

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
February 23, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. RYBCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to the Assembly a group of grades 10 and 11 students from Cochrane High School, and that's situated in my constituency of Regina Victoria. They are accompanied by their teachers, John Maxim and Mrs. Hanson. I'd like to compliment them for their interest in this Assembly, and I hope their stay here will be both educational and enjoyable. I'll be meeting with them for pictures around 2:20.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

PCS Profit Picture for 1982

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labor, the chairman of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, you will be aware that in 1981 the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan had a profit of \$141 million — its fifth straight year with a profit picture. PCS also paid a \$50 million dividend to its shareholders, the people of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, for two years in a row. But I'd like to know from the minister today and I ask him to advise this legislature and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan what the record will be in 1982 during his first year as chairman of a very important public corporation. In other words, I'm asking the minister, what will be the 1982 profit picture for PCS, and how big a dividend is it likely to pay?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, we are just in the finalization of our financial statement for the end of 1982. We are having our potash board meeting on Monday, and I will be able to answer more fully at that time.

MR. KOSKIE: — As a supplemental, Mr. Speaker, I think that the minister will be aware that there were certain projections made in the potash corporation by the board of directors indicating the possible projection for 1982 for the potash corporation. But I want to ask the minister, will he advise this legislature, will he stand up in this House and deny as a fact that, as of May when he took over the operation of the potash corporation, it was in the profit picture of over \$20 million?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, many things have happened in the potash industry in the last 8 to 10 to 12 months. I'd like to remind the member opposite that starting in January last year, while your administration was still in place, that you were starting to run into the difficulties that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan entered into in 1982. Your inventories climbed to 1.1 million tonnes before we took over. You didn't have the guts to lay off your workers to reduce that inventory to a workable level. We inherited your problem.

It's been a very difficult year. We were not going to make the profit that you had projected in your March budget, by any means, and you wouldn't have been able to meet it either. The farmers around the world are not buying potash. It's as simple as that and we have taken a number of steps to try to increase and improve that position in 1983.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Certainly, I asked, as a supplemental, a specific question to the minister; whether or not he is prepared to stand up here and deny that when he took over the potash corporation as of May 1982 indeed the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan had a profit picture of \$20 million.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I'm not sure what the actual is, Mr. Speaker, as of April 26, but I know you did project \$150 million which I know that you would not have met. We are coming down to the final line on our statement and it will be tabled.

The other thing that I would like to say is that the PCS International question had a lot to do with the poor performance of the corporation this past year because the customers out there didn't know what was happening. The biggest market is the U.S. market. They have corn coming out of their ears. I don't care what you do, you're not going to force farmers to buy potash.

We are going to attack that and we have already started. We have moved the Atlanta office from Atlanta to Chicago. I don't know why it was in Atlanta in the first place other than it might have been a nice place to go and have a board meeting. We've got the office right in the middle of the market area right now. Sixty per cent of the U.S. sales is right around Chicago.

The other item is that your sales staff were on a salary, nothing tied to an incentive whatsoever. We have changed that. We've got a U.S. marketing man who is in charge of the sales now and we are projecting an increase in 1983 over what happened in 1982. I'm pleased to report that as January this year we were 25 per cent of what you were at in January of last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLAREN: — And on top of that, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce that we've just signed a 220,000-tonne order with China last week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — The minister gets up and constantly, again and again, talks about the troublesome child that he inherited. And I want to say to the minister that this obviously . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. The hon. member knows that in question period he is not able to make comments, but rather to ask questions, and I ask him to get on with the question.

MR. KOSKIE: — Agreed, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that with that in mind, what I already said but was ruled out of order (but keep that in mind), I want to say in view of that fact I would like the minister to indicate what was PCS's share of the total potash

market in 1982. And what was its share in the international sales, its share in the North American sales, and I want him to indicate how that compared with 1981.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I can give you the percentage as far as the American sales are concerned. I heard many, many comments on the radio, in the press, about this massive drop in market share, from 37 per cent down to 18 or 19.1. I want to advise you that never in the history of PCS have you been at 37 per cent. We've averaged 31, we're at about 27 this year, and we're aiming for at least a 5 per cent increase this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Do I understand the answer to the last question to mean that our share, the PCS share of sales to the United States market has dropped and dropped substantially from about 31 per cent to (in his own figure) 27 per cent? We have lost that much share of the market? Is that what you're saying?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, yes, that is true. And there are a number of reasons for that. There are American mines supplying potash in the United States. There's Russians hauling the stuff up the Mississippi Valley on barges selling it at a price, at anything they can get. There's American mines in Canada and the American people are looking after some of their people also, just the same way as Saskatchewan is trying to get Saskatchewan content in all the projects that we've got on the go. But we are attacking it. We feel that the area of the market was not addressed properly. As I said earlier, we are getting incentives for our salesmen and already the results are starting to show up.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the potash corporation. With respect to the last question, I clearly did not ask my question clearly enough for the minister to appreciate. I am asking not what our share of the American market is, but I am asking whether or not, of all the potash that goes from Saskatchewan to the American market far less of it is now being provided by PCS in 1982 than was provided by PCS in 1981. We are not keeping our share of the Saskatchewan potash sold in the United States. Is that true?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I think I just answered the question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I've already answered it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order. With the amount of commotion in the Chamber it's impossible for the minister to answer the question and to be heard, and I would ask the members to maintain decorum.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — The average marketing share that PCS has had in the American market is around 31 per cent. This year we supplied approximately 27 point some odd per cent to the American market. That is a drop of 4 per cent, 3 point something per cent. I don't know what more I can say.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, let me get the answer clear. When you say 31 per cent, you're talking about 31 per cent of the Saskatchewan potash that moves to the United States or 31 per cent of all the potash consumed in the United States?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — 31 per cent of what we had shipped of the potash sales to the United States.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, it is now clear, as the minister makes it clear, that of all the potash that moved from Saskatchewan to the United States our share is decreasing.

Now I want to direct a question to the minister with respect to Saskatchewan potash moving not to the United States but to other parts of the world, through Canpotex. Will the minister advise whether or not our share was previously approaching 55 per cent and is now just over 40 per cent? Are those figures about accurate?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, on the offshore market we are in the average of 43 to 45 per cent of the international market. The reason for that is that this past year the total potash industry in Saskatchewan is now in Canpotex. Two of the companies were not in last year.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I will ask this question again. What was the percentage of all Saskatchewan potash moving to offshore markets in 1981 — Canpotex plus the other two companies? And what is the total percentage of PCS potash now moving into international markets as it was in 1982? What were the 1981 and '82 figures?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice and get the accurate figures for the member opposite for tomorrow.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. He has made reference earlier to the large inventory. Would the minister concede that PCS has approximately 40 per cent of the productive capacity of the potash industry in Saskatchewan? And would he concede that when he became chairman PCS's inventory was no higher than 40 per cent of the total inventory held in Saskatchewan? Will he concede the point that while PCS's inventory went up, every other potash producer's inventory went up and that PCS did not have a larger inventory than other producers?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, PCS in Saskatchewan's inventories we want to have at a 400,000 to 500,000 tonne inventory level. The other companies in the province were not at that level at the time that we took over because they started their slowdown in November, in December, in January of 1981. And that is the reason why we had to have the layoffs this past year, because of that inventory up there. We could have slowed it down. We have to have it again later on this winter. We are going back to a three shift, and we're hopeful that we can carry this through through the balance of the year now with our sales projections and not have to have any more layoffs. But the other companies did slow down their production long before PCS did.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'll ask the question again. Mr. Minister, do you agree: one, that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has approximately 40 per cent of the productive capacity of the industry in Saskatchewan; and, two, that when you became chairman, the inventory of PCS was not more than 40 per cent of the total inventory held in Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Yes, we have about 40 per cent of the production capacity

which would be around 400,000 tonnes but the — just a minute, I'm getting my figures wrong here — 4 million tonnes. Okay. The 1.1 million would be about 20 per cent of production capacity for the year. I don't remember what the total inventory was of all the companies at that point in time.

