interesting.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**HON. MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me this morning to introduce to you, and to members of the House, a group of students from my constituency from Tantallon and Spy Hill. They are 32 in number, I understand, and they are grades 4, 5, and 6. Their teachers are Les Patzwald and Betty Regel. They are also accompanied by parents Mabel Godwin and Linda Perrin, and their bus driver, Rodney Irwine. These people come from the very southern extreme of my constituency along the beautiful Qu'Appelle Valley. Many of you, I am sure, will take the opportunity to visit that area sometime. I understand that they will be doing a tour of the building. I will be meeting them at 11 o'clock to answer some questions and have drinks and pictures with them. I certainly hope that all of you will join with me in welcoming this group of students to the legislature.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **QUESTIONS**

#### **Problems of Kamsack**

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. My question concerns the problems at Kamsack. Mr. Minister, do you not agree that the following statement to you by Mayor Mydonick of Kamsack is reason enough for an investigation?

Eagle Developments Ltd., owner of the parcel described as lots 3, 4, and 5, block 25, and lots 1 and 2 (plan such and such) was not assessed in 1979. The town lost tax revenue from that highway commercial property of at least \$5,000 in 1979. Two councillors were, at that time, shareholders of Eagle Developments Ltd. The parcel was registered on January 5, 1979. Mr. Smishek knew of the irregularities in the assessments before December 1, 1979, and did not correct them.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, that allegation made by the major is not a new one. My officials have examined it. We communicated with the former mayor and with

the town council. We did acknowledge that there were some mistakes made by council but we do not acknowledge that there is, at this stage, reason to be establishing a judicial inquiry. I did write to Mayor Mydonick just the other day. I asked him if he could provide some further information and evidence which would give us a basis to establish a judicial inquiry, as he suggests.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Supplementary. Do you not agree that this next statement is enough reason for an investigation?

On January 22, 1979, council voted to offer 10 acres of this land for \$1. Then on May 3, 1979, council voted to offer additional land for the sum of \$2,000. On January 22, 1979, there was no disclosure of the fact that the same two councillors were business partners and principals of Kamsack Manufacturing.

I did start out with "do you not agree with this statement?" He also adds:

I am prepared to sit down with the officials of your office to go through all of the documentation that has been brought to my attention.

How much more do you want, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I can inform the hon. member that on that particular allegation, the officials of the department did meet with some council representatives and the former mayor. The evidence will also show that in the case of that particular piece of property, what was paid was \$2,001 and not \$1 per acre. In addition to that, there was payment of \$357.50 for registration, \$1,075 for the subdivision cost, and \$3,973.60 for servicing costs.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — New question to the minister. Is it true that you have indicated to the press and this House that these items are not important enough for you to have a full investigation or judicial inquiry into wrongdoings at Kamsack? Did you indicate this to the press and this legislature?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to this House and to the press that I have asked for information from the mayor to give us further evidence why there should be cause to establish an inquiry. I am still waiting to hear from the mayor.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Supplementary to that question. Would you not agree that the letter which I have in my hand, dated April 8, from the Mayor of Kamsack, written to the Premier of this province with a copy sent to you (the letter which you stated had no specifics in it at all), which outlines serious discrepancies with respect to the adherence of the laws of this province, is not enough for you (or the Premier who is a learned lawyer) to carry out public investigations to resolve the problems which you have already admitted do exist?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that the officials of the department did meet with the former mayor, Mayor Nadane, the administrator and certain council members more than a year ago. We did communicate with the former mayor and pointed out that some errors have been made. I also met with the councillors regarding the charges which were made earlier. We believe that the officials of the department handled the situation quite well and we also believe that it is better that the mistakes which have been made (in my judgment some of them which were made

inadvertently by council and the administrator) should be corrected and that they should be given the opportunity to correct them rather than the department setting up inquiries, more particularly judicial inquiries.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could you tell this House, Mr. Minister, what more detailed information or evidence you need in order to have your guarantee for a judicial inquiry into Kamsack? I must assume the only convincing evidence would be a public request from the ratepayers of the town of Kamsack. What more do you want? If you ask for more evidence, you'll get it.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has some evidence that we do not have, we would be happy to examine it, should he provide it for us. But at this stage, based on the information we have, we do not feel that there is a basis to establish an inquiry. We are not trying to cover anything up; we are not trying to hide anything. It seems within our local communities there are always differences.

Remember we have 495 local governments and differences do arise between the citizens and council members and between council members themselves. I am sure that in the 495 local governments, at the present time, there are some differences. The hon. member raised a difference of opinion which exists in one of the communities he represents. Does that give cause to establish inquiries and, more particularly, judicial inquiries? We believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is better for local governments to work out their own problems?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — We have faith and trust in local governments and in the election of local governments that they can make their own decisions and govern themselves.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, in response to the questioning in the House the other day, the minister indicated that an investigation had been conducted into the affairs of the council of Kamsack. Then he withdrew that and called it an inquiry; he drew that back and called it a few questions. The reason he drew it back, I think, is because under the act (section 15), it requires that any investigation must have a report filed with the mayor of the council which is being investigated. Will you now tell us where that report is? When was the investigation done? Who did it?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I think I made it very clear in this House that officials of the department reviewed the situation. Call it an internal inquiry; call it whatever you want. It's on the record; I believe if you examine the transcript, the director of management services plus one of the municipal advisors met in January of 1980, with the former mayor and some councillors and the administrators, and reviewed the minutes and the records. I also met with the council members at their request. All council members were present except the mayor. We reviewed the allegations made by a citizen. Following that, I wrote to the mayor in detail, pointing out some of the findings and that we believed the council should make corrections in its procedures and in some of the actions it had taken.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — These are your words, Mr. Minister.

Two officials of Saskatchewan urban affairs investigated the allegations made by W. T. Sasyniuk in his letter of September 10, 1979.

If you investigated the allegations, you must have filed a report with the mayor. Where is the report? Will you now provide it for this House?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the mayor a letter dated February 27, 1980.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Okay, Mr. Speaker. In your very neat chronology of events here, I am sure you were setting these out with some degree of precision. On February 27, 1980 you wrote a letter to W.T. Sasyniuk. We have a copy of that letter that we can provide you with, if you like.

On February 26 you wrote a letter to Mrs. Ann Cherwenuk. In your neat little chronology here, which I assume you pulled together with some degree of precision, there is not one mention of a letter anywhere around that date to the Mayor of Kamsack. If you in fact mailed a letter to the Mayor of Kamsack relating to this so-called investigation, will you provide it in this House, and when?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I will give it consideration.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Well, if that letter is the only report you have as it relates to your obligation under section 15 of the act, you are obliged to provide it to the mayor. In your neat little chronology, there is no mention of it. Will you now provide it and get out from under this coverup, this cloud you keep hanging over Kamsack?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the hon. members opposite are trying to do. Obviously, they are trying to smear the good name of the town of Kamsack and of some individuals. I have not resorted to naming people. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, during the course of the estimates which will be coming up, hopefully this morning, we can have a more thorough discussion. We have nothing to hide; we'll give the members opposite in this House all the information we have.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — In a letter to the Premier, with a copy by registered mail to you, the Mayor of Kamsack asked for a judicial inquiry. He said he is prepared to set out all the documentation he has with you; he is not prepared to do the government's homework for it. When will you meet with the Mayor of Kamsack, take a look at this documentation and get on with the judicial inquiry?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What allegation do you make?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll be prepared to meet with the Mayor of Kamsack.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I don't want to waste the question period trying to regain order in the House; however I am prepared to use up the time trying to get order.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to meet with the mayor at any time, as soon as we're able to arrange a mutually satisfactory date. I might inform the hon. member that the current Mayor of Kamsack has never asked me for a meeting . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, as soon as we are able to work out a mutually satisfactory date, I'll be glad to meet with Mayor Mydonick.

### **Legality of Zenith Space Phone Attachments**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — A question to the minister responsible for Sask Tel. Mr. Minister, as you are aware, the primary purpose of television sets is for viewing television.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Under your regulations you indicate that no sale of any equipment, whose primary purpose is for hooking to Sask Tel lines, will be allowed to be sold in Saskatchewan. Zenith television sets' primary purpose is (as you fellows all just agreed) for viewing TV. Why will you not allow the sale of Zenith space phone television in Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. CODY:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct in one respect; we do have television to view; there's no question about that. But with regard to the Zenith space phone, it has zero to do with viewing an entertainment program — absolutely nothing to do with it at all. It has to do with telephone servicing and anything that has to do with the telephone belongs to the Crown corporation known as Sask Tel. You have the regulations in your hand, so you know them well. We disallow anybody to own a piece of equipment which he can use as a telephone in this province.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Minister. Every other province in Canada allows the sale of these sets and the hookups of these sets except in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba where they require an acoustic coupler, but otherwise you can hook them up and sell them in any other province in Canada. Your regulations say it must be the primary purpose of the equipment. The prime purpose of the Zenith space phone television set is a TV; it's just an added feature. As you are aware, the market is changing and we are going to have the majority of sets with this feature in the next few years, and you're barring them from Saskatchewan people.

**HON. MR. CODY:** — I disagree with the hon. member because his facts are not correct. The fact of the matter is that there are all kinds of Zenith TV sets in this province. They're all legal; they're working and I'm sure they're working well. But in so far as the space phone attachment is concerned, that is not allowed in the province of Saskatchewan because it is not for entertainment viewing; it is for telephone purposes, and in Saskatchewan the regulations tell you that the telephone must be owned by Sask Tel. This is the case now and I hope it will be the case in the future.

**MR. THATCHER:** — A supplementary question to the minister. Let's be very clear about this. Is the minister telling the people of Saskatchewan that they are going to be deprived of a technological improvement which will be taken for granted by every other household on the North American continent, strictly because they are burdened by the big brother attitude of Sask Tel?

**HON. MR. CODY:** — Well, certainly not, Mr. Speaker. Let's fact the fact that Sask Tel and the telephone system in Canada is the fastest moving technological operation in the world and we are part of it here in Saskatchewan. Sask Tel is a part of it, and in fact, is one of the leaders in Canada when it comes to new technology.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. CODY:** — And, Mr. Speaker, we're going to continue with new technology, just as we have in fibre optics and as we have in every other kind of thing. We have no intentions of stopping new technology — none whatsoever. But, when it comes to

using the telephone, the telephones will be owned and leased to the public of Saskatchewan by Sask Tel.

