

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 11, 1983**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**Standing Committee on Estimates**

**The Clerk:** — Mr. Sutor, from the standing committee on estimates, presents the second report of the said committee which is as follows:

Your committee considered and adopted the following resolutions respecting interim supply.

1. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$237,060 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1984.
2. Resolved, that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain sums, expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, '84, the sum of \$237,060 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.
3. Resolved, that this committee recommends that upon concurrence in the committee's report the sums as reported and approved shall be included in the appropriation bill for consideration by the Legislative Assembly.

**Mr. Sutor:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member from Saltcoats:

That the second report of the standing committee on estimates be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

**QUESTIONS**

**Funding for Community Switchboard**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services. Over the weekend it came to light that a group known as community Switchboard, in Regina, had had their funding cut. I wonder if the minister would confirm or deny this report for the Assembly and for the people of the province — whether or not in fact funding to this group in Regina has been eliminated?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, funding to this particular group, as a whole, has been done away with. But some of the services, particularly the switchboard service, which is a service to the deaf people of this province, has been continued. And in Regina that will be taken up by mobile crisis centre, and in Saskatoon, crisis intervention and SHIP (Saskatchewan Hearing Impaired Program) will share the

delivery of that service to the deaf people.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. As the minister will know, about 12 people were involved in Community Switchboard, I believe six permanent and six part time. Can you tell me how much the budget of mobile crisis has been increased — that community group — to allow for the hiring of that kind of staff to take place of the cancellation of a program which last year, by your own numbers that you sent to me, got \$110,000 to provide a telewriter line for the Regina deaf community?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't have the specific figures with me today and I'll have to take notice of the question for the member from Shaunavon.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Social Services. And my question is: what is it that is being carried on by the other agencies that you referred to? Is that just the service for the deaf, or is it all of the services which Community Switchboard provided?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — The Community Switchboard basically offered a service of information referral and the switchboard. The switchboard is going to be picked up by the agencies that I said to the previous question. Those agencies also have information and referral services, and when we did the overall review of the NGO (non-governmental organizations) sector, the whole question of duplication was a priority to be answered, and we felt that given the restraint, the period that we're in, that this was one way of maintaining a very vital, essential, direct service, without watering down that aspect of it.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Is the minister suggesting that the referral service is going to be carried on by the other agencies, or are you admitting that that service will simply not be available to the people who use the private social service agencies?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the member from Regina Centre means when he says the whole issue of referral of service. Many of our community agencies do referral. There's many numbers out there to telephone, and I'm the first to admit that often there are so many that it becomes confusing to the user. But, nevertheless, the question has to be answered: what is uppermost in maintaining a service in a period of restraint? And we have elected to go the matter of the switchboard, the service for the deaf. It's a direct service and it is an essential service; there is no other service. And I might add, to date that service is only available for Regina and Saskatoon and not for any of our citizens who are deaf and living in rural areas or other centres of this province.

To come back to the issue of the referral, we have a provincial inquiry centre. Many of the referrals that come in, the questions for information, often do with government programs. There is also a human service directory that is there for the public to utilize.

**Mr. Shillington:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Are you suggesting that the Provincial Inquiry Centre will have information about private social agencies to the same extent as Community Switchboard did? Are you suggesting that that is what my constituents are supposed to do: to call the Provincial Inquiry Centre when they want information on private social agencies?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I did not suggest that that is all they would do.

What I said is there is a network already in place. Many people that phone community agencies often phone on government programs. We have a provincial inquiry centre for that. Certainly they will be phoning for other community agencies, but there's also a telephone book with many of them listed. The sexual assault lines are publicized very widely. The issue of transition houses are often publicized. And if it's a crisis situation that you're in, the telephone number for Regina is right there — mobile crisis intervention.