MR. KOSKIE: — I would like to ask a question to the minister in charge of the potash corporation. Mr. Minister, as you will realize there has been some concern shown with respect to the continuing operation of the potash corporation in the present government, and this is evidenced by a request for a public inquiry. You have refused today to answer in detail many of the questions. You have refused to set up a public inquiry. It is my understanding that your way of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Does the hon. member have a question? I find that you are standing and making statements but not really asking questions. Would the member get to the question?

MR. KOSKIE: — Is it not a fact, Mr. Minister, that today you have in fact instructed your senior employees to call an informal press conference in Saskatoon to discuss the details of the operation of 1982 potash corporation and also the projection for 1983?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, all that I have done is called our regular board meeting for next Monday in Saskatoon.

MR. KOSKIE: — I'm going to be very specific. It is my information, Mr. Minister, that indeed the management has called a press conference, an informal press conference, to discuss the details of the operation of the potash corporation in '82 and in '83. Is that not in fact undertaken and have you not in fact, or your management in fact, contacted the reporters indeed in Saskatoon and other areas?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any informal press conference, or whatever, that has been called. All I know is that we're having a board meeting next Monday at 9:30.

SGI Rate Increases for 1983

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. My question is this: have you as chairman of Saskatchewan Government Insurance approved an application by SGI to the public utilities review commission for a rate increase in 1983?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — You're talking about the AAIA, I take it?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — An application by SGI to the public utilities review commission is what I'm talking about.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be a little careful in the way I reply to that question because the fact . . . Specifically, the way he put the question, the answer is no, SGI doesn't apply to the public utilities review commission.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister: does SGI administer the automobile accident insurance fund? And, if not, who does?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes. The answer to that question is yes, we administer the AAIA, The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister this: if an application is made to the public utilities review commission on behalf of the automobile accident insurance fund, who makes the application? Is it not made by SGI?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes, it's made by SGI on behalf of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. The hon. member knows the answer to every question that he has asked so far, Mr. Speaker, and I wish he would get to the point of his question.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, I know the answer to every question except the first one I asked, and it is this: have you, as chairman of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance, approved an application by SGI to the public utilities review commission for rate increases in 1983? And, I will accommodate the minister by saying by SGI on behalf of AAIA if he wishes me to say that.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a supplementary to the minister in charge of the SGI, the organization which administers the automobile accident insurance fund.

The question which I ask is this: how much of an increase in rates under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act was asked for by SGI on behalf of AAIA?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to answer that question. Yes, we have applied for a rate increase in the amount of 6.7 per cent.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of the SGI, which administers The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

My question is this: is the information on the nature of the application to the public utilities review commission available to the public at this time? Will the minister table the application made to the public utilities review commission? Will the minister make available to this House the nature of the application to the public utilities review commission?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Not at this point, Mr. Speaker.

TABLING OF SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: — The message from His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor reads:

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits further supplementary estimates of certain sums required for the service of the province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1983, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I move a motion, seconded by the House Leader:

That His Honor's message and supplementary estimates be referred to the committee of finance.

Motion agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Death of Arthur Thibault

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I would like to take the opportunity to advise the House of a sad piece of news.

I have been advised that Mr. Arthur Thibault, a member of this Assembly for the period from 1959 to 1978, died yesterday, and I know that members would join with me in extending sympathy to Mrs. Thibault and the family, and we'll have an opportunity to more formally do that at a later occasion.

I am advised that tentative arrangements for the funeral have been made for Saturday, this coming Saturday, the 26th, at Wakaw, at 10 a.m., and additional information will be available when further arrangements are clearer.

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, if I could join with the Leader of the Opposition in extending condolences to Mrs. Thibault, I had the pleasure of serving in the Assembly with Arthur Thibault from 1971 to 1978. His interest in, particularly, driver education and safety of vehicles was well known throughout the province. I hope to make arrangements to attend the funeral although I'm not quite certain that I will be available. I hope that in my absence if I'm not there the Leader of the Opposition and members will extend my condolences to Mrs. Thibault, and those of the government.

MR. BOUTIN: — Mr. Speaker, I, too, being a member for Kinistino have know Mr. Thibault well and would like to join the House. My condolences to them.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 2:31 p.m. His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave royal assent to the following bill:

Bill No. 62 — An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Prince Albert-Duck Lake

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 2:33 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Presentation of Newly Elected MLA

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to present to you Mr. Sidney Peter Dutchak, member for the constituency of Prince Albert-Duck Lake. He has taken the oath and signed the roll, and now claims the right to take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: — Let the hon. member take his seat.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MOTIONS

Leave of Absence — Member for Shellbrook-Torch River

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Before orders of the day, and with leave of the Assembly, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Finance:

That leave of absence be granted to the hon. member for Shellbrook-Torch River on and from March 7, 1983 to March 28, 1983 to attend on behalf of this Assembly the 32nd seminar on Westminster Parliamentary Practice and Procedure, organized by the United Kingdom branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Motion agreed to.

Referral to Communications Committee

MR. KATZMAN: — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to ask that the matter of taking still pictures of members in the House be referred to a standing committee on communications, moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

CONSUMER AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 4

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to introduce to this Assembly today the deputy minister of consumer and commercial affairs, Mr. Jeff Bugera, to my left; immediately behind me, Mr. Allan Higgs, who is the executive director of the commercial division; Mr. Al Dwyer, who is the director of administration for the department; and Mr. Mac MacGillivray, the acting rentalsman.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to say, initially, what I think will be my approach and I think, in varying degrees, the approach of many of my colleagues. I think, Mr. Chairman, we will not be examining the estimates as exhaustively at this point in time as we will be later in the spring when we are dealing with estimates in what will be the next session. I think it is fair to say the opposition caucus are unhappy with the way this government has managed their legislative program. We have met for two-week sessions on and off all year. I do not think a month

has gone by but what we have met, and we are just now getting to the estimates a few scant days before the government tells us they want to bring in a budget. We think that's no way to manage a government program.

It's no way to manage a legislative program. We asked for, and we were given, assurances that we would be called back in January to deal with estimates. Obviously, because this government felt it couldn't handle itself in the legislature during a by-election, obviously, because you people felt you would embarrass yourselves with some repeat of the Van Mulligen affair or whatever, you chose not to call the legislature until the day after the by-election, leaving us with what is clearly insufficient time to deal with the estimates.

I want to go on record as vehemently complaining about such cavalier treatment of a legislative program. Whether you people are prepared to admit it or not, this is an essential part of the process of government. I know when the members opposite were in opposition, you did not take your role seriously. I want to tell you that that is not the approach of this caucus. We take these estimates seriously. We want time to do them properly, and we feel cheated at the fashion in which you people have governed yourselves this last year.

Having said that, at this point in time it may not be appropriate for us to delay the estimates, and thus delay your budget. That is going to cause inconvenience and, in some cases, hardship to innocent people. In any event, we are dealing with estimates after the money is virtually all spent. By the end of next month, it will be all spent. So we expect you should be able to estimate your expenditures with some degree of accuracy if we don't soon get going.

I want to make that complaint. I want to just express the hope that it never happens again. I want to express the hope that from here on in we have time to deal with the estimates. I want to put you on warning that you will not find us as co-operative again. This is your first year in office. We expect that your first year in office may not be your best. I am sure you are hoping it isn't your best. Given all that, it is probably not appropriate to delay the budget by delaying the estimates. Therefore, in part to give you some allowance for inexperience, we are going to attempt to deal with the estimates in the time frame which you have made available to us. So I say again that we will not be dealing with your estimates as exhaustively at this point in time as we will in six weeks when, I assume, we will be back at it again. I think at this point in time we'll be dealing with what we believe to be the bare essentials.