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

**MR. HAM:** — Another question to the Minister of Telephones. With reference to new technology, Mr. Minister, in response to a question yesterday with regard to Sask Tel's removal of enclosed telephone booths, you indicated that you were not aware of this policy. As Minister of Telephones, have you made yourself aware of this policy, and why have you done this?

**HON. MR. CODY:** — Yes, as a matter of fact, I spoke to the president of Sask Tel this morning and the policy has not changed.

**MR. HAM:** — Yesterday, Mr. Minister, you indicated that if I could inform you of a few instances of this having taken place, you would investigate. Only two enclosed telephone booths are left in my riding, out of some 15 or 20. I am under the impression that this is not taking place only in Swift Current but throughout Saskatchewan. First of all, since you have spoken with the general manager of Sask Tel, can you justify the reason for this?

**HON. MR. CODY:** — I did speak to the president this morning and I told him of the question which I had from the member for Swift Current. He indicated to me that this is not a new policy. However, in certain circumstances, as there have been over many years, phone booths become redundant. There is very little business and as a result, when the phone booth is in disrepair, we then discontinue with the phone booth itself, and we have a single-pole telephone. That is the only kind of a policy we have; it has been that way for years and it hasn't changed, and it's not going to change.

**MR. HAM:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister obviously is aware that this so-called policy, which he wasn't aware of yesterday, has been carried on by Sask Tel for the last two or three years throughout this province. You used the word redundant. Can you tell me, Mr. Minister, have you ever had the opportunity to use a telephone that is not enclosed during a snowstorm? If you haven't, would you please do so next time it rains and report back to this House as to why you feel it's a better system?

**HON. MR. CODY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I obviously have an opportunity to use a telephone during a snowstorm, but I'm usually using the one in my house.

### **Increase in Gas Prices and Interest Rates**

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Premier. Mr. Attorney General, I am sure you are aware that yesterday the Bank of Canada prime interest rate reached its highest level in recent history. I am sure the Attorney General is aware that there was also a gasoline hike yesterday. I am sure he is also cognizant of the fact that the jump in the price of gasoline for the residents of Saskatchewan was the highest in Canada.

I am also sure the Attorney General is aware that the primary reason for that is the sliding provincial tax which this government has imposed on every litre of gasoline. In light of the record levels of both gasoline and interest rates, and that they are the two biggest contributors to inflation, my question is this; is your government, in light of the fact you can do nothing with interest rates, considering any sort of rollback on this

sliding gasoline tax which you have imposed on the residents, in light of the fact that gasoline now is far more expensive in Regina or Saskatoon than it is in Toronto or Ottawa?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer shortly put is no. We do not have any plans to change the present method of taxation. This method of taxation, with regard to gasoline sales, is adopted, I believe, in six or seven of the provinces of Canada in addition to the province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, for a good many years your government has been telling the people of Saskatchewan the wondrous benefits that they are receiving from their natural resources and their geographical position. Would the Attorney General tell the people of Saskatchewan when they can expect to receive some benefit from their proximity to the refining and processing centres of gasoline, and when they are going to stop being ripped off by their own government when they are paying higher prices than they are in eastern Canada?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I do not accept the member's statement of fact, or at least the assumption upon which the question is predicated, about Saskatchewan people paying the highest gasoline prices in the country. But I do not want to debate that for the time being. The question really is: what benefits come from Saskatchewan resource policy? I want to tell the hon. member I could spend some considerable time, which question period would not permit me to do, in reciting, for example (just give you one example) that in the province of Saskatchewan there is no medical care or hospitalization premium. The Leader of the Opposition laughs at that and I want to tell the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, that they pay a medicare premium of \$180 a year in resource rich Alberta. You people say that does not come from our resource taxation policy. Where does it come from? You have to pay for this expense somehow. It comes from the resource revenue, and that's the difference between the Tories and the NDP. They would tax the sick rather than taxing those gasoline buyers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Final supplementary to the Attorney General. The Attorney General certainly does telegraph when he has been harpooned. My question to the Attorney General is simply this: in light of your answers, are you in effect telling the people of Saskatchewan that your government is going to sit completely immobile while our citizens continue to be ravaged by the two largest economic destroying forces, namely inflation and energy costs, and we to take the Attorney General's worthless rhetoric as some sort of tonic?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I will treat the hon. member's statement as a question. You can call it rhetoric or whatever you want, but I invite the hon. member for Thunder Creek to compare, for example, Alberta's level of taxation throughout the piece on income tax, on medicare, on hospitalization, on cars, on gasoline taxation, on insurance (much maligned SGI, by the Conservatives opposite). I invite them to take a look at it. It will say to the hon. member opposite that the people of Saskatchewan are as well insulated, as much as a provincial government can do, from the effects of inflation as any provincial group in Canada.



**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — I do want to say to the hon. member opposite that he may want to get additional tax dollars, as he has suggested in previous sessions in this House, from hospital beds or medicare costs (as the member for Thunder Creek himself has suggested in 1978 and repeated in the House in 1979); that is not the policy of this government. The policy of this government is the other way around.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I hope the members of the Assembly will take into consideration that example of debatable questions and debatable answers and take the opportunity to review that in the record and compare it with the rules that govern the question period. They will see that not only was the question out of order, but the answer is out of order, as well.

They are both highly debatable and were put in debatable fashion. That is not permitted in the question period.

## **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

### **Government Measures to Alleviate Drought Conditions in Saskatchewan**

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the Assembly on the extent of the current drought situation in Saskatchewan, and on some of the measures that this government will implement for 1981 in response to the situation.

On Tuesday, April 28, the minister's drought committee met to evaluate the present situation facing Saskatchewan farmers. The minister's committee consists of representatives of SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Western Cow-Calf Association, National Farmer's Union, and Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association.

The committee indicated the following conditions

1. The pasture situation is generally poor. Many pastures were overgrazed last fall, and grass is coming along very slowly. Pastures in the South are very bad, probably the worst since the '30s, and probably the worst on record.
2. Surface water is generally poor to very poor in the southern half of the agricultural region. Well drilling activity has increased substantially.
3. Soil erosion has been moderate to severe in the southern half of the agricultural region. The northern area has not suffered significant erosion to this date.
4. There is some carry-over of feed supplies due to the mild winter. However, this carry-over will be inadequate to accommodate an extended dry-lot feeding in the absence of summer grazing.

The local rural municipal drought chairmen has also provided very useful information on local conditions throughout the province. Their reports confirm the conditions of soil moisture, pastures and water supplies as being generally more serious in the southern portion of the province than in the northern agricultural area.

In view of these conditions, the drought committee recommended that a 1981 drought assistance program be implemented to consist of the following major programs: feed transportation assistance, emergency fencing assistance, cattle transportation. It recommended that a number of programs approved previously be confirmed as part of the 1981 drought program: the individual deep-well program, the ground water search program, the water pumping program, and the commodity listing service. It recommended that the province reinstate the sale of pelletized screenings through existing market facilities, and provide feed transportation assistance on these sales; that the province encourage the use of its commodity listing service, and include green feed listing in its service; that the province publish information on livestock rations for dry-lot cattle.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce, in keeping with the recommendations of the committee, that the province will:

1. Extend the feed transportation assistance program from May 31, 1981 to March 31, 1982. In 1980, the program provided \$25 per ton transportation assistance for fodder movements over 50 miles. This mileage deductible will be reduced to 35 miles for 1981. Also, assistance on feed grain movement will be increased from \$4 per ton in 1980 to \$10 per ton in 1981. The 1981 maximum for the producer will be set at \$3,500 for beef and \$7,000 for dairy, the same as for 1980.
2. A cattle transportation assistance program will be implemented to cover the period from April 1, 1981, to November 1, 1981. Assistance will be double compared to the 1980 level. The program will provide 5 cents per mile for cow-calf pairs to a maximum of \$10 and 4 cents per mile to a maximum of \$8 for individual adult cattle. Maximums per farmer will be doubled to \$1,000 for a one-way trip for 1981.
3. The emergency fencing program will be extended past the current May 31 deadline to November 30, 1981. 1981 assistance will be 50 per cent of material purchased to fence new pasture, to a maximum of \$300 grant per producer, the same as in 1980.
4. A number of programs previously approved for 1981-82 will be offered as an integral part of the 1981 program. These include the individual deep-well program, the ground-water research program and the commodity listing service.
5. Sale of pelletized screenings will be reinstated through existing marketing facilities. These pelletized screenings will qualify for transportation assistance.
6. The Department of Agriculture will also provide information on suitable dry-lot rations for cattle and will expand its commodity listing service to include green feed as it becomes available.

Mr. Speaker, in announcing these 1981 programs, we recognize that we cannot remove the hard reality of drought for many of our farmers. However, I am confident that these programs will help to alleviate the hardships and will provide much-needed assistance to producers.

Mr. Speaker, when I announced the interim drought relief program in late March of this year, I indicated that this province would request federal sharing for a long-term drought relief program. Since that time, the federal government has indicated its concern with the drought situation and has agreed with the need for a co-ordinated

effort to deal with the program. However, there has been no agreement on cost sharing to this point.