**Mr. Shillington:** — A new question, Mr. Speaker, I can't believe the minister is so isolated from her clientele that she believes that between the Provincial Inquiry Centre and the Regina telephone book that my constituents are going to make do. The problem, Madam Minister, is that many of these people have a problem, they know there's someone to help, and they just don't know who to go to or where to ask. I am asking you: who do my constituents call who have a problem but they don't know who to go to? Who do they call? They used to call the Community Switchboard. What's the number now that they call?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps at this point in time if the member thinks I am isolated that they call him, their MLA.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### **Funding for Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services. In a previous answer, she mentioned that she had done a study and review of the non-governmental organizations and had come up with a list or some rearrangement of governmental groups in making these decisions, and if so, which groups were involved, and if it was a study, whether or not a copy of that can be made available to the people of the province who ultimately paid for it?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that we ever said we conducted a study on the NGO sector. I did say that we had reviewed and studied. To study is quite different than to commission a study to be done. We reviewed it over the past year, and I think I've stated many times in this House before that it wasn't an easy task. Nobody ever admitted that it was going to be, but it had to be done, given the period of time that we are in, and that is one of restraint and slow recovery, and it is going to be slow. It's not going to be fast. Realistically, we have stood up and we said, 'We admit this; we know this, so how are we going to deal best in order to maintain a safety net out there for the people that need it most? How are we going to deliver a system so that it is a direct delivery system as opposed to perhaps the advocacy and the co-ordinating of administration network?' We elected to go the direct service.

Now, in the review, we came up with direct essential service, and that was not done in isolation of the NGO sector. And when I say the NGO sector, I do not mean just SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies), and if the member would like to come to my office, we'll sit down and we'll go over my calendar for the past year: the number of people, community agencies, community boards, town councils, United Way people form the volunteer sector, at the grass roots community, who have had a great difficult time in trying to set some priorities for themselves, too. Their problems that they are facing are no different than what my

department has had to face this year, and we have sat down, and we have talked about that together, and we have agreed it is essential that the direct essential safety net of services be there for the people.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Of course the groups are having a great deal of difficulty making a go of it because you won't give them any money. Your problem is that you can't get money out of finance minister . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order please. The member rose to his feet and asked for a supplementary, and he is making a statement. I would ask the member to come directly to his question.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a follow-up question. In light of the fact that the minister failed totally to answer the previous question asked, what I was asking is who you consulted in this decision to cut a great number of community groups. You have said that you met with and spoke to a good number of people. What I want is a list of the groups who you consulted on these cut-backs and what their opinions were. You're making it sound like they agreed with it, and if that's true I would like a list of those groups you consulted and spoke to who helped you make this decision.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — I'm not sure what the question was. I prefer them more direct. You're quite welcome to my calendar over the past year as to the number of groups that I have met with. The issues were discussed, and if at any time you're wondering, did I say to them (and let's use the fair deal tax service as an example) . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's correct, they haven't. But in my previous meetings with that particular group where they were involved, I had indicated to them at that time that there was going to be some very difficult, painful, hard decisions that were going to have to be made.

Mr. Speaker, the chatter from the opposition reminds me of my days when I was in the child-rearing occupation, and we had a child that would continually talk, interrupt, for whatever reason, and we . . . What do you think we called him? 'Motor mouth,' until he grew out of it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order please. I don't think those comments referred anything to the question.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. You're right; they didn't. The consultation and talking with people did take place. I will give you a copy of my calendar and you can look at the groups that I have met with. I think it comes out to about 59 since probably the first of June, and if you want to zero in on the NGOs out of those, that's fine also.

### **Funding Cuts to By Ourselves**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Health. Over the weekend we learned that a group known as By Ourselves, a group of people who have mental problems, have gotten together to serve the community needs of a group of people, a large number of people in the city of Regina and elsewhere in the province. It has come to light that that group has had their funding cut totally by the Department of Health, and I wonder if the minister will confirm or deny that this group, who maybe aren't that popular as a group in Saskatchewan, and defenceless, whether or not their funding has been totally cut by his department?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take exception to the words of the

member opposite indicating that there's certain people out there in Saskatchewan that aren't that popular. That may be your interpretation, sir, but it certainly isn't the interpretation of this government.

Now let me explain to you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you would be quiet for a moment I might just tell you the answer. If you're willing to listen, you'll get the answer. If you want to chatter just keep chattering; the choice is yours.