With that in mind, I want to begin by asking the minister about the provincial mediation board. I want to ask the minister a series of questions, first one of which is: what is your staff level and how does that compare with the staff complement as of May 8, 1982?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, there are 19 positions on the provincial mediation board, the same number as last year.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are all of them full? Are all of them filled with incumbents?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — There are two vacancies presently, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Is it your intention to fill those as soon as suitable candidates can be found?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, they are filled in an acting capacity at this time by capable replacements.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Is it your intention to fill them with suitable candidates on a permanent basis as soon as such candidates can be found, or are those positions frozen?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, it will depend on our analysis of the workload. At the present time we find that the work is being carried on capably by the two people that are filling those positions in an acting capacity in the organization.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm just not sure I understand the minister. Do you have 17 people there and two of them filling these additional positions, or do you have 17 permanent and two temporary? How many people do you have at the provincial mediation board at the moment?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Again, Mr. Chairman, there are 19 positions, 17 are filled permanently. Two of those that are vacant are being filled on a temporary basis from persons seconded from other branches within the department.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are those two positions frozen then for the moment? Is that what you're telling me?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — No, they're not frozen; it's a management decision not to fill them at this time.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — This is not a treasury board decision, in other words.

Let me ask then about your ability to deal with inquiries for assistance. How timely are you dealing with inquiries for assistance? Are you able to keep up to date and deal with them in a timely fashion?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — At this point, the Saskatoon office is nearly current. Regina is current at this time in its caseload. There is a backlog in Prince Albert in existence at this time, and we hope that the Prince Albert backlog will be cleared up by the end of March.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, in a professional capacity, I've had some complaints — nothing that I regard as inordinate or obscene, but some complaints — about the backlog. I have an inquiry with respect to the provincial litigation board — it was leading up to it — and that is the Bankruptcy Act. There is a section of the Bankruptcy Act which gives an authority the power to make an arrangement among creditors for the settlement of debts. The difference in the authority granted by the Bankruptcy Act is that the board there can order the creditors to accept an arrangement, and there is an upper limit on the total volume of debts that can be dealt with and it's relatively low. That section, as I understand it, has never been proclaimed in Saskatchewan.

I was driving one morning listening to one of the open-line programs, and I heard a lawyer answering questions about debtors and the law. That individual stated that the section had not been proclaimed in Saskatchewan because there was inadequate staff to administer it. It strikes me that that section is one that is badly needed. In my

experience as a lawyer dealing with debtors and creditors, there is a crying need for some authority, a court or a provincial mediation board, which could order arrangements to be accepted by creditors and to be accepted by debtors. I'm wondering if that comment is accurate. Is that why that section has not been proclaimed? If it is accurate, has there been any consideration given to increasing your staff complement and proclaiming that section so that this badly needed service would be available in Saskatchewan, as it is in most other provinces?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, there has been no indication in the office, in the department, that we cannot handle any of these matters that have been brought to our attention. In fact, the acting rentalsman informs me that any situations of this type that have been brought to the office have been handled quite ably, so therefore in that light, we will not be increasing the staff load, particularly at this time of restraint, and at this time of need for streamlining.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm not sure that I made myself understood. This has little to do with rent controls. It has to do with debtors and creditors. The difference under the Bankruptcy Act is that the board would have the power to order creditors to accept the arrangements. One of the difficulties of the provincial mediation board which is frequently encountered is that creditors will not accept arrangements which are in the best interests of the debtor and often in their best interests. This section gives the provincial mediation board the power to order creditors to accept it. In my experience, it is a badly need power and I'm wondering why, and I ask you again, why has this section not been proclaimed and enforced in Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Well again, Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that we have been able to handle any problems that have come before us at this time without any problems. In regard to that particular section of the act that the hon. member refers to inside the Bankruptcy Act, I will have to get further information for you on that. I quite frankly don't know where it stands at this point.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm not going to make a big production over it. They may call the staff back before the public accounts committee and deal with it there. That may be a more appropriate form in which to deal with the problem rather than in estimates.

I say though, Mr. Minister — and I'll say it and leave it — that that power is badly needed. Your office is not able to handle the problems. The provincial mediation board does not have the power to authoritatively order creditors to accept the arrangements. This would give them that beneath a certain limit and it is badly needed. I wished your staff would get on with the job of proclaiming it.

We'll leave that for the moment and I want to pass a compliment on to you and that is with respect to the corporations branch. That branch is working well and I want to compliment those involved with it. It deals with matters expeditiously. It's efficient. It's relatively cheap now for people to deal with that branch and I want to congratulate your staff. I think I can fairly say that a former minister was involved in the reformation of that whole area so that area is working reasonably well.

I have a question with respect to the toxicology centre. You have a \$25,000 figure inserted here. Has that been spent, and if so, what has that been expended on?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes, Mr. Chairman and hon. member, I was pleased to attend opening ceremonies at the University of Saskatchewan last week at the opening of the

toxicology centre, and I was quite impressed with the people they have employed there, particularly the new director, and the direction they're going.

The Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs grant was \$25,000, which is part of a total \$200,000 grant from the province of Saskatchewan, I believe. Health contributed \$50,000, and agriculture \$50,000. Anyway, between five departments it amounted to \$200,000 from the Government of Saskatchewan.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The item in the estimates under cemeteries. I see some of the staff smiling. This is not a new problem. I notice there is a landslide business here in cemeteries. You've doubled your expenditures. I am wondering why the expenditures have been doubled. Are you taking over more cemeteries, or have your problems with the existing cemeteries become exacerbated by something or other?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — We currently, Mr. Chairman, operate three cemeteries in the Province of Saskatchewan — that is, the government does. Those three are: Moosomin, one at Weyburn, and the latest acquisition by the people of Saskatchewan was the Resthaven in Moose Jaw in September of 1981.

The reason for an increase in operating costs was an update of equipment, and we've met all outstanding commitments that we've had to in the operation of these cemeteries.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What is the government's policy with respect to cemeteries? Is it your intention to continue taking over cemeteries that are experiencing difficulty? What is your policy?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Well, it's certainly a matter of concern for the Government of Saskatchewan and this department, the operation of cemeteries in the province, Mr. Chairman. We're currently looking at the situation, reviewing it. I know that answer has been used many times, but we are reviewing our policy in regard to maintenance of cemeteries, and it is one of the priorities of the department to arrive at some suitable arrangement for the people of Saskatchewan in regard to operation of these cemeteries.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I guess it's a succinct translation of that is you don't have a policy on cemeteries, and are desperately thrashing around trying to find one. All I can say is I wish you good luck, Mr. Minister.

I want to get onto the area of rent controls. By way of background, let me say that I recall it was stated in *Public Accounts* that the average increase given to landlords over the past year or so was 13 and change — 13 point something. I would ask you to confirm that information, first before we go on.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — That is correct, Mr. Chairman. It is between 13 and 14 per cent.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I'm wondering why no attempt is made to have these people treated in an equitable fashion with wage earners? The Government of Canada has implemented a 6/5 program which has been imposed on the public sector. The private sector has been encouraged to follow it and most are, in my experience, particularly non-organized businesses I think are generally following the 6/5. You people have adopted a program which sounded different, but given a lower rate of

inflation is much the same.