A number of the programs I announced today are ones which the federal government has cost shared in previous drought situations. We will continue to explore cost sharing for the 1981 program and I hope sincerely (as I am sure all members here hope) that the federal government will agree to join us in dealing with this issue.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, in responding to the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, I must preface my remarks and be fairly blunt in saying that it is totally inadequate; it is construed and put together by a group of bureaucrats and I wonder if they ever left the office in Regina. I would suggest to the minister that perhaps it's time to get some of these bureaucrats who are more interested in promoting ideological concepts out of the Department of Agriculture.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. It's a well-known rule of this Assembly, in practice, that ministerial statements must be brief, factual and specific. I listened with care to the Minister of Agriculture's statement. It was relatively brief, considering the gravity of the situation. It appeared to me to be factual, without expression of opinion (personal or otherwise) other than the policy of the government, and it seemed to be specific. I must take this opportunity to remind the member for Thunder Creek that responses must be brief, strictly relevant comment. A debate cannot take place, nor shall the tone of a member's presentation be such that it indicates debate.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was being precisely factual. I'll try to remove all voice inflections, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try to comply.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! This is not an opportunity to debate a statement I have just made in the House with regard to the member's statement. This is an opportunity for the member to respond to the Minister of Agriculture; it has nothing to do with me.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Back to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, on point one (and I am going to respond to your statement in accordance with your recommendations): in your statement you tell us that assistance to fodder movements over 50 miles will now be reduced to 35. It was 50 last year. Mr. Minister, where have the officials of the Department of Agriculture been to think that the costs have somehow gone down? I can only term point one as ridiculous, ludicrous, and a variety of other adjectives.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I implore the member for Thunder Creek to think carefully of what he said. His statement, "ridiculous, ludicrous," and other words of that nature, imply debate. He is debating what the minister has said. If he speaks in a manner which indicates that he doesn't agree with the government's policy on this matter, that is fine. But, in effect, he wants to start a debate . . . Order, order! The practice is very clear: a debate cannot take place. I think if the member goes back and looks at the debate which has taken place up to this point, he will see that that is what has happened. A member cannot launch a debate at this time. If he wants to, there is ample opportunity to bring forward a resolution to deal with the drought program of the Government of Saskatchewan. Now is not the time to launch into a debate on the issue.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Are you telling me that he cannot condemn what is being said, and must praise it or else say nothing? Is that what you are

saying?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think that point of order is not well-taken. I have never, never, (nor has any other Speaker) said that a member of the opposition must agree with a ministerial statement on the other side of the House. The rules are quite clear: the response must be a brief, strictly relevant comment, and a debate cannot take place. Now, it is up to the member to frame it that way. It is not up to me to do that. I am just going to tell the member when I believe he is not framing it in that fashion. I will also tell the minister when I believe he is not framing his ministerial statement in that fashion.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, I indicated our total disapproval on this side of the House of point one — the reduction of 50 to 35. If anything, it should be doubled, instead of reducing it to 35 miles. It should be put up to 100 miles at the bare minimum.

Moving to point two, where the cattle transportation assistance program will be implemented. My question to the minister is very simple: when there is a drought, a province-wide drought, where do you move them to? Consequently, your second point is of very little economic relevance to the producers in this province.

Point number three, your emergency fencing program. On this side of the House, we have said the \$300 on your emergency fencing program is nothing. You might just as well remove it; it's not even worth the bureaucracy involved to process it. You are talking maybe 75 posts and a strand of wire. Isn't that wonderful! I have scorned it before; I scorn it again.

Moving to point four, I suggest, Mr. Minister, that the government has failed to provide assistance to dugouts, a tangible area, and I don't see that included. I don't see assistance for bringing draglines in from outside the province, if necessary, to have them available. They are not available now. We suggest to you that point number four is inadequate. You have not delved to find out the real situation. Again, I suggest that your bureaucrats didn't leave their offices in Regina.

Point number five, Mr. Minister. Again, we have expressed our comments on the question of bringing screenings from the terminal points back to Saskatchewan. In other debates, it has been termed as a ludicrous, silly policy — it has allowed some of the most valuable livestock feed to leave our province; it has allowed the farmers to be deducted at the source, and pay the freight to Fort William or Vancouver. Now, you are going to subsidize these same screenings to come back to Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, the Speaker will not allow me to term that policy what I would like to. Last year, the point was brought to you that you are allowing a year's supply to the livestock industry to leave. Now you are going to pay the freight to bring it back.

As it happened last year, Mr. Minister, as was the experience. Regarding those subsidized pellets which were brought back, similar pellets were offered by competitors to your source for much less money. The program did not work. Specifically, UGG (United Grain Growers) last year was offering screening pellets for far less money than your subsidized pellets were being offered by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

Point number six says the Department of Agriculture will provide information on suitable dry-lot rations. Mr. Minister, about a month ago in this Assembly I asked you if your department would look at a very tangible source of relief — not a solution but something which could be of use — and that was the use of liquid feed supplements. At that time, you scoffed at the suggestion. You indicated that the government had no

plans to look at it. I again say to you, Mr. Minister, that if there are people in the Department of Agriculture who say that liquid feed supplements (a very positive suggestion put forward by the opposition) are not a useful, worth-while tool in the livestock industry in a time of drought, then I say you had better get people who know something about the livestock industry.

Mr. Minister, in concluding my remarks, I say that this paper is useless and was poorly thought out. It's a bureaucrat's dream, I suppose, but is of no value to a practical producer.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

### **Bill No. 94 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code (No. 3)**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — I move first reading of a bill to amend The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code (No. 3).

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

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **Inaugural Flight of Frontier Air Lines**

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, as transportation critic for the opposition, announce to all members the inaugural flight of Frontier Air Lines tomorrow. I'd also like to advise members of the Assembly that the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources will be joining me on that trip to Denver. We would like to take this opportunity, and I'm sure all members would like to join with us, to wish Frontier Air Lines all the success in the years to come in its provision of an expanded air service to the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, and to all the province, making it the third major air line to serve our province. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to join with me in congratulations.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **THIRD READINGS**

### **Bill No. 80 — An Act respecting The Medical Profession**

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

## **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW**

### **INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE**

## Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 19

### Item 1 (continued)

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister for all the reports he has found, which we have been anxiously awaiting for several days, and which he has promised to table this morning.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Chairman, during the course of the review of my department's estimates, the hon. members opposite have made a variety of allegations with respect to my department's activities in the town of Kamsack. I have repeatedly indicated that the only reason I was unable to answer some of the questions was that we did not have the information at hand, and that given a few days to review our files, we would be willing and able to provide these answers, if possible. We have now had the opportunity, and I am able to provide an outline of the department's activities in Kamsack over the past six years to 1975. The members opposite have made reference . . .

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. What is your point of order?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that I asked for the reports and not an explanation.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Order, order. It won't expedite matters.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If they will allow me to finish, I am anxious to hear the words of the minister and the answers in his reply, Mr. Chairman. Meanwhile, I would appreciate receiving the reports, and then I will listen to all he has to say.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — That is not a point of order. He can say anything he wishes.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I will continue to deliver the remarks I wish to at this particular time. Members opposite have made reference to my letter of March 8, 1979, and, in particular, to studies funded by my department. When we ended this discussion on Tuesday night, it was suggested that four studies were undertaken by the department: (1) the cost-shared study, (2) the refinery situation, (3) industry profiles, and (4) the shopping mall.

I wish to take a moment to clear the record regarding this matter. In fact, Mr. Chairman, only three studies were undertaken and funded by my department. I will deal with these individually in the course of these remarks.

With reference to the refinery situation (and I am quoting from my March 8, 1979 letter):

There was no study, per se, commissioned by the department. The department did participate in an analysis of a request for financial assistance, which was requested by Northern Petroleum in 1976.

Further, Mr. Chairman, department officials analysed operating projections at the request of Arrow Petroleum after that company had acquired their refinery. In actual fact, only three studies were funded in whole or in part by the department. To put this in some kind of context, I should point out to the members opposite that the studies were done in response to both local and government concerns over the impact on the community of Kamsack of possible closure of the refinery.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the study done by the Saskatchewan Research Council on manufacturing opportunities and industry profiles and the study of a shopping mall proposal were indeed irrelevant to the refinery situation, inasmuch as one of the objectives was to encourage other positive development in Kamsack to lessen the economic impact in the event that the refinery did reopen.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, three studies were funded by my department. They are as follows:

1. Kamsack — a market analysis and proposed community business district development plan. This study was commissioned on February 26, 1975 between the town of Kamsack and the Department of Industry and Commerce. The study was done by Mr. Mosiuk of Kamsack at a contracted cost of \$5,000 which was cost shared on a 50-50 basis by the town and the department. I have a copy here for the members opposite.
2. A commercial development plan for the town of Kamsack. This was with reference to the shopping mall and a copy was provided members opposite on Tuesday evening. This report was presented to the development committee for Kamsack in July, 1977. So you already have that copy.
3. Manufacturing industries for Kamsack. This study was commissioned by the department in May, 1977, and was completed in March, 1978. Again, this report, completed by the Saskatchewan Research Council, was presented to the Kamsack development committee on April 10, 1978.

I would be pleased to provide the hon. member for Souris-Cannington with a copy of this report.

Now to conclude, three studies were carried out. One was cost shared on a 50-50 basis; two were funded 100 per cent by the department. No other studies on Kamsack were commissioned by the department.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this is the information which the hon. member was looking for.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that the second and third studies which he talked about, the commercial development and the manufacturing and industrial development for Kamsack, were funded 100 per cent by the department. Will you provide us with the cost of those, please?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — On the shopping mall study, the cost was \$11,000, and on the manufacturing opportunities study it was \$14,582.84.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You indicated that the Kamsack marketing and developing plan study was \$5,000 and was cost shared 50-50. Who paid the other 50 per cent? I

presume the Department of Industry and Commerce paid 50 per cent; who paid the other 50 per cent?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — The town of Kamsack.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — What resulted in that first study?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Chairman, after the meeting, the town council requested the department to arrange for the presentation of the DREE (Department of Regional Economic Expansion) industrial development training course in Kamsack. In subsequent discussions with Mosiuk and the town council of Kamsack, Mosiuk proposed that a market analysis and commercial development plan be undertaken. That's what resulted.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — On the manufacturing and industrial study, you indicated it was done by SRC. Was that total cost of \$14,582.84 paid for by SRC or by industry and commerce?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — That was paid for, as I indicated, by industry and commerce to SRC.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — What were the results of that study?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Chairman, the report was actually the result of the study. I really don't know to what you are referring.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Was there any development as a result of the study? Was any manufacturing brought in as a result of that study? Was any other industrial development brought in as a result or was it just a study and then it was put in the basement of the Sask Power Building so you could take two or three days to find it four years later?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — As a result of the study there were three different opportunity profiles established. I have these and of course they were made public at that time. Town council had them, and I don't know who else. They were on every information rack in all the civic places and in our department and all over.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, were any new factories brought in as a result of it?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — We can't really put our finger on it and say that there were actually industries or businesses established in Kamsack as a result of that particular study. I might say that there have been industries and businesses established in Kamsack, either prior to or after that time.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, that's an indication of the knowledge you have of your department. It's typical of the criticism which I was making the other day about how little you know about your department and how little you're doing in your department. Mr. Minister, you're paying out \$15,000 for profiles and whatever else it has cost the taxpayers (plus the involvement of your own department which doesn't show up as a cost, but it is) and we really don't know how many thousands of dollars you paid over and above the \$14,582.