I want to tell you that there are decisions that have to be made, as my colleague, the Minister of Social Services, said. It is true that By Ourselves this year will not be funded.

But I want to say at the same time, and I want to say at the same time, and I'll say it twice so that you understand and don't get it wrong, that I am going to visit some areas in North America within the very near future, Mr. Speaker, to see how the delivery to people in this category is performed, is probably one of the best areas in this continent. That's where I'm going to see how we can better deliver services to these people, and I can assure you that this government on this side of the House will come back and institute a program far in excess of anything you ever did in the last 10 years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — A new question, Mr. Speaker. Let me remind you, Mr. Minister, that you found money to give the doctors a 6 per cent increase, and you have cut the services available to the mentally ill. I ask you what kind of priorities you have to cut the services available to mentally ill and give the doctors an increase in salary? How do you justify leaving these people without any services?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Once again, Mr. Speaker, the opposition is wrong in their facts. It wasn't 6 per cent; it was 5.75 per cent to the medical profession. I think that is a very reasonable . . . And I congratulate the doctors of this province for accepting that type of a settlement in this year of restraint.

The member opposite tries again to mislead this House, to mislead the people of Saskatchewan, by saying 'vast numbers of people.' By Ourselves, was one group of people in Regina, Mr. Speaker. I think they were funded to \$5,000. I said previously to the other member and I say it again: that I am going to investigate some of the most up-to-date delivery services, health services to people with psychiatric provinces in this continent. And we will come back from that and we will bring in programs that are an added benefit to these people.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Supplementary. Is the minister telling us that you believed the services of By Ourselves to be superfluous to the mentally ill? Is that what you're telling us?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — I don't know, again, how you interpret. I did not say that at all. I said it was one aspect of the delivery on a much broader scale. I am going to look at that total delivery of services by this government and this health department to the people with mental problems. And I can assure you again, and I'll say it for the third time within three minutes, that that will result in an improved program. Bear with me, my friend. Listen, watch and learn something.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Question to the Minister of Health. Is he attempting to tell the people of the province that the way he is going to improve the care for mental patients

and people who have mental problems is by cutting programs? Is this the new, improved, number one system that he talked about so much prior to the election?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, again I will indicate to the member opposite that I think the new, improved system is \$70 million more in this budget than last budget. I think the new improved system again is \$17 million to cancer services that were neglected by their government over the last ten years. Those are two evidences of improved service and when we assess and come down with the new program for the mentally ill it will be of the same magnitude.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **Nursing Home Beds in Saskatoon**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Health. I have here a news report which is headed, 'Nursing Home Bed Numbers Frozen in the City,' referring to Saskatoon. When the minister took over the Department of Health, and he will be aware that there was a proposal to build 144 beds in Saskatoon, nursing home beds. I wonder if he could inform us whether or not this plan to build that facility is now been scrapped by this government?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, there is no intention to scrap that plan. I want to inform the ministers again, as a government that listens to the people, tonight at 5 o'clock I am leaving for the Saskatchewan association of special home care's convention. I just inherited this part of health delivery service, as you know, the first of this month. I am going to visit with them over the next few days and, in consultation with those people, who are the boards who are delivering the service, I can assure you, once again, that we will come up with plans and delivery models — just watch the paper and listen to the radio, boys — that will be more acceptable to the people of Saskatchewan, and furthermore satisfy the vast need that you left this province in.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. As he will know, the waiting list in nursing homes in Saskatoon has increased since you became Minister of Health and since your government took over. The average waiting list for level 4 beds is now about two and one-half years in the city of Saskatoon. And what I would like to know is when you will be meeting your commitment that you made to the people of the province before April 26th, '82, that you would take care of the nursing home problem, when by every indication the problem has gotten much worse.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I think for anyone to ascertain and find out what should be done, you go and talk to the actors and the people in the scene, and that's what I'm doing tonight. I want to assure the people of Saskatchewan and the members opposite, though, that the plan that we will come up with will be a sincere plan that we can develop, and not as you did in last April, go around and promise them all across the province of Saskatchewan, playing on the people who need nursing home accommodation. And you were the minister at the time, and that's exactly what you did.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. As proof of his goodwill to the people of Saskatchewan, I would like to inform them that last year this government promised six . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. This is not a time for giving of information, but rather a time for asking questions. If the member has a question, get directly to it.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Health is whether or not he will agree that in this year's budget, nursing home construction, there has been a decrease of 30 per cent in the budget of nursing home construction from this time in this year, as to what you had in last year's budget — a cut from \$4 million, or to \$4 million from \$6 million in nursing home construction?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Would you clarify this? Is this our budget this time, and our last budget, or your fudged budget that you had in April?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, this will be the Conservatives' fudged budget, where last year you promised 6.4 million in Social Services for nursing home construction. And this year (in case you haven't read your own budget), it's \$4 million, a decrease of 2.4 million.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — As you realize, I've just taken over this portfolio, but my colleague and good friend who was the minister in charge of this before, tells me there is 2 million in that budget for enriched staffing, and I think that is a service to the people in those homes. And if there's that need for new staffing, again, one goes back and says, 'I wonder' what the situation was like there three years ago, four years ago, as late as 10 years ago?'