I may say, in fairness to the federal government, whom we frequently pillory about their programs, they at least have suggested that all segments of government and all segments of society ought to adopt the guidelines. Why have you made no attempt to adopt the guidelines in the area of rent controls? Why are landlords, somehow or other, in a needier position than wage earners?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — It would be fair to say that we all regard rent control, at this time, as being a complex situation or issue if you want to call it that. This government certainly is cognizant of the fact that we've got to deal with concerns of both renters and landlords. In that light, last July we did convene a ministerial advisory committee to advise the minister and the department on the concerns of the renters and the landlords and other parties involved in the whole rental business. At this time we're very cognizant of the fact that we've got to look at the situation carefully.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that this government is following the rent control legislation as it was set up by the previous government. We are using the exact same formula that they used for many, many years. But, that doesn't preclude the fact that we recognize there may have to be some changes in the future.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, since the minister has gone into the history of the legislation, let me try to say . . . I was the minister in charge of that for some period of time. That act came into being in the last wage and price controls, which we had in 1975. At that time wages were controlled and prices were supposedly controlled to a given percentage, and at that point in time that's the way that legislation operated. All landlords in the province were given 6 per cent or 5 per cent of whatever it happened to be, but they all got the same. That isn't your system now. Now every landlord is dealt with individually and you are well above — in terms of your percentage increases — what you are giving everyone else. I am asking you how you consider that to be equitable. Wage earners are restricted to something above 6 per cent, modestly above 6 per cent, with landlords getting 13 per cent.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, again we recognize that there are inequities in the program. We also recognize that we are in a policy of CPI minus one. We are in the process again of reviewing rent control and how it affects many, many people in this province. We are working very hard at this time within the department, and through representations to renters and members of the rental industry, to formulate a program that is fair and equitable for both sides of this question. I'm hoping that in due course we'll bring a program in.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, you weren't nearly as indecisive when you were dealing with wage earners. There you were able to make up your mind that they got CPI minus one. Why the momentous degree of indecision when dealing with landlords? I have the uncomfortable feeling (and I'm sorry to exhibit a degree of cynicism), but I have the uncomfortable feeling that you're going to be studying this thing for some time to come. It's just been a habit of this government.

The Minister of Labor has been studying since last June a report that I understand is less than five pages long on the minimum wage.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Three wages.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Is it three pages? He's been reviewing it and studying it, and that poor man hasn't got over the three pages yet. In terms of its complexity, it's trifling compared with this. And I just wonder when you expect to complete your review. Will it be this year? This month? This decade? This millennium? When are you going to see the end of this review?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — In due course, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I take that to mean that we are not going to see any changes in this program in the foreseeable future. If there's some other interpretation I should be placing upon that comment, then I'll sit down and let the minister answer. Is that a fair interpretation? There are no changes in the foreseeable future.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, I can just repeat what I said before. We are reviewing the program and how we can best arrange it to suit everyone involved in the rental business, both renters and landlords. I can't put a definite time on it. We know that some changes are probably needed, but as far as the time limit is concerned, I can't give the hon. member a time frame on that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Let me ask you what the average rate of return you allow landlords is. What's the average rate of return you allow them on their equity?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, we don't consider a rate of return on equity.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — If you don't know what his rate of return is, how on earth would you know whether or not a landlord needs 13 per cent? Surely you must know what his rate of return on his investment is in order to allow him an increase. If he is making a very large return on his investment, I would think it's somewhat untoward that you'd allow him large increases. On the other hand, if he is making a very small rate of return on his investment, I would think that you may be able to make a stronger case. If you don't know what his rate of return is how on earth do you set him those increases?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Well I'm sure the hon. member is very familiar with what the rent control formula is, Mr. Chairman, but if he has forgotten it I'll go over it for him again. Point one is revenue versus operating costs. The costs of utilities and taxes, etc., are also taken into the formula. If a landlord has put improvements into his facility, the costs of those improvements are taken into consideration. And there is also the comparison factor. If one apartment block there is charging \$250 or \$350 for a one-bedroom apartment, a like apartment down the street in the same city should receive a like amount of rent. So it's determined by this formula that was drawn up by the previous administration, and this administration inherited it. Now we've gone along with it as best we can to this point in time. I've said we're willing, and we're having a look at it as to making it more equitable for both parties concerned.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — But, Mr. Minister, you are confirming the worst criticisms of the trade union movement and of others who object to wage controls. Because what you are doing is controlling wages and you are not making any attempt to control their prices. If you don't know what his rate of return is, you can't make any determination as to whether or not he really should get an increase.

You don't need to remind me of what the formula is. I know that by dint of painful experience, because the single most common cause of complaint in my MLA office

is the rentalsman and it is the size of the increase. And I hear this time and time again from senior citizens. "They give me 6.5 per cent on my pension, and they are increasing my rent by 13 per cent, and how is that fair?" And you can't answer that because you don't know what his rate of return is. You don't know whether he is making a lot of money or whether he is losing money.

The system you have was changed since the day that we had wage controls. It was designed in a time when there was no wage controls. And you are confirming the worst criticisms of the trade union movement and others who object to wage controls by controlling wages and not prices. Now surely you ought to change the system. Either know what their rate of return is, which might be difficult because I know some of them keep a fairly simple set of books (to be kind to them), or you ought to introduce an across-the-board increase which roughly complies with what wage earners are getting. Surely you can't answer that pensioner's question any better than I can when he say, "Now how is that fair?" I can't answer that. And if you can give me any help with it I'd really appreciate it.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, we are looking at the problem. I can assure the hon. member opposite that we are working on it. I can't give you a time frame. But I can assure the renters of Saskatchewan, particularly Saskatoon and Regina, that we will do our best to make it an equitable situation.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are you able to tell me whether or not you have as a goal to introduce legislation, or changes in the program during the next session of the legislature? Is that your goal? I won't even ask you if it is your intention. Is it a goal of yours?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — It's possible we may move that quickly, yes.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, it's possible there may be an earthquake in the middle of Regina. I wasn't wondering about possibilities. I was wondering about probabilities. Is it probable that you will introduce legislation in the next session?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — No, it's not probable, Mr. Chairman, it's possible.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's exactly what my constituents are saying to me, that it is not probable there will be any changes made and that's exactly what I was saying to you. And I say, Mr. Minister, that is a highly inequitable program and one that does you no credit. It does the government no credit, and it discredits the whole system of wage and price controls, when you make no effort to control prices. I know the complexity of it and I know the difficulty of it. I had the challenge of serving in Executive Council in a period of time when we had what was supposed to have been wage and price controls. But at least during that period of time in the '70s there was an effort to control prices. What you have just told me is that you are making no effort to control prices at all and the pensioners can just go hang themselves with their 6 per cent increase. And they have nowhere to turn except to eat less or to somehow or other save somewhere else on what is often a very meagre existence.

I want to get on to another area, Mr. Minister, and that is item pricing. I have never understood, I may say, your reason for the moves you took last year. And I would appreciate it if you would justify the changes you made in this area last year.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — I would remind the member that we did not make any

changes whatsoever. You set up a task force in January of 1980 or was it '81, to study the situation vis-à-vis item pricing. That task force was made up of five members. There was a member of the women's institute and the president of the Saskatchewan branch of the Consumers Association of Canada, two members from the industry — one from Federated Co-operatives and one from Westfair Foods — and the other was the deputy minister of consumer and commercial affairs at that time. The members of the task force, after several months of study, came back with a report that was not decisive. Two said, "Yes, legislation." Two said, "No, we don't want legislation." So we were left as a government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll come to that later. We were left as a government with making a decision.