Would it not be your responsibility and your duty to follow up on the commissioning of



such reports to determine whether you have actually accomplished anything and to determine if factories or manufacturing plants have come in as a result of the studies? Just because an extra plant came into the town of Kamsack, it doesn't necessarily mean that it was a result of your study. To inform yourself and to provide information for further development, it would seem to me that your responsibility would be to determine if, in fact, your report accomplished anything. The answers you are giving are typical of the lack of knowledge you have about industry and industrialization in this province.

I have said it before and I will say it again; Mr. Minister, you have no idea or clue about what is going on in industry and commerce, other than what you have tried to accomplish in Italy, Japan, and the rest of the world, and the jaunts that you've taken at great expense. I'm sure that a lot of people would envy you. I am sure that you could have sent your deputy on those jaunts and that would have accomplished a lot more than you accomplished. You don't even follow up on reports that you have commissioned (I presume you commissioned this one — I'd like an answer on that). You don't even follow up after paying out that kind of money, after doing that kind of work, to find out whether or not you've actually been successful or have accomplished anything in spending all of this money that belongs to the taxpayers of this province.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Chairman, after those glowing remarks of the hon. member for Regina South, which I will of course ignore, I want to remind him that any report of any nature is geared toward the benefit and the enlightenment of the community at large. In this particular case, it was definitely meant for that purpose. The report — if you will read it and you haven't had time to read it; I can understand that — is directed to the people of Kamsack. It's to alert the people of Kamsack to what the potentials might be in that particular community. It was also meant — if you will read it — to involve the business community in Kamsack, to involve them in seminars so that they can enlighten themselves on what the potential might be in that particular area. I might tell you that as far as I'm concerned and as far as our people are concerned, whether that report had any particular bearing on the increase in involvement in the town of Kamsack or not, I don't know, but the town of Kamsack has definitely flourished. It has come about. Things have happened in Kamsack — shopping malls, and you name it; various other industries have come about. So there have been results from these particular reports.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I know what a report is meant to do. The question is: do you know what it's meant to do? You replied to the point that I was trying to make; it was exactly the point I wanted to make which you have now admitted. And you don't bother following it up. You wait until you come in here and are asked the question. You do a report; you do a study; you spend \$15,000 plus (probably double that with the other costs that are involved and are hidden); then you forget about it. You don't follow up. You don't encourage the town or the people or the businessmen. As far as you are concerned it's history. You've done the job. You kiss it good goodbye. You file it in the basement of the Sask Power Building, gathering dust. Three years later, at our request, you take three days to find it. You don't even know where it is — that's exactly the point I wanted to make. That's exactly what I've been saying about your capabilities in that department. Until you wake up and start putting your act together, Mr. Minister, industry and business in this province are going to go exactly the way they have been going, and that's downhill. All your reports are indicating that. You are accomplishing absolutely zero in the direction you give to your department and to your people.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — I want to thank the minister for sending these reports over. This one

is a real prize. It is the one you excerpted from the other night, and tried to pass off as three separate reports. So, we already have that one, but thanks for the original copy.

You did send us over the shopping centre report the other night. I thank you for that. We already had the Mosiuk report (as we will call it). It is your letter, Mr. Minister, that says:

Studies done in the Kamsack area for the effects of possible closure of the refinery. (Below number one it says) Further studies relevant to the refinery situation . . .

Now, you provide those further studies relevant to the refinery situation and do it at your leisure. I am not going to ask you to send your people down to the archives and work 24 hours a day. If it exists, they should be able to put their hands on it. If it doesn't exist, you run a sloppy department and you don't know what you have over there, because you said you had it, in your letter. If you can't provide it, just stand up and say so. Admit that you run a sloppy department, or admit that you are part of the whole scam going on in Kamsack.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would read the letter carefully, it says (and I am not saying that there were 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 reports; it doesn't matter; read the report, read the letter):

Further studies relevant to the refinery situation, industry profiles (which is part of manufacturing profiles) and shopping mall proposals were all done by the department.

That is what it says. Now, it doesn't spell out and say that there were 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 reports. These were all done and encompassed in the reports you now have. That is what the letter says. That is what we are doing.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — The letter says (and I point out that my mother tongue is English and I have some knowledge of the language):

Further studies relevant to the refinery situation . . .

I don't care about industry profiles and shopping malls. I am talking about the refinery situation. You either provide the report, or admit you don't have it, and that you drafted a sloppy letter. That is the only way it can be — one or the other. You either have the report and you will provide it, or you have the report, but you won't provide it, or you don't have the report, and you drafted a sloppy letter. Now which is it?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Chairman, maybe I have to admit (if it was my error) that the letter should have been worded in a different manner, possibly. All of the reports we write (as the letter indicates) revolve around the refinery situation. Those are the reports which you have.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You are suggesting, Mr. Minister, that the further studies which the member is talking about are included in that. If that's what you're saying, then you should have said "included in this study" and should learn how to write a letter.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the reports revolve around the refinery situation. That's what I am saying.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, to delay these estimates any longer would be a waste of time for the taxpayers of this province — that department is wasting enough money now. The minister is wasting enough of the taxpayers' money, so we will see what he has to do in the next year. Maybe he'll improve his position a little bit and we'll carry on with the estimates.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You've got good staff, Norm. It's just that you don't have any directors or administrators.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The only problem with his staff is that he doesn't let them do what they should be doing, or what they are capable of doing.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 11 inclusive agreed.

## Item 12

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I think I asked you this question before, I'm not sure. Your report shows some \$200,000 spent in that department last year, and this shows a \$456,000 estimate and, again, the same amount for this year. I don't know if you spent that \$456,000 on the '80-81 estimate. I see there are no people employed in there so there is no cost that way. I don't know how you can justify \$456,000 this year with interest rates the way they are. Does that have a bearing on the rate, or is it just so much money regardless of the rate that you're paying on it?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, that \$456,000 is an estimate of what we are expecting to spend this year. As I indicated to the hon. member in estimates a few days ago, we are intending this year to put on a heavier campaign to promote the program. Hopefully, we will be able to use that money, and will have to go back to treasury board for more.

Item 12 agreed.

Items 13 and 14 agreed.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, I think this is probably the correct place to ask this question — you show 106.5 person-years for your department. Where are these people located? Do you have field staff? Do you have them located in Regina? Do you have them spread out throughout the province? Are there any outside of the province, and so on?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Our head office is in Regina where the prime staff is located. We have nine regional offices around the province: Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Tisdale, etc.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — With the Chair's permission, I would like to go back to a question which I wanted to ask earlier. Will the minister agree?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Will the committee agree to revert back? Agreed.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let's talk about the industrial parks. They may be under Sedco's subvotes or they may be under industry and commerce, I'm not

sure. How many parks do you have in the province at the present time? Secondly, how many new ones will you be developing in Saskatchewan this year?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — I don't happen to have that information. That was a subject for the Crown corporations committee. It is a Sedco project and not an industry and commerce project. I just can't give you the figures off the top of my head. I don't know at this time.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The Sedco subvote will be coming up. I could ask it then and you can give me the answer. I have one other question. Are you planning an industrial park for Shaunavon this year?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — As I said, that's part of Sedco's responsibility. However, to answer the question, yes we are.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Could you tell us when you will be making an announcement on that?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Very shortly.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister some questions about the industrial parks, since he has chosen to go into them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — These deal with Sedco estimates. We're going to be dealing with Sedco in about two minutes. Could we wait until then so we don't get out of order.

**MR. THATCHER:** — I know what the answer is going to be when we start questioning him about Sedco in that estimate. He is going to say it is a statutory vote and therefore not open to discussion in this Assembly. If the Attorney General is in the Assembly, that's what's going to happen. If industry and commerce is not related or tied in with Sedco, I'd be greatly surprised.

Vote 19 agreed.

## **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW**

### **THE SASKATCHEWAN RESEARCH COUNCIL**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 35**

##### **Item 1**

**MR. SWAN:** — I'd like to ask the minister what involvement the Saskatchewan Research Council has had in the development of the ethanol project which has been proposed by the Department of Agriculture.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — The research council has not, as yet, been asked to get involved in that project.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Minister, does the research council have the capabilities for doing the type of research necessary to determine whether or not an ethanol plant is feasible and what would be the best way to address the setting up of a plant? Does it have that capability?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Yes, the research council does have the peripheral facilities but it would have to add many more facilities to its program in order to do the necessary research and to establish a plant.

**MR. SWAN:** — Has the Saskatchewan Research Council been asked by the provincial government to assist in the research necessary before this plant will go ahead?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — No, as I indicated earlier, the Saskatchewan Research Council has not yet been approached on the subject.

**MR. SWAN:** — You are the Minister of the Department of Industry and Commerce and also the minister responsible here. Do you not feel that the Government of Saskatchewan's not even coming to the Saskatchewan Research Council doesn't give a very good indication of its respect for the council? Do you have the operation of the POS (protein, oil and starches) plant in Saskatoon under your wing in this portfolio?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — To answer your latter question, the POS plant is not under our jurisdiction. To answer the first question, I am sure (and as you well know), the ethanol plant which the Minister of Agriculture is proposing is only in the proposal stage. I don't know whether the Department of Agriculture has done any outside research or not. I'm sure that if and when the time comes there will be a necessity to have research; the Saskatchewan Research Council will probably be involved.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Minister, I believe it's a point you should be taking to your cabinet colleagues. We develop the Saskatchewan Research Council, which is capable of doing research projects, yet the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to use a firm outside of Canada. To me, it shows that we don't have confidence in our own capability. It also shows me that we set up a research council which is a complete waste of money, as far as the government is concerned, if you're not going to use it.

The POS plant, you say, doesn't come under your portfolio. The Government of Saskatchewan is a member of the POS council. They have shares in it. They have the right to use it. They haven't contacted that facility in the development of an ethanol plant. To me, it seems that there is something seriously lacking in your government when you don't use either of these facilities. They cost us a lot of dollars to set up. Why aren't we using them?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, POS is not directly involved with SRC. The Government of Saskatchewan has shares in POS with the Department of Agriculture. The question you asked earlier was: are we involved with POS? We are not directly involved with POS.