After taking in all the input that we could from people far and wide across the province, we said that we weren't going to impose any more legislation on the people of Saskatchewan. If you look at Saskatchewan in terms of the other 10 provinces, we were the second — we were; I don't know if we still are — in terms of stacks and stacks of legislation across the country. We simply said we weren't prepared to legislate the industry into putting individual prices on items, if they chose to put in their electronic scanners and go with shelf labelling. We recognize that consumer price awareness does indeed go down a certain number of percentage points. And we do recognize, indeed, that there will be a saving in the long run for the consumers of Saskatchewan. The fact remains that each and every person who shops for a can of beans or a head of lettuce or a can of soup or whatever has the free choice, the free choice, the freedom to go to whichever grocery store they choose in this province. If they don't like the service that the co-op stores in Saskatoon or the co-op store in Prince Albert or the co-op stores in Regina are providing, they have the choice, the freedom to go wherever they wish. We have simply said that as a government we're not going to stick Big Brother's hand into this situation. The free market and the free choice will determine who has the business in the long run and that's where it lies.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I'll put it to you another way. You're not prepared to protect the consumer any more than you are prepared to protect the pensioner. Have you or have you not received a submission from the consumers' association with respect to item pricing? And if you have, what was the nature of that submission?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes, we have received a letter from the consumers' association of Saskatchewan indicating they were not at all happy with the decision. And that's to be expected because they were the ones that led the charge. In addition, I might add that as I referred to that task force before, two against and two for legislation, the fifth member, the former deputy minister of consumer and commercial affairs, wrote me a letter after the decision came down from the task force that she was not in favor of item pricing because she said it wouldn't work at this time. So if you really want to add the numbers up, it's three against individual item pricing or against legislation, and two for it.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I would be interested in your view of how a consumer is supposed to be able to shop comparatively in something like a grocery store. It's one thing in a store where you may be buying a small number of expensive items. Where a consumer is buying a large number of relatively inexpensive items such as in a grocery store, I am interested in your view as to how they are supposed to remember prices of many tens if not hundreds of items and shop comparatively. How do you expect the consumer to shop comparatively without item pricing? How do you expect them to remember all those prices?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, I certainly am not here to defend the grocery industry. It is not my intention to do that now or at any time in the future. I will say this, the department has been in consultation with the grocery industry to make sure that they maintain their shelf labelling at a proper size so young and old alike can see it. We will continue to meet with the industry and when we rendered our decision on this matter we said that we would continue to monitor the industry and if it proved that legislation was needed, well, there was that possibility that we would have to go ahead with it. But at this time we see no need to legislate the grocery industry.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I frankly don't see how a consumer is going to operate in the stores that you allow . . . Let me just say as well that I recommend to the minister a rereading of your statute and the purpose of your department. Your department's function is to regulate the commercial world and to protect consumers. That's what you're there for, and I ask you how you're doing that when you allow stores to take item pricing off the goods? How on earth is a consumer supposed to remember the price of items, a hundred or so items, and if they do and they are able to remember it from one shop to the next, how on earth does that consumer check on the accuracy of the information in the computer?

I think there are two concerns. One is that the consumer can't shop comparatively; two, that they can't check the accuracy of the information in the computer. Anybody who thinks computers aren't going to make any mistakes haven't been where I've been. I ask you, how do you suggest consumers shop comparatively without any pricing and how do you suggest that they check the accuracy of their bill?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Well, I don't do the grocery shopping in our family, although sometimes I think I should. But my wife has shopped at both types of stores and many other women that I have talked with have shopped at both types of stores. Now, I have had opinions on both sides. From the information I am given, the stores, the industry, that uses the scanners, provide a tape that says quite clearly, if I may use a brand name, Campbell's beans or whatever, 29 cents or 59 cents.

I don't know what a can of beans costs. But the tape does provide that information. The stores also provide a grease pencil. If you go in there, if you want to shop at that store, you can take the grease pencil, pull the can off the shelf and mark it on there as you wish. Then you also have the tape when you are through purchasing your groceries. You can take that tape home and run it across each item or you can do it before you go out the door of the grocery store.

It all boils down to the fact that the consumers of Saskatchewan have a choice as to what store they are going to shop in. There are only, at this point, 10 stores that I am aware of in Saskatchewan that use scanners. Now, that must leave thousands of others that still mark items individually. I doubt very, very much that in coming years a great many stores will go to scanners because they are costly to install. Usually only the large chains can afford to install them. The small corner store can't afford to install them at this point. It's just not cost efficient.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Minister, would it not be possible to conclude that in the stores that do have item pricing, the scanning devices, that consumers may be in a situation where they might shop wiser because of the fact that there's no item pricing as opposed

to stores that do utilize item pricing? Is that not a possibility?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Well, I'm not sure I understand the gist of your question. But I think the women that I have talked to say that, yes, they can shop just as wisely with a store that provides scanning equipment versus one that doesn't. They have all the information they need in front of them in the form of a large shelf label, in the form of the slip that comes out of the cash register at the end. They've also got the grease pencils they can use if they want to mark the individual price on the item as they do down the shelves.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I will not even bother commenting on the comments of the member for Moosomin. Let me just say (and I will leave this subject) that the slip does not contain Campbell's soup, 10 ounce tin. It simply does not contain that kind of information. I am going to leave the subject. Suffice it to say that it is apparent to anyone who has given the matter some thought that your decision may be in the best interest of the chains. It's not in the best interest of the consumers. That was certainly the view of the consumers' association.

I appreciate the corner store may not put in a scanner, although I have seen some with them in. But you are likely to run into them in the grocery stores which are chains where it is most difficult to comparatively shop, and where it is most important for many consumers to comparatively shop because they spend such a large percentage of their money inside the doors of that supermarket. So I will leave the subject by saying that I would hope that you would give it a little more active consideration than it's apparent that you are.

I want to get on to the subject of gambling. I want to ask you if there are . . . I understand the minister is not responsible for the "lotteries," not responsible for the Western, the interprovincial Super Loto. As I understand it, you are, however, responsible for licensing of gambling by individuals and by charitable institutions. You license charitable institutions to conduct gambling operations. You're not responsible for state lotteries.

I just ask you (and I don't intend to spend a long time on this) if there are any changes planned in the area of gambling, any changes in the regulations or in the policy with respect to gambling?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — The member opposite is probably aware that we in November did change policy to license charitable organizations to sell the break-open type of tickets. That is the only change that we have made since taking government. I do not contemplate any change in policy in the future. As far as this government is concerned — as far as I'm concerned as an individual — every dollar that is made from lotteries of one kind of gambling or another in this province should be returned to charitable purposes.

MR. KOSKIE: — Just on that point, Mr. Minister, you indicated that there has been a change of policies in respect to the instant-wins, I think, type of gambling. I'd like to ask whether or not you have included calcuttas, because that in fact was not licensed in the past.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — No, we have not included calcuttas.

MR. KOSKIE: — You indicated that you were not looking at any more particular changes

in the relaxation in respect to gambling. The other day I recall (it may have been) yourself indicating that Saskatoon would be able to set up a casino in the Centennial Auditorium and that casinos would be established that would help to finance the cost of operation. This is a statement that came out of government the other day, and I want to ask you to explain to us whether there is in fact a government policy relating to the establishment of casinos.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — At this time, no.

MR. KOSKIE: — Are you aware of any government statement in respect to the possibility of setting it up, and whether there was an announcement by government in respect to the establishment of a casino at the Centennial Auditorium in Saskatoon?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — I was recently asked that question, Mr. Chairman, and I indicated that any changes in gambling legislation or policy would have to come before this government. If indeed we did make any changes, it would have to fall in line with the criteria already set in terms of what charitable is. Now whether we define the Centennial Auditorium as charitable is something that will have to be determined in the regulations.

MR. KOSKIE: — Are you in fact then considering in respect to the extension to charitable and what will be included in the definition of a charitable organization the auditoriums? What I'm asking is are you in fact considering the auditoriums? What I'm asking you is: are you in fact reviewing, as a department, the possibility of the extension of casinos in this province, as they have in Alberta and Ontario to a very large extent?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — When the new government took over in May, when I became the minister for this department, there was already a committee in place of the deputies of consumer and commercial affairs and culture and youth, as well as the deputy of the attorney general's departments. They have been conducting an ongoing study as to where we should be going in terms of gambling policy, lottery policy and whatnot. I have not received any official report from them at this time, but I dare say that they've probably been approached or had representations made to them by the Centennial Auditorium in Saskatoon and the Centre of the Arts in Regina.

MR. KOSKIE: — Since you have extended the gambling rates to the instant-wins, is it possible for you to provide us with the regulations or the guidelines under which those are regulated? I know it will be generally the charitable organizations, but are there any limits as to the total amount that can be sold by a given organization? Is there any regulation which in fact governs, as it does with others, when you took over the department? Or have you just simply said that any organization, so-called charitable, can sell instant-wins when they want to and as much as they want to?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — The department would be amenable to supplying you with a copy of the regulations and you can peruse them and go through them at your leisure.