**MR. SWAN:** — What research projects for the Government of Saskatchewan have been undertaken by the Saskatchewan Research Council?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — I would have to go back over the books to find out how many projects we have done. I can give you three projects under the year 1980-81; a major acid rain study, a residential energy conservation study; use of agriculture waste products and energy conservation on the farm studies. These are only three of about 50 studies done or ongoing projects that are being carried out.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, just looking at your report on the retrofit, the

reinsulation of this 50-year old home in Weyburn, I am curious what kind of insulation was used?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — I am sorry, my people tell me they don't have the specifics on that. But we will be glad to get that for you.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I am basically interested in whether you might have used formaldehyde.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — We would only be guessing, and the guess would be no. We don't know.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Will you check it out? I have one other question. You don't show any people employed in your subvote — where are they shown?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — We never show them, Mr. Chairman. They are not members of the public service. The Saskatchewan Research Council is a bit at arm's length from the government. We only give it a grant to operate. The rest of its funding comes from the private sector.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Perhaps you could indicate how many people are employed in the SRC.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — There are roughly 200 people employed in the SRC.

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 35 agreed.

## **HERITAGE FUND**

### **BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE (RESOURCES DIVISION)**

#### **INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE**

#### **Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 19**

##### **Item 1**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Is that a continuous grant every year? Is it being used for expansion as they go?

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — No, Mr. Chairman, that is a commitment which we made two years ago. This is the last one that will show up for the expansion of Ipsco (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation).

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 19 agreed.

## **CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

### **SASKATCHEWAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION — Vote 48**

## Item 1

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister some questions about Sedco. Mr. Minister, we have discussed this in Crown corporations; we have discussed it in industry and commerce. On this item, I want to ask you again about this cloud, about this \$220,000 valuation by a man working for industry and commerce and why he evaluated the property at Kamsack that was purchased for \$1. I want to ask why your man did this one month prior to the date of sale. I have asked you this, and I have asked you this, and you said that if I would come to your office you would tell me privately. I want it in this House.

**HON. MR. VICKAR:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid the hon. member is accusing me of saying that he can come to my office and I'll give him a definitive answer as to why that happened. I never made a statement like that and you check *Hansard*. I would never make that statement because I don't know anything about that. I answered all those questions in Crown corporations and I will not deviate from that. These questions were asked in Crown corporations; you got all the answers; you're not getting any more from me because I don't have any of my people here. This is not a Sedco vote.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — This is a Sedco vote. You want the money; give us the answers. You did, Mr. Minister, in Crown corporations.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — This item is a statutory item. There is no vote on it. It is possible for a discussion to take place on it and the minister, if he would like, could have his officials in here to provide him with information.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Will all due respect, Mr. Vice-Chairman, your ruling is incorrect; your ruling is not based on precedent. We have been through this one other time and the Chairman made a similar ruling to what you're making and he was wrong at that time. I'm going to give you the precedent for which he was wrong and I'm going to go back to April 4, 1979, if I'm not mistaken (my memory fails me), I think I was involved with the Attorney General and I'm going to read from the blues in the committee:

During consideration of vote 48, a point of order was raised by the Attorney General to the effect that vote 48 was a statutory appropriation and thus there was no vote to be taken and questions upon it were out of order.

Have I got you, Mr. Vice-Chairman? I don't want to leave you behind. Okay?

The Chairman stated that while the item was statutory and was not to be voted upon, it has been the practice of the committee of finance to call every item listed in the estimates, whether statutory or to be voted, in order that general questions on the matter could be asked.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I hope this is the end of that thing forever in this Assembly.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — I believe the member was not listening to what I had said, because this is exactly what I did say. I reminded the members that although it was not to be voted on, questions and discussion could take place, and at the same time, the minister could have assistance to provide him with answers. That is exactly what I said and all you did was read the ruling that I had made.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to talk to the minister about some industrial parks. You built an industrial park in Saskatchewan which has been a real turkey, so I am advised. I want to ask the minister: what progress have you made as far as involving the private sector, in your industrial park in Saskatoon, because it is our understanding that virtually everything in that industrial park is related to government. Now, I understand that you bludgeoned Northern Telecom to become a tenant there, but as far as the community of Saskatoon becoming involved on the private side, there has been virtually no participation at all. Would the minister tell us whether all of the space in that industrial park is leased; what percentage of it is not leased; and what the overall situation is? Perhaps the minister could pay more attention to the question rather than seeking bail-out advice from the Attorney General. Handle this one yourself, or resign.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — Order! The discussion can be of a general nature on this particular item, not a detailed questioning, which should be done in Crown corporations.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman, the precedent has already been set and, respectfully, I don't think it is up to you to tell the opposition what questions we are going to ask. Questions are questions . . .

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — Order! The general discussion can take place at this time, but the detailed examination of the Crown corporation should take place in Crown corporations committee; that's what it is all about.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman, if I wanted to ask that question in Crown corporations, I would. I asked a very general question as to the operation of something in Sedco. How more general can you get than what I asked for? Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, why don't we get on with this debate and get out of here. Maybe you haven't got anything better to do than be here until July, but most of us do.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — Order! What I have indicated is that general discussion can take place, and I am going to stick to that. The Crown corporations committee is the place for detailed questioning. The questions you asked appeared to me to be very detailed, in that you were asking for specifics — things that were taking place in the industrial part in Saskatoon. I believe that is not a general discussion.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Well perhaps, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you can tell us what a general discussion is. Would you prefer if I prefaced my remarks in a general sense? Mr. Minister, I would like to have a general discussion and a general appraisal with you about the success rate that an industrial park has had in Saskatoon, in attracting the community involvement of the private sector in Saskatoon and elsewhere. Could you, in a very general sense (general and broad enough that the Vice-Chairman could understand) inform us as to the progress you have had in this area? Could you perhaps do so without consultation with the Attorney General? If you are asking the Attorney General to answer the questions for you would you please inform the Assembly that you are unable to answer the questions, incapable of asking them, and we'll then address our questions to the Attorney General.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the conclusion of my remarks, I am going to move that we report progress on the Department of Industry estimates, and that we proceed immediately to urban affairs. I want to indicate to the members of the



House that, in my years in this legislature, a Crown corporation official has never attended the committee of finance to discuss, under a statutory vote, the question of the details that the hon. member is seeking.

I want to tell the members of this House, and you obviously decide whatever you want, that you have a full-fledged Crown corporations committee, in which Sedco was up for almost a week, wherein detailed questions on industrial parks were asked by the opposition, and discussed and answered by the minister. Now the member seeks (either because he was not present in Crown corporations committee or is not satisfied, for whatever reasons) to invent the wheel again by going over the entire situation. I say quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, that is an abuse of the processes of all of us as members of this House. We have to play by some ground rules in order to do the people's business. We have to agree to some broad general rules without getting into some kind of feeling of "I'm going to show him — we are going to continue on with Sedco," or whatever the operation is.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is unfair to ask the minister to answer detailed questions on Sedco without his officials being here, or ever being here in this House. I think it is an abuse of the process, and, if I may say so, irresponsible of the opposition who had a full chance to discuss this in detail only a few days ago with respect to Sedco — you had that chance. You could have put the member for Thunder Creek on your Crown corporations committee. He could have spent two weeks, 10 days, 500 hours asking those questions of the minister. Now, the member gets it into his head that he wants to ask them, and he is going to put the minister on the griddle on the ruling on that basis.

I say, with all due respect to the Leader of the Opposition, that is simply unfair. That's just not right — not fair to us, not fair to you guys, and it is not fair to the way the House is operating, or, if you will, fair to the way the public is going. You just simply can't go round and round and round and round.

Mr. Chairman, I move that we report progress and stand the Department of Industry and Commerce estimates.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Chairman, speaking to the motion made by the Attorney General, I would like to comment that we should not rise and report progress. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that we have a vote there of about \$37 million and we would like to ask that minister what he is going to spend that \$37 million for. We want to talk about that.

If the Attorney General has told the Assembly that this minister is not capable of telling the people of Saskatchewan what he is going to spend \$37 million for, then I think that minister should be removed from the cabinet right now.

If the Chairman could, would he explain to me what the function of the committee of finance is? I don't care whether a vote is statutory or non-statutory, but I know that \$37 million is a heck of a lot of money. I think most people out there regard \$37 million as an awful lot of money. Let's face it, we both know why the Attorney General wants to rise to report progress; it's because this minister can't answer those questions. That minister isn't capable of answering those questions. The Attorney General has done that in the past and he is doing it again. When that minister can't go to his officials, then that minister is totally lost. When we can't talk about big dollars, then there is something wrong with democracy — something God awful wrong with democracy. All we wish to talk about today is how a Crown corporation is going to spend \$37 million of taxpayers'

money. That is all we want to talk about. If there is something wrong with that and we have to rise and report progress because we have an incompetent, inept minister, a minister who has proven that fact by his actions year after year, month after month, then it's a real savage indictment of democracy and an indictment of this Assembly.

The minister can crank his hand around. Let me tell you, that's probably the most productive thing that this minister has done since I have been in the Assembly. If we have to rise and report progress every time we get a minister up front who doesn't know anything about what he is supposed to be in charge of, then democracy has sunk to a brand new low.

Mr. Chairman, we want a recorded vote as to whether we rise and report progress, because we would like the taxpayers to get a little productivity out of their dollars being spent for this Assembly. We think we ought to work today. We think we ought to talk about that \$37 million. If the government is afraid to expose the incompetence of the minister over there, then it's an indictment of all of us. I'm not going to be indicted because of the incompetent over there.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — It has been moved by the Attorney General that we move on to urban affairs. Order, order!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You've made a motion. We have the right to speak to it. If you want to report it, go ahead.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — We're in urban affairs, item 1.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He made a motion to move and report progress. Now, at least run this House properly or get out of the chair . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do something right for a change.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — In the committee it is not a motion when the House leader moves that we move on to urban affairs.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He said, "I move to report progress." If that isn't a motion, what is it? Why is he recognized . . .

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, point of order. Keep your calm, please. Just keep calm. In the committee of finance, you can come back to this item two months from now and you can talk forever. In committee of finance, the government House Leader has the option to call whatever estimate he wants at any time. That is a fact. I am standing — call it what you will, by motion, by will or whatever — the Department of Industry and Commerce for the time being. I'm calling the Department of Urban Affairs. It requires no vote to do that — never in the history of this province. That's what I am doing.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Show us the rule.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, no, that's the rule.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You're making the rules.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Government House Leader, before you change the estimate to

municipal affairs, will you let me, as House Leader on this side, explain our concerns regarding that subvote on Sedco?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I am not denying the member that right. I am denying it, perhaps, today by calling urban affairs but I am not denying that right when Sedco comes up again. You will have that right. I've tried to express my concern about what I think is the abuse of process that's going on here. You people don't buy that, obviously. You'll have a chance to rebut that. He has already done that in two or three emotional, real or otherwise, statements. It'll have to come up again. You can express your concerns again. I am hoping, under the circumstances and in a second reflection, that you people will understand what you're doing to the parliamentary process, and that you will think about it. We'll go on to urban affairs and put in an hour's work on urban affairs. For that reason, as the manager of the House, I am standing industry and commerce. I am calling the Department of Urban Affairs. That's why the Chairman is calling Department of Urban Affairs; that's why we're moving to urban affairs. You people can come back to Sedco at some other time if you want and we'll have the hassle again. So, Mr. Chairman, I'm calling urban affairs.