MR. KOSKIE: — The minister will be aware of the regulations. Could he just outline for the benefit of the House, in case there are further questions, sort of outline the guidelines which you adopted in introducing instant-wins?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — I'll quote some of the what we feel are the more, all right, charitable odds. Well a break-open first of all. A break-open means a lottery scheme in

which a predetermined number of cards are offered for sale at a predetermined price per card, and in which the purchaser wins a prize, if any, as determined by the combination of symbols revealed, or it could be a scratch-and-win. A charitable object or purpose is defined as any object or purpose for the relief of poverty, for education, for sports, recreation, cultural activities, the advancement of religion, or any other purpose beneficial to the community.

Proceeds. All net proceeds from a lottery must be used for a charitable object or purpose. As far as dates are concerned — you asked regarding dates — a licence for the sale of lottery tickets shall specify the date for the lottery and the date on which sale of tickets may begin. There shall be no sales outside the province. In regards to remuneration for sales, no person shall be paid directly or indirectly to manage or conduct a lottery. A local authority may issue a licence to a charitable organization to hold a lottery where the lottery consists only of a raffle, bingo, or guessing contest, or wheels of fortune at a carnival or a bazaar, etc., etc. You can read these just as capably as I can, I'm sure.

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to ask one other question. That of my colleague was a series of questions on item pricing. And you indicated in gloating terms that you weren't going to do any regulating. I'd like to indicate that during the term that your party was in opposition, the now Minister of Government Services and Revenue, Supply and Services introduced a private member's bill which in fact would introduce item pricing. I'd like to ask the minister if indeed he is aware of the position of his party in the past, and whether a discussion was made with the member who introduced the bill in order to get her now changed view on item pricing.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Well, that member did indeed introduce a private member's bill. I would rather she replied to this question than I, but I think she would respect the fact that this decision regarding item pricing, and legislation regarding it, was arrived at by consensus through Executive Council, and through caucus.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much. On the subject of gambling, is there any limit on the maximum prize at a break-open?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes, \$25,000.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — \$25,000 is the maximum of the total prizes in such a scheme. Is there any limit on the size of the individual prize which a person may find in the ticket?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — There is no limit on the ticket itself.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I think I just have one final question with respect to gambling. Is the department satisfied that the act is being enforced with respect to calcuttas, or are calcuttas still a problem? They were at one point in time. I am wondering whether or not these are still a problem for you.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — That's a matter for the Attorney General. It would be a violation of the Criminal Code, and the department does not deal with that matter.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — One question with respect to your office of your rentalsman in Saskatoon. It was alleged from a variety of sources, staff had been hired at the rentalsman's office in Saskatoon by contacting the Conservative office in Saskatoon. Did that or some facsimile of that occur?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — The temporary positions that were filled in the office of the rentalsman in Saskatoon were done in accordance with the guidelines that had been followed by the previous administration.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There seems to be an acoustics problem in the Chamber. The minister answered a question I didn't ask him. I asked you if staff were hired in the rentalsman's office in Saskatoon by contacting the Conservatives' office in Saskatoon, or some facsimile of that process?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — The criteria for the hiring of these persons had nothing to do with what their party affiliation was.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Did it have anything to do, and did it occur either directly or indirectly because of contacts with the Conservatives' office in Saskatoon?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — From the way I understand it, their curriculum vitae were on file with the new government. They were selected after the positions were freed by the public service commission.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's what I'm trying to find out. Where were they on file? It has been alleged (and not just by the opposition caucus) that they were on file at the Conservative office. That's where you got the appointees from.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — We continually review applications that are sent in to the department. They are put on file. When temporary positions such as these opened up, those files were drawn upon.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are any of those temporary employees still there?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes, they are.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — How temporary are these political wheel horses that you got from the Conservative office?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — I don't reply to his statement of political whatever he said. But I will reply to the question in regard to how they are going to stay there. I understand that temporary employees stay on for one year, and then at the end of that one-year period the positions are reviewed again. If those people are needed for the amount of work that is there, they will be kept on. That's the way it has been operating in the past; that's the way it will continue to operate.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are there vacant permanent positions which are not filled, whose work these temporary people are doing?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I'll leave the subject by saying I take the minister's highly evasive answers to be an admission that that did in fact occur. You and I don't seem to be able to communicate across the floor of this Chamber. You are answering questions I'm not asking. I don't expect I'm going to get you to answer the questions, because I don't suppose you could survive if you gave me an honest answer. So I take your highly evasive answers to be an admission that that did in fact occur.

I simply say it is further evidence of this government's utter lack of understanding of what a professional public service is and should be. I thought we had moved away from the days when governments sacked all the employees of the public service and filled them with as many appointees as they could. I thought we had moved away from that toward a more professional . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, that change was made on April 26. After April 26 we no longer in this province, I gather, have a professional public service. We have a different system now, and that is political appointees recommended through the Conservative Party offices, and that is . . . This was not an issue in a by-election. The 21st was irrelevant to the problem, and I may say that if you . . . I may say to the member for Moosomin . . . I'm utterly out of order.

Let me then say to the minister that you may want to communicate this to the member for Moosomin; that may be in order. Let me say to the minister that I sincerely hope you take the events of April 21 to be a blanket approval of everything you've done over the last year. I really hope that you believe, as the member for Moosomin believes, because if you really believe that, it's going to be a spectacular and a disastrous one-term government. I really hope you believe the principle just enunciated by the member for Moosomin: the events of April 21 can be a blanket approval of everything you've done. February 21.

I'm drawing to the end. I want some information. You may provide it in writing, and I want to say while the Minister of Government Services is here in the Chamber . . . I wish you would communicate to the Minister of Government Services, whose attention I simply cannot get, that I would have expected the answers to inquiries that we made in December from her in her estimates. I haven't got them. The Minister of Labor has given me the answer to his questions, and the Minister of Government Services has not, and I can tell you that we want those. We should have had them by now; we want them soon, and if we are put in the position of not getting answers, I can tell you that we simply will stop accepting written answers to questions, and you will have to have them on the spot.

This is a system which is designed for your convenience, not ours. It maximizes the convenience to the opposition if we get the answers right then and there. The system of allowing ministers to provide written answers is a convenience to them, and if it's going to be abused, then it is simply not going to be tolerated and we will expect all answers before we leave the estimates.

So I issue that as a warning.

I would like — you may provide this in writing, since this minister's record is as yet unblemished in providing written answers — the names and salaries of your personal staff, people who work in your office, your executive assistants, secretaries, special assistants. I'm not sure if you have an acting deputy or a deputy. In any case, I know the name of your present incumbent; I would like the salary. You may provide that in writing as well.

I would like to know how many people in the Department of Consumer Affairs were dismissed since May 8.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — I'm not sure I understand. Do you want that in writing passed

on to you, or do you want me to verbalize it here for you now?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'd like you to verbalize the answer to the last question: the dismisseees.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — The terminations were Wesley Ashwin, board member of the provincial mediation board, Saskatoon; William Costiuk, registrar of the Saskatchewan Securities Commission; Murray McConnell, board member, provincial mediation board; Vee Lynne Pearson, deputy minister; William Tait, chairman of the provincial mediation board, Regina.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes. Has there been anybody laid off then as distinct from dismissed? If it is short enough to be done verbally, would you give that to me verbally?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — No permanent positions have been laid off in the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. Some temporary people have been released.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Has anybody been transferred against their wishes?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Nobody was sent to P.A., eh? Do you have a public relations officer or some facsimile thereof, a PR officer or public relations officer on your personal staff? I understand some ministers do, some don't.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are you planning to obtain such an officer?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — At this point in time, no. That will be a decision that's probably arrived at through Executive Council.

MR. KOSKIE: — In respect to the list of names that you indicated that were in fact fired, it seems to me that on that list was another individual who received a fire notice and was subsequently rehired in the corporation's branch. I think you know who I'm talking about. I would like you to indicate how you arranged that little episode of first indicating a firing and then a rehiring.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — I would let the Deputy Premier answer that question if he's here.

MR. KOSKIE: — A minister in charge of a department, are you saying that an employee of your department was fired and then rehired and you're not prepared to indicate what transpired? Were you not in charge of it? Did you not have a part of it?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — It was an unfortunate error at the time. It was a mistake and it was rectified as soon as possible.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, would you indicate the nature of your mistake? I want to hear that. I'd like to know. I'd like the minister to indicate the nature of the mistake. Explain the situation, how it happened. You said it was a mistake. Why don't you explain it to the House?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — We recognize that an error was made, Mr. Chairman. I'm not prepared to expand on it any further than that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — This is related to item 1. I will be asking similar questions on similar items as we go through them. There is a relatively healthy increase, even for this profligate government, in this item. A quick calculation would suggest a 45 per cent increase. Part of that was budgeted for by the former administration, but not all of it. So, it was a healthy increase over what was budgeted by the former administration. I suppose if I had an opportunity to read the supplementary estimates, which I haven't yet, I'll find yet another overexpenditure, but for the moment I just ask you for an explanation for the increase.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — In regard to the increase, I'll go down the list for you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It would be satisfactory simply to send it over. It may be somewhat detailed, I don't know.

I think I could save us some time, Mr. Minister, if you would give me, as the Minister of Labor has so courteously done, promptly, an explanation for the increase in estimated '82-83 over estimated '81-82, and as well give me an explanation for the increase or decrease over the estimates tabled by the former administration last March — if you know what I'm referring to. Last March the former administration tabled estimates which gave the estimated '82-83 and the estimated '81-82. What I want is an explanation for the difference between what appears in this book and what appears in the estimates which we tabled last March. If you could give me an explanation for that on all items, budget items 1 to 14, I think that would be my last question.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — There was a 2.9 per cent increase over what the former administration proposed, amounting to \$154,280. Again, if you want me to pass on these details of what this increase involves, I will do that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What I'd like, Mr. Minister, is an explanation for increases or decreases, as the case may be, for each subvote; an explanation for the increase or decrease between estimated 1982-83 and estimated 1981-82, in your estimates; and an explanation for the decrease or increase over estimated 1982-83 in your estimates and estimated 1982-83 in the estimates tabled by the former administration last March. If I could get that undertaking, I'd sit down and we'd go on to co-ops.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — We'll provide that information for the member opposite.

MR. KOSKIE: — Since the minister apparently had nothing to do with the firing of the individual that was rehired, I just want a clarification whether he takes direct responsibility or whether it was the transition committee, headed by the Deputy Premier, which he was calling upon to answer, in respect to the firing of the deputy minister and the others which he indicated here today that were in fact fired.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — It was a decision of the new government. We're comfortable with the staff we have there now. We decided that changes were needed; they were made.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — This is my final comment. I take it that your undertaking to provide explanations for increases or decreases also covers any additional expenditure in the supplementary estimates. As I sat down, assuming that was my last question, I

opened up the supplementary estimates. I find out that this profligate government, I can call it none other, has another 116,000 in supplementary estimates in administrative services in its estimates (no. 2). Supplementary estimates (no. 3) have another 93,000 in it. So I assume that you'll be providing explanations for the entire lump sum, whatever it may wind up at. There may be a supplementary 5 and 6 before we get this budget passed.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — In that we don't have the budget approved, we've had to operate on special warrants, so that's the explanation.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I just hope your undertaking to provide explanations for the increases also covers the supplementary estimates.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — If there are discrepancies in the increases or decreases, we'll provide the explanation for it in the material that will be provided by the director of administration.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Item 9

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, I wonder, if you have the figures on a calendar-year basis, you can give any indication of what's happening in the registration of corporations? I'm not looking particularly for detailed ones for '81-82 but in calendar '82 how did it compare with calendar '81 in incorporations?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Referring to the statistical summary of the annual report for '81-82, on page 8, for new business corporations registered, the fiscal year ending March 31, 1980, there were 4,864; the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, 5,087; the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982, 4,221.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — In 1983, the year for which we are voting the money, what's calendar '82 look like?

Mr. Chairman, while the minister can't obviously give me the figures up until the end of March, can he give me the approximate figures up to the end of, say, December? How are things going?

Items 9 and 10 agreed to.

Item 11

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister to provide me with a list, with a simple table, not now but later, of the filings of prospectuses under The Securities Act for calendar year '81 and calendar year '82, or some similar period, the 12 months ending on January 31 or whatever is reasonable from the figures. And also a simple tabulation of the number of brokers, broker dealers, etc., and the number of salesmen.

Item 11 agreed to.

Items 12 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 4 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)
CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE
CONSUMER AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 4

Item 1

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, and I really direct this to the chairman, but I'll ask the minister in proper form. We have dealt with the main estimates for 1983. We will in due course deal with the supplementary estimates for 1982. We do not need, as I understand it, to deal with the supplementary estimates (no. 1) for 1983 because they are subsumed by the main estimates. And we have now called supplementary estimates (no. 3). Do we need to deal with supplementary estimates (no. 2)? This blue book. I understand that we do but I do not fully understand it. All this is unprecedented, may I say.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — No, we don't deal with that at this time because we don't have our budget for the coming year. We are operating on special warrants. Does that satisfy the member?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Let me try to clear my head. You'll all sympathize with the problem. All right. We are going to vote \$5,396,000 which is listed here. Added to that we are going to vote the \$95,000 which we just voted — \$93,000, I'm sorry — which appears in supplementary estimates (no. 3).

I am asking: is the minister wanting us to vote any more money, i.e., does the minister want us to vote the \$1,107,820 contained in supplementary estimates (no. 2), or is that already included in some other document and is it already included in the totals which we have voted?

I understand it then that the big book of main estimates, the totals therein contained, include the totals which are set out in supplementary estimates (no. 1) and supplementary estimates (no. 2), the two blue books, but not the sums included in the supplementary estimates (no. 3) — the white book. Accordingly all we need to deal with for the year ended 1983 is the big blue book and this white book entitled Supplementary Estimates (No. 3). We also will, of course, deal with supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ended in 1982, but that's the normal thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — That is correct.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 4 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

CONSUMER AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 4

Items 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 4 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

CO-OPERATION AND CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 6

Item 1

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes, it is my pleasure to introduce the deputy minister of co-operation and co-operative development, Mr. Dale Folstad. To my right, the director of administration in the department, Mr. Don Trew.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Having said I would deal expeditiously with the estimates of the department of consumer affairs, I proceeded to take two hours. I will try much harder to be a little more concise this time.

I put the minister on his guard that I'm going to have a go in the spring over the future directions of this department. I have some dark suspicions about the future of the department, but I am not going to deal with those at the moment.

I wonder if you would tell me whether or not you have any plans to expand the department, and if not, do you have any plans to restrict the operation of the department perhaps by transferring functions of this department elsewhere?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — We have no plans to expand the department at this time, and no plans to restrict it. Was it your question? No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I wonder if the minister could give me the number of new co-operatives formed in the '81 year — I think this is done by calendar year — and the number of new co-ops set up in '82.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — In the year ending March 31, 1982, 142 new co-operatives were incorporated, with a year-end total of 1,236.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — An estimate of this year's incorporations.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — April 1, 1982 to November 30, '82, there were an additional 92 incorporations, and there have been several since that time. I don't have the exact figure.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Have there been any changes in the area of policy, research or planning since May 8, 1982, and whatever the answer, are there any plans for any