**MR. THATCHER:** — On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Call it whatever you want, but when the House Leader calls a subvote and suddenly removes it, what are the people of Saskatchewan and what are we supposed to conclude? The Attorney General called that subvote; the minister is theoretically here to answer for his department to the tune of \$37 million. I suggest to you that the House Leader called that. When the House Leader calls it, we have the opportunity and we have the right to go on with it. How many times do we have to waste this Assembly's time and the taxpayers' dollars to be here simply because you have an incompetent over there. The only reason you're pulling this is because you are shielding a minister who isn't capable of defending his estimates and answering the questions. What other reason is there . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I'd like an explanation from the Attorney General. I'd like him to tell the House how he can call a vote and say, "Let's do this."

Then the first question that the guy can't answer, the Attorney General as House Leader gets up and says, "Oh, we're pulling it. We're going to pull it." Let me tell you, Mr. Attorney General, there are ministers over there that stand up without their officials. They know something about their Crown corporations.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — Order!

**MR. THATCHER:** — They know about what they're supposed to be looking after. They can answer these questions. He gets up and says, "Oh, we're pulling it; we're going to pull it." Let me tell you, Mr. Attorney General, there are ministers over there who stand up without their officials. They know something about their Crown corporations. They know what they are supposed to be looking after. They can answer these questions. But because you have an incompetent over there, you're afraid to expose him.

If I ask for Sask Tel (and I've had my differences with the minister responsible for Sask Tel) he would stand up and fight his own battle today. He wouldn't need you. The minister in charge of SPC would stand up and fight his own battle.

How many times do we have to have this minister protected by you, downgrading this entire Assembly?

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — Let me indicate to the member what is taking place. Sedco is

stood, and we are moving to the Department of Urban Affairs. The subvote has not been signed or passed, and there is no vote to be taken on Sedco.

I called the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, item 1, and I did not call vote 48, as you indicated. It has now been stood, and we have moved to the Department of Urban Affairs.

## **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW**

### **URBAN AFFAIRS**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 24**

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Don Moroz, the deputy minister of urban affairs; Dave Innis, the associate deputy minister of Urban Affairs; Don Bennett, the director of administration; and Bob Blackwell, the director of municipal management and finance.

#### **Item 1**

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask of the Minister of Urban Affairs. There is one thing we must establish about this problem at Kamsack. Mr. Minister, do you stand on behalf of protecting some individuals in Kamsack, or do you stand on behalf of the citizens of Kamsack?

What we are going to bring up is in the interests of the people of Kamsack ("we" meaning the Progressive Conservative Party), and not in the interests of individuals. I want to have the commitment from you, Mr. Minister, that you are not tied in with any individuals or that you are not trying to protect any individuals. I want on the record before we proceed that your interest is to clear the cloud that is over Kamsack.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, perhaps that's an area on which the hon. member and I can agree. I am concerned and interested in the community of Kamsack, and the citizens of Kamsack — not only the people who reside within the community, but those in the surrounding areas, as well. It is a proud community with a large number of good people, and we do have a concern about their welfare, as well as the good management of the town of Kamsack.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — I wonder if the minister would tell me what obligation there is with the Department of Urban Affairs, and any other department of the government for that matter, as it relates to the approval of an airport adjacent to an urban community? I am talking about community planning approval and that kind of thing.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, with respect to airports, there are really several departments which do get involved — the Department of Highways and Transportation, in the case of the province, the federal Department of Transport, the Department of Urban Affairs, and at times the Department of Rural Affairs.

In terms of our responsibility in urban affairs. It is a matter of land use, if it is within the immediate community or an urban community.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Would you indicate what involvement your department had as it relates to the airport in the town of Kamsack?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, we have had almost no direct involvement with the airport at Kamsack. The Department of Highways provided the funds so far, and the federal Department of Transport approved the plans.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — The federal Department of Transport also approved the set of plans in 1977 for a site some short distance north of Kamsack. The site they are working on now is virtually in town. Surely, there is some obligation in the department. You indicated that it relates to land use. Which subdepartment is involved? Is it community planning, or what section is involved? What was the extent of your involvement in the approval of the plans for Kamsack airport?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have been advised by my officials that we have not been asked to approve anything in the case of the airport at Kamsack, nor have we approved anything. The plans have been approved, as I understand it, by the DOT (Department of Transportation).

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Is that the only requirement necessary for the spending of some (I think) \$45,000 of the Department of Highways' money — approval of the DOT? Isn't community planning involved here at all? The minister responsible for Sask Tel likely wouldn't know anything about it, in any case.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — No, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have not been involved. The Department of Highways was satisfied, presumably, that the airstrip meets the requirements. The DOT, as I understand it, had given it approval. We have not been asked to approve anything and have not approved anything.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman, regarding this airport, I have a few details I want to bring out. One of them involves your answering letters about the airport. I just want to read this into the record, Mr. Vice-Chairman:

January 24, 1980: letter from flying club to town of Kamsack asking about relocation of airport facilities.

February 18, 1980: town administrator replies to letter, indicating location of new airstrip.

February 25, 1980: regular council meeting. Section 4 — Kamsack Flying Club suggests foundation of an airport development committee; town considers formation of an airport development committee.

March 4, 1980: administration committee meeting recommended to council the establishment of an airport development committee as per terms of reference, also, to report and recommend to council on all matters relating to development of the Kamsack Municipal Airport and its facilities. The committee has a councillor as chairman; the president of the chamber of commerce and the rest of the members are from the flying club.

March 10, 1980: regular council meeting. Recommendations of administration committee are adopted to establish airport development committee as per terms of reference.

May 1, 1981

April and May: committee meets. The April committee agreed to look into other locations for an airport. At the second meeting in May, a Mr. Koturbash tells committee that in spite of committee's terms of reference to look into all aspects of airport development, council has previously decided that the existing site within the town limits should be the permanent location.

May 12, 1980: council meeting. Shymko and Boyd are to be authorized for the crushing of 4,000 cubic yards of gravel for use in the airstrips.

So they just went ahead, Mr. Minister, without involving the people.

June 19, 1980: council meeting. It was agreed that councillors Andrychuk and Wlasichuk, and the town engineer head a committee to investigate flight paths and zoning easements, and bring a report back to the council.

July 28, 1980: town engineer report — Highway No. 6 — hiring of scraper to excavate the airport site. Citizen groups meet with council to suggest alternate location. Town engineer presents cost figures of new location suggested by citizens.

August 12, 1980: committee meeting in council — proceed with airport development.

August 12, 1980: special meeting of council. Proceed with airport development due to high cost of alternate site proposed by citizens. The town engineer, on the airport, listed figures for both the town council site and sites proposed by the citizens.

A letter from Saskatchewan Highways and Transportation to the R.M. of Cote, on September 22, 1980, authorized the use of an abandoned road for airport purposes. It was suggested by some workers of the airport committee that two abandoned road allowances be used for airport runways.

A letter sent to the Premier on August 21, 1980, by citizens, said that airport construction has just started.

September 16, 1980 is a reply to the letter to the Premier by the deputy minister to the Premier advising that the Department of Highways and the Department of Urban Affairs will reply.

That is where you were involved — the Department of Urban Affairs will reply.

The Premier's office answered three weeks after the citizens' letter. This is a stalling practice. On October 17, 1980, there was a reply from the Department of Highways. The note replies almost two months later, October 27, 1980, there was a reply from the Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Minister, don't stand up in this House and say you weren't involved in the airport. We turn around and give you the dates. You should have them right there. You were involved; you were involved plenty.

August 25, 1980, there was a letter by a citizen requesting documentation indicating the by-law or resolution authorizing the expenditure of funds on the airport

development, also, the by-law or resolution deciding the location of the airport site. August 22, 1980, there was a reply to the above letter.

September 18, 1980, there was a letter by citizens to town administrator requesting information on zoning restrictions or easements. October 14, 1980, reply to above letter.

February 18, 1981, there was a letter from councillor Cherwenuk requesting information on gravel. February 19, 1981, reply to letter. March 18, 1981, another reply to above letter.

Copy of agreement between town and the Department of Highways; note section 2(a):

In discussions with town council, town engineer admitted there had been no soil taken at the proposed town site.

The town waived tendering clause, claiming town workers would construct airport. Town workers in fact did very little work. The majority of work was done by contractors. The names of contractors tendered for the work — hauling of pit gravel was done by Broda Construction.

Broda Construction is mighty involved here. Broda had two councillors — partners in three separate companies. Easements were not obtained by town council. Easements were not obtained by town council on property adjoining the airport which is privately owned. Also: there is no by-law for rezoning property where new airport is located from agriculture to airport.

I can't understand, Mr. Minister, how they can get away with the Minister of Environment. We've been trying to build an airplane strip in the town of Craik. We're told that we have to have the signatures of the Department of Highways. We also have to have a zoning by-law. The Department of Environment has to be involved. They wouldn't let us do it. We don't have this in place yet, so they've stopped it.

On this particular case, the grant money was flown in before it was even passed.

Town of Kamsack by-law 877: present zoning of property where new airport is located in agriculture.

On page 9 under "use is permitted," airport is not listed, therefore, rezoning was necessary.

A list presented to RCMP as possible violation of The Urban Municipality Act: October 23, 1980, copy of proposed rezoning of the new airport; copy of Airport Assistance Act from the Department of Highways; copy of report by Machibroda Engineering. This report is a study paid by the citizens of Kamsack on their proposals of an alternate site.

Mayor Mydonick mails out handout after the *Kamsack Times* refuses to permit his letter to the editor.

Possible violation, The Urban Municipality Act, RSS 1978, Saskatchewan, chapter U-O, section 40(5) by Larry Koturbash, Kamsack councillor and agrologist, and by Al Zabinsky, Kamsack councillor and manager.