future changes with respect to this branch?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Policy and planning is still an integral important part of the Department of Co-operation where we had a separate and distinct policy and planning program before. Now we have integrated it with the development branch where we feel the policy and planning people can be more directly involved with the actual operation and therefore do a more complete job.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Did the integration, as you put it, result in any deletion of any positions? Did it result in any layoffs or any positions not filled?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — A copy of the reorganization, as I'm sure you're quite aware, was delivered to Mr. Blakeney's chief of staff at the request of the deputy minister, and that explains in detail the reorganization process that has taken place in the department of co-ops.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I'm not sure that's an adequate substitute for the estimates process in the House. I ask you again: were there any positions deleted as a result of the integration? Any layoffs? Any fewer warm bodies trotting into the building each morning as a result of this integration?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — In the reorganization process there were 15 positions eliminated; two permanent positions were created, leaving 13 positions the net effect, in terms of human resources. It is my understanding that all of those people that were affected in this reorganization have been found other positions, some within government and some without. I might add that of the permanent positions that were eliminated, the people involved were given four months notice. In the temporary positions, they were given 24 days notice.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, in other words what you did was abolish planning and research. You may call it, Mr. Minister, an integration but you did away with the positions, and you now say it's being handled by development, and that is a very different responsibility. The development people are the people who liaise directly with the public. You know that policy and research are at the opposite end of the whole system. So I say to you, Mr. Minister, what you've done is abolished policy, research and planning.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — We have not done away with policy and planning, and as I indicated, there are two new positions created in the co-op development branch to take up policy and planning direction. We feel that to be effective, operational policies and program initiation should be tightly linked to the area responsible for their delivery. Formerly the policy and planning and program co-ordination branch performed this function. It will be carried on now within the development branch.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, as I say, I'm not going to take a lot of time at it now. But I see this, Mr. Minister, as the nose of the camel. The former Liberal administration did not repeal the act, but came very close to abolishing the department, by transferring functions, integrating, amalgamating, all the processes you are. And by 1971, there was very little left of this department. It was a mere shadow of its former self. And I suggest, Mr. Minister, you are in the process of doing exactly the same thing. As I say, I don't intend to go through it exhaustively now, but I warn you that we're going to have a go at this in the spring. And I'm going to be a little more difficult to satisfy when you

suggest that same work is being carried on by 13 fewer bodies.

Do the same comments apply with respect to education? Has this been integrated in some fashion?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, I want to reply to the last statement of the member opposite. Since this government took office in early May, we have made a point of establishing lines of communication with the leaders of the co-op sector in this province. And you know as well as I that the central co-ops, or federated, the wheat pool, The Co-operators, co-op college, and Credit Union Central, they have told us in no uncertain terms, “Look, these are tough economic times across the country. We have had to make cuts on our staff.” I used to be an employee of federated co-op. They had to become lean and hungry. In effect, I believe they deleted some 60 positions or more. This was an economic fact that they had to deal with.

They told us, “Department of co-operation, you have to do the same type of thing.” We have addressed that situation without affecting people personally. As I indicated earlier we have deleted some 13 positions — 15 rather, two of them re-created — so 13 in effect, net. All of those people have been found new positions either within government or without. They were given four months notice, the permanent positions. We have dealt fairly and we have dealt squarely with them. This government is not going to abolish the department of co-ops, if that’s what you’re alluding to. We recognize the co-operative sector as being important. They have good leadership. They have good people. And they have asked us to be lean, to be efficient, and to be productive. And this is what we’re doing.

We’re not using co-ops as a political football, as the former administration did. They say they want to be treated as equals. We will treat them as equals.

Now, as to your question of the education services branch. Education services has been amalgamated with administration services under the capable leadership of Don Trew who I have every confidence in. We will provide those services to the co-operative sector of this province without any lessening of effectiveness. But we’re doing it with fewer dollars. That’s what the people of Saskatchewan want. That’s what the people of the co-op sector have told us.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are you doing it with fewer people?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — How many?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Only the director position, Mr. Chairman, has been terminated.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — So you had two positions. You terminated one. Do I understand that correctly?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — No.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, then, how many positions did you have? I am wondering. You terminated one. That’s one of how many?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — There are presently three permanent positions in the education area plus three seconded positions, which are teachers.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Now, I want to turn to another one of your all-absorbing interests, and that's natives. I gather that the native unit was abolished. What was that "integrated with"?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — The native unit, Mr. Chairman, was integrated with the development branch. It is fulfilling the needs of the development of native co-operatives in the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Have there been any positions abolished? If so, how many?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Three temporary positions were dropped in the native unit and one permanent was added.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — With respect to the co-op guarantee board, in the year under review and up until February 1, 1983, was there any default made in any of the loans? If so, let me say that I will accept an answer in writing to the following, because we just simply don't have time to deal with it: has there been any default made in any of the loans? If so, has the co-op as a board or any lending institution taken any steps to realize upon security, any security? Has the co-op guarantee board been asked to pay out any sums which were not repaid? In other words I want to know the state of the outstanding loans with the co-op guarantee board. Given the time, I'd accept that in writing.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes, we'll provide that in writing.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'm coming to the end of this. I asked you as Minister of Consumer Affairs for details of your personal staff. I'd repeat the question here. Now the answer may simply be the same. You may have intended to give me . . . you may not have any different change from within your office between personal staff which are in consumer affairs and those in co-ops. But I would ask that the answer I get cover all your personal staff whether they relate to consumer affairs or co-ops. I'd ask to get the name of your deputy; I'd ask for the salary of your deputy (provide that in writing if you like). I'd ask for the names of any who have been dismissed from your department and the salaries. That may be partially included in this memorandum from Mr. Folstad; it may be entirely in there, and the names of any people who have been laid off. I'd also ask that you provide me with the same information on any increases or decreases . . . I'd better restate the question since it was different officials. I would ask for your undertaking that you provide me with an explanation for any increases between estimated '82-83 and estimated '81-82 in the estimates which you tabled, and any explanation for any increases or decreases, any changes — any explanation for any increases or decreases between '82-83 as contained in your estimates and '82-83 as contained in the estimates which were filed last March by the former administration. I'd like to have you your undertaking for those matters. That would conclude my questions on your estimates, given the hour.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes, we'll provide that information.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want to direct one question to you, Mr. Minister. In respect to item 7, there are grants to credit unions for assistance to low-income borrowers. That's item 7 and I'll just have one question in respect to that. I note that the amount from the

estimate in 1981-82 and the estimate in '82-83 is down considerably. I just wonder whether you feel that this service is not needed, whether there is a reduced emphasis on that service, or whether in the previous year the amount was not spent?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — The Prince Albert Credit Union and the St. Mary's Credit Union in Saskatoon dropped out of the program because they found it wasn't being utilized. Thus the decrease in the amounts.

MR. KOSKIE: — One final question. There was a program in the Department of Social Services where a funding was done to a local community group, say in Moose Jaw or in Regina, and a grant was provided to assist low-income people file their income tax without charge. In questioning during the House, as I recall, this program was being discontinued by the Department of Social Services, and we were led to believe by the Minister of Social Services that in fact this type of provision for assistance would be taken up by the Department of Consumer Affairs. And I just wonder whether in fact that has been done, to provide a service which was previously being provided by the Department of Social Services.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Chairman, that is a question that should have properly been asked during the estimates of the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. It has nothing to do with co-operatives.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 6 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

CO-OPERATION AND CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Vote 64

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 64 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

CO-OPERATION AND CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 6

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 6 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

CO-OPERATION AND CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 6

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 6 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

THE SASKATCHEWAN RESEARCH COUNCIL

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 35

Item 1

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Frankly, I wasn't quite anticipating this. I'm just simply going to ask for the kind of information I asked for on the other departments. He can provide it in writing. The name and salary of your permanent head. The names of anyone who was dismissed. The name and position of anyone who was laid off. An explanation for any increases or decreases between estimated '82-83 and estimated '81-82 in your estimates. An explanation for any increase or decrease between estimated '82-83 in your estimates, and the estimates in this text which was filed by the former administration last March. If we had that, I think we would let it go for now and pick up the pieces, and pick it up again in a much more thorough and vigorous fashion in the spring.

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Yes, I'll see that the member opposite is supplied with that information.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 35 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

THE SASKATCHEWAN RESEARCH COUNCIL

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 35.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 35 agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m.