I quote:

A member of the council who votes on a question or on a matter in contravention of subsection (4) is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$50, and if convicted of the offence, his seat shall immediately become vacant, and the council shall, subject to section 46(2) immediately arrange for an election to fill the vacancy, and such person shall continue to be disqualified from being nominated or re-elected as a member of the council for a period of three years thereafter.

Section 40(4) reads as follows:

Any member of the council who has an interest in any question or matter that comes before the council shall immediately disclose his interests in that question or matter, and shall not vote thereon.

I quote further:

The matter below involves a decision of the town council of the town of Kamsack to develop a hard surfacing standard for the Kamsack municipal airport, and their choice of site for the development.

In the consideration of the town council of Kamsack in the matter of the location and development of the Kamsack municipal airport, it appears that the two above-mentioned councillors, indeed, had an interest, as it relates to the act, by the fact that the decision taken by council to locate and develop the airport on a site within the town limits, abutting the Kamsack boulevard, resulted in the development corporation, of which the two above mentioned are directors, gaining control of virtually all available highway commercial property on the east Kamsack boulevard.

This control is valuable to the two above-mentioned town councillors because they are also directors of two other companies which own a hotel, a service station-restaurant, as well as a large amount of highway commercial property on the west Kamsack boulevard. Highway commercial property on the Kamsack boulevard, especially the east Kamsack boulevard, is the most commercially viable, and therefore, the most valuable in Kamsack.

Presentations made to Kamsack town council, as well as to a committee of the town council, suggested alternate locations to develop the airport and the significantly greater benefit to the town of these alternate locations.

The engineering evaluation of one alternate location indicates the cost of development on the alternative location would not be significantly different, although the benefit to the town would be significantly greater.

A decision by council to develop an airport on a site, other than the one it chose, would have made available to the town unoccupied highway commercial property on the east Kamsack boulevard that is already fronted by a service road along its entire length. According to its present zoning classification, this property is suitable for the development of a motel, restaurant, service station, etc. In addition, the location of the airport on any



other site would also have made available to the town seven blocks of residential property already surveyed for residential development.

The matter of the location of the Kamsack airport came before council as early as 1975, and on several occasions in 1980. During regular and special meetings of council, as well as during meetings of committees of council, the issue of commercial property pertaining to the airport was raised, specifically, at two meetings of council on August 11 and August 12, 1980.

At no time did either of the two above-mentioned councillors indicate that they had an interest in the matter. They both repeatedly spoke strongly in favor of the location within the town limits at these meetings in its consideration of an alternate location adjoining the northwest perimeter of the town, adjacent to the town golf course, which was suggested to council by a group of citizens.

Council was influenced by the presentation of a comparison based on an estimate prepared by the town's engineering technologist of the cost of development for an equivalent airport facility on both locations, which showed the costs of locations outside the town limits to be prohibitively high. When it was pointed out to council that the engineering basis of that estimate, which they should have been familiar with by their experience as councillors, it was very suspect. The two above-mentioned councillors chose to defend those estimates. In addition, they attempted to ridicule.

During the meetings and in the press, the group of local citizens pointed out the shortcomings in those estimates. A subsequent professional engineer's appraisal of soil tests and survey levels of the location outside town limits, and the actual excavation on the site within town limits, show that the engineering basis of estimates presented by town engineering had, in fact, significant shortcomings. It seemed clear that by the actions of these two town councillors, they did not disclose their interest, and they defended suspect cost estimates. The council was influenced in a decision to locate the airport where it did, and because of that influence, council may have been prevented from acting in the best interests of the community.

Now the reason, Mr. Minister, that we bring this to you in this legislature, is that these reasons have been brought to town council through the latter years, and the town council would not act. So, when the town council does not act until they have a new mayor, they have now got a new mayor. He was elected, Mr. Minister, by going door to door, saying, "I'll clean up this mess in Kamsack if you support me as mayor." And he defeated the old mayor who was responsible for these things. These are the reasons why it has to come to you, Mr. Minister. The town council would not act on behalf of the people of Kamsack, and it is up to you when the town council does not act on behalf of the people. There's a reason why we are bringing the stuff to you. There's a reason why the new mayor has sent wires and letters to the Premier, and copies to you. It's coming on your hands because the town councils of the last several years have never acted.

This is just the airport. We will get your remarks on that and move on to something else.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman, let me first of all try to answer the hon. member's allegations that I have been involved, or the department has been involved, in the airport situation. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think it would be useful so that the record is

clear. The Premier did get a letter, signed by a person named Larry Mosiuk. The letter was referred to me, to urban affairs, and to the Minister of Highways. That letter was replied to under the date of October 17, 1980, addressed to Mr. Larry Mosiuk. Let me read the letter:

I am replying to your letter of August 21, 1980, to Premier Allen Blakeney, in which you request the Minister of Highways and Transportation and me to jointly investigate the actions of the Kamsack Town Council regarding the development of the Kamsack airport.

With respect to these matters pertaining directly to the Department of Highways and Transportation, my colleague, the Hon. Eiling Kramer, will be writing you.

As Minister of Urban Affairs, I can investigate local decision if council exceeds its statutory authority, but as a matter of policy, the province does not interfere with the decisions taken by municipal councils, particularly in those areas in which the council clearly has the authority and competence to decide. I have no evidence that the Kamsack council exceeded its authority in making the decision it did with respect to the development of the airport.

With respect to conflict of interest cases, urban affairs is not responsible for enforcing the statutory provisions in this area; rather it is handled through the courts if a citizen lays a charge.

If you believe the council has exceeded its authority, it would need more information than contained in your letter. The information which I have received from the highways department indicates that the town council acted within its authority.

This is signed by me, Mr. Chairman.

That is the extent of our direct involvement in the case of the airport. I am advised that the matter of the airport is now being advertised for rezoning purposes and that we, as a department, will be getting the request from the town for rezoning, subject to the approval. Now until we get the request for rezoning, we can't act on it. We don't impose ourselves on the local governments before they make decision or when they don't place anything before us.

The hon. member, in closing, said there have been wires and letters from the mayor in respect to the airport. Mr. Chairman, I have not received any telegrams from Mayor Mydonick or any letters in respect to the airport. I'm sorry. If he has letters to that effect, I would like to get them so I can comment or respond to them. But, with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I have not received any request from the mayor in respect to the matter of the airport in Kamsack.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Minister, we have some more stuff that we could go through but it would just take too long. I'm going to try and summarize on a few of the important matters, as we only have a half-hour left today. I hope we will be finishing this next week.

I have one letter here dated September 10, 1979. You received this letter from Mr.

Sasyniuk and he specifically outlined some very serious allegations. In your answer to him, you said they were most serious. I'm not going to read this letter out because it would take too long, but it's dated September 10, 1979. We have already brought the matter of this letter up in the House and you have said you have it. I will table it.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important aspects of this case is the sale of the land for \$1. People keep saying that it was sold for \$7,000 or \$2,001. Well, I'm going to read to you what was said at a council meeting of September 13, 1978:

Kiwaluk-Shymko: That we offer to sell to Bill Plowman 10 acres . . .

I think this Bill Plowman happens to be from some other province; he wasn't heard of in that area and he is still not there.

. . . 10 acres of land and a portion of parcel 8, plan 65 (I won't go through the figures) for the establishment of a manufacturing industry for the sum of \$1. The sale of the property is subject to the purchaser being responsible for all services, the town being provided with preliminary plans.

Now this is the sale of 10 acres for \$1. I want to table this. I'm going to be tabling a lot of stuff here so you might as well stay here with me.

There were some discrepancies about this when it got out to a few people in the town. There was a little argument on council. Somehow or other on January 22, 1979, they did it again.

Zabinsky-Boyd: That we agree to sell to Kamsack Manufacturing the property described as . . . For the sum of \$1 plus the cost of all services.

They did it again. That's definitely 10 acres for \$1. They all voted on it; it was voted unanimously. The two councillors involved, Mr. Zabinsky and Mr. Koturbash definitely voted on this. Table this please.

Mr. Minister, would you agree that this is contrary to the act — just that one parcel alone which I have tabled?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member made reference to a letter of September 10. I did not hear him say who it was that wrote the letter; I presume he is referring to Mr. Sasyniuk's letter dated September 10. The letter was written to me. Mr. Sasyniuk, in his letter, makes six allegations:

1. The sale of property at less than fair market value;
2. Improper assessment and taxation of property;
3. Councillors performing work for the town;
4. The conduct of council business in in-camera meetings;
5. Failure to deal with petition relating to parking on main street;
6. Improper use of industry and commerce report for personal gain.

I presume that's the letter to which the hon. member is referring. In addition to that, Mr. Sasyniuk makes a number of allegations in respect to the local MLA, the hon. member for the constituency, Mr. Lusney.

Mr. Chairman, after receiving the letter from Mr. Sasyniuk, I thought, because of his allegations, that I should consult with the local MLA, Mr. Norm Lusney. This I did. I wanted to get his views. There are, as I said, allegations about the sale of property and about taxation.

I notice (for a variety of reasons) that in the case of the councillor, Don Boyd, the hon. members have refrained, so far, from making any references to his name. I understand that he's the same Don Boyd who was the Conservative candidate in the by-election. I think that was in 1977. Mr. Sasyniuk makes allegations that Mr. Boyd, when a council member, also performed work as a contractor for the town. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into the amounts or rake through individuals.

To save time (although I'm prepared to spend as much time as is necessary because I think it's important that the air be cleared), I want to say that I did acknowledge Mr. Sasyniuk's letter. This is the letter which I wrote to Mr. Sasyniuk:

I am writing you to acknowledge your letter of September 10 in which you expressed certain concerns over the activities of the council of the town of Kamsack. I will be having the matter referred to within your letter reviewed internally by members of my staff and a report prepared for my consideration.

In closing, I would like to thank you for writing to me about your concerns.

Mr. Chairman, we have concluded that perhaps the best way to deal with the allegations was to give Mr. Sasyniuk an opportunity (to the extent that we could assist in giving him an opportunity) to meet with town council and discuss and air his grievances, allegations and complaints. This was also the view of the hon. member for the constituency. He thought this would be a good way of proceeding with it. Finally, the council did invite Mr. Sasyniuk to a council meeting. I have a copy of the letter here somewhere. If my memory serves me correctly, they set the date of January 7. The council invited him to a meeting on January 7. For reasons best known to Mr. Sasyniuk he refused to appear. He failed to appear and to meet with the council to discuss his complaints.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also inform the hon. member that two of our staff from the department met with certain officials of the town of Kamsack, and I believe the then mayor. They reviewed the allegations which were made by Mr. Sasyniuk. During the course of that review, the council asked whether they could have a meeting with me. I agreed to a meeting and a date was set for January 29 in Regina. Unfortunately, the mayor at the time landed in the hospital. I met with the council but the mayor was not able to meet with us because he was in the hospital. Therefore, there is an error in one of my references in a letter which I wrote to the current mayor on April 27.

Generally, our review of the situation indicates the property in question — 13.5 acres of land — was priced at \$2,001. In addition, Kamsack Manufacturing (the people who bought the property) paid \$357.50 for registration of title, \$1,075 for subdivision costs, and \$3,973.60 for servicing costs. Our people, in examining, found that the land in question is on the side of a ravine and is adjacent to an old sanitary landfill site in the

town. Not a professional review, but a review by our people, indicated that this was perhaps not an unreasonable arrangement in price which was agreed to.

Mr. Chairman, the inference was made that somehow Aldermen Koturbash and Zabinsky were involved in Kamsack Manufacturing. Certainly, our investigations to that point did not indicate there was any evidence whatsoever that Alderman Koturbash or Alderman Zabinsky had any financial involvement in Kamsack Manufacturing, Mr. Chairman. That is what is shown on the records. If the hon. members have any proof that there is direct involvement in Kamsack Manufacturing by those two alderman (I think Zabinsky is no longer an alderman, but Koturbash is), certainly, our investigations did not demonstrate that to be the case.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Chairman, at no time in this House did we involve a Mr. Don Boyd, a Conservative candidate. You just did; we didn't. These are your old tactics, Mr. Minister. You have been receiving and answering letters for years, but you've put nothing into them. All of these letters have been nothing but a big circle. The letters go to the member for Pelly and he turns them over to you to answer. Or the Premier gets letters from there and he turns them over to you to answer.

I am going to table some more stuff here. I wish to table the province of Saskatchewan's Land Titles Act, the bill of sale for \$2,001 for 13 acres of property sold to Kamsack Manufacturing. One month prior to the date of that in October, on September 4 one Mark Litowitz, who worked for the Department of Industry and Commerce in Yorkton, valued the property at \$220,000.

It confuses me, Mr. Minister, that the town sells property for \$2,001, but a man working for the Department of Industry and Commerce valued the property at \$220,000. I wish to table this one.

It is also very interesting that a month after that, in November 1979, Sedco loaned \$343,370. This is the certificate of title with the registration of debt against the property. Also, on April 1, 1980, Sedco loaned another \$111,000. There is also something else here. As soon as this all came into being, Mark Litowitz quite working for the Department of Industry and Commerce and went to work for Kamsack Manufacturing. Then, when the heat came on this last month, he quit and went back to his old job. That's very coincidental.

Another one which I wish to table is a council meeting on May 8, 1979:

It is recommended to council to sell parcel B, plan 66 Y 00049 and that a portion of parcel A, plan AB 5420 as amended by master of titles order no. 65Y 1 438, laying south of the surveyed road . . . In excess of the original 10 acres (no connection — two different sales) up to the west bank of the creek, subject to a legal survey boundary for the sum of \$2,000.

I wish to table that one. There are two different sales — \$2,000 for 3 acres and 10 acres for \$1. You keep insisting that this \$2,001 was for the property and yet I have also heard you say \$7,000. There are the facts.

Now I have other documents which we could use to show conflict of interest. They are for Eagle Developments and Arrow Petroleum. I haven't time today, but these documents show where the two councillors, Mr. Koturbash and Mr. Zabinsky, under

false pretences, had the people thinking a man by the name of Cas Broda owned the property. When you go to the registrar of companies, as we did, and search it, you will find out that the three councillors at one time owned Arrow Petroleum. Two of them still own it today. Eagle Developments is owned by two councillors. We will get into that next week. Maybe we wouldn't have to if you will agree to go by what you said in a letter here. You said in this letter, written by you:

Mr. Randy Konkin indicated that a petition supporting the actions of the mayor has been signed by more than 300 people. If such a petition exists, I would appreciate receiving a copy, if it supports the inquiry that you have requested.

In my hands I have this petition. It is signed by 289 persons, but I must add to it that there was another petition at the senior citizens' home. A lady from the senior citizens' home phoned me and said she wanted to tell me of the action that happened at the home that day. There were over 200 names on the list. A member of council walked in, pulled it off the wall, tore it up and put it into the wastepaper basket. So with that, we would have close to 600 names taken in the last few days. I wish to table this.

No, Mr. Minister. How much do you want to do an inquiry? Do we have to get into this next week and go through all the documents here? Or are you going to call a judicial inquiry because you want what the people want? There was an interview done by one of the media in Kamsack yesterday. He even went into Arrow Petroleum where there is a cafe (Mr. Koturbash even owns it) and he interviewed the people, "What do you think about this situation?" And every last one said that they wanted a judicial inquiry to clear this up. There are only two or three people, I understand, who did not want a judicial inquiry — the councillors and one past mayor who was defeated by the new mayor. They are the only ones who don't want it.

You say that we are doing the damage to Kamsack. I reverse that on to you, Mr. Minister, and say that it's on your shoulders. If you do not call a judicial inquiry into the affairs of Kamsack, it's you, Mr. Minister who is completely responsible for the cloud that's out in Kamsack. You can clear it, and let the guilty suffer. Let the cards lay where they be. A member from here wants to get in.

**MR. BERTSON:** — The minister has maybe not seen the petition yet, but it has been tabled, and I'm sure it will be available to him. There are 200, almost 300, signatures on the petition supporting the actions of Mayor Mydonick asking for a judicial inquiry. The minister has said that if there could be support shown for the position of Mayor Mydonick he would call a judicial inquiry, and clear the cloud that is hanging over Kamsack. I think the minister is obliged to conduct an investigation. You nodded your head a while ago when I asked you if that selling of a 10 acre parcel of public land for \$1 was in contravention of the act. You nodded your head in agreement. I think that in itself is enough to cause you to have some sort of investigation launched in the town of Kamsack. You did say in a letter to Mayor Mydonick, on April 27, 1981 (I might add that this letter was written after we raised the matter in the House; we'll check the record), regarding your second point: two officials of the Saskatchewan urban affairs investigated the allegations made by W.T. Sasyniuk in his letter of September 10.

Also, section 15 of the act says that you are obligated to provide a report of any investigations to the mayor. Where is that report? If you conducted an investigation, you are under some obligation to provide that report to clear the individuals who stand accused, to remove the cloud from the town of Kamsack and to allow the local

functioning of local government. Local government today in Kamsack is virtually handcuffed because of the inaction of your department. You've had letter upon letter, upon phone call and telegram from many citizens, including two members of council and the mayor. What is it going to take for you to call a judicial inquiry into the activities of certain members of the town council of Kamsack. What is it going to take? The people in Kamsack are not happy about the situation here. They're bitter; they're suspicious; they don't know what's going on. The allegations have been made. There's only one course of action open to remove this cloud, to let the community of Kamsack get back to some form of normality. When can we expect your department to call for this judicial inquiry?

While I am on my feet, I want to point out that I questioned the minister earlier on the involvement of his department in the site approval of the airport at Kamsack. I think (if my memory serves me correctly) there was a \$45,000 grant from the Department of Highways to the airport site in the town of Kamsack.

I just had a call about 10 or 15 minutes ago from a Mr. Ken Morrison of Transport Canada in Winnipeg. He informs me that not only is the airport site in the town of Kamsack not approved by his department, but it's not licensed. It is operated by the Yorkton Flying Club and in fact, isn't a municipal airport. The only approval of an airport site by the Department of Transport was the site north of Kamsack that they approved in 1977.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — The two members have both talked and it seems to me that in all fairness they should now give me a chance to respond . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Their purpose is probably to talk out the clock.

**MR. BERTSON:** — The minister a while ago asked how you tie in Eagle Developments to members of council. There were two members of town council who were shareholders and directors of this closely held company called Eagle Developments. Eagle Developments owns property adjacent to the airport in the town of Kamsack. Councillors, who shot down the airport site that was approved by Transport Canada, sat on council while they made the decision to go ahead with the airport site in town. They own the property adjacent to the airport which was known to agriculture. This is the same piece of property that we were talking about some time ago. It cost the town of Kamsack upward of \$5,000. The original estimate, I might add, was \$9,000. Someone said there was an appeal filed to have the assessment reduced, but nobody can find a record of that appeal.

So, we have these two councillors sitting on city council who are also part of this closely held company, Eagle Developments. Airport here, Eagle Developments here. Why do you suppose those two particular councillors wanted the airport there? Why? They voted on every motion in council that affected Eagle Developments as it relates to the zoning and purchase of the land initially on the airport situation, and the denial of the site approved by Transport Canada.

How do we tie in Kamsack Manufacturing? The owner of Kamsack Manufacturing, who bought these 10 acres of land for \$1 happens to be a major shareholder in Eagle Developments, a closely held company. He also happens to be a major shareholder in Arrow Petroleum. He also happens to be a shareholder, along with these same two councillors in Woodland Developments (which is another story) . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Let me tell you that there's no particular party, including yours, that has a monopoly on the virtues of honesty and good sense.

I think those are fairly well spread out across all political lines except perhaps . . . I don't suppose that you've ever heard of Randy Konkin. He is one of the most honest and upstanding gentlemen I've ever met. He happens to be solid for you guys, except on this particular issue. It's all tied in. The member for Moose Jaw knows something about this. He can grasp it more quickly than most. Will you now, since it has been well-demonstrated by the petition, letters from the mayor, letters from citizens, phone calls and telegrams and by visits to the Premier (I don't know what else they have to do to get your attention to act on this matter), call a judicial inquiry?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Chairman, in respect of the petition . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order. I remind members of the rules of the Assembly which state:

If the Assembly is in committee of the whole or committee of finance, the ordinary time of daily adjournment is specified by rule 3.3.

The committee shall rise and the chairman of the committee shall report the committee's progress.

At the conclusion of the report, Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the Assembly without question put.

So it is my duty to inform the Assembly of that. However, if members wish to carry on for a few minutes and listen to the reply of the hon. minister, it's fine with me. Would it be agreed to do that?

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:03 p.m.