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, that's fine about the staffing. But the question was on the funding of nursing home construction, to get back to the question. Is it true that there is a cut from 6.4 million in last year's budget — your budget — to 4 million this year in your budget?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — I would just have to take . . . I don't have the figure right in my mind. I will check, and I will report back to you. But I want to say once again that we will, and we are committed to delivering what we say we will. And that's the difference. We will build the nursing homes that we can. But I think that's a commitment that the people of Saskatchewan want and respect. And that's a commitment I make today.

### **Grant Cuts for Credit Unions**

**Mr. Shillington:** — The minister mentioned the responsible promises; I may say the government opposite wrote the book on these things.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have cautioned the member twice today. I would ask you now to get up and deal with questions as questions are supposed to be dealt with.

**Mr. Shillington:** — My question is to the Minister of Co-operatives. And I'm referring the minister to the grants for credit unions for assistance for low-income borrowers which was reduced entirely, once again an effort to make the poor pay for your irresponsibility.

I ask you how you justify deleting that program entirely.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Speaker, St. Mary's Credit Union in Saskatoon, as well as the Prince Albert Credit Union, indicated that no one was taking up the services offered in this program devised by the former administration, so it was by their own initiative that they discontinued the program.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have that in writing? . . . (inaudible) . . . That may have something to do with the noise surrounding you. My question to the minister was a supplementary. Do you have that in writing from those credit unions?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I'll take notice of that question. I'll have to ask the department people, Mr. Speaker, if they have it in writing.

### **Administration of Rent Control Problems**

**Mr. Shillington:** — I may say, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, a new question again having to do with services provided for those on the lower echelon of economic scale. It has to do with rent controls.

I would remind the minister that when your officials were before the public accounts committee, they indicated they were having difficulty keeping up with the workload. How do you justify cutting staff in that area when they're having difficulty keeping up with the workload?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Speaker, as a new government, we believe in productivity, something that that former administration didn't believe in. We say that we can do the same amount of work with the same number of people . . . I mean more work with the same number of people than they were able to do, and administration of rent control problems are carrying on. We're picking up the backlog quite nicely, and hope to have it in good order . . . in good hands in short order.

### **Greenbush Challenge Camp**

**Mr. Koskie:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Justice, may I direct a question to the Minister of Environment? Mr. Minister, you may be aware that a program, which is close or within your constituency, and innovative criminal justice program, well-established program, the Greenbush Challenge Camp for young offender, near Hudson Bay, was discontinued by the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General. I would like to ask you whether you are in agreement with the discontinuation of that program.

**Hon. Mr. Hardy:** — Mr. Speaker, I've been well aware of the discontinuation of the program. And when I looked into some of the facts and found out some of the true facts about the whole program, it has a lot of value. It did assist young offenders. But one of the things, the cost-wise of it, was that it cost \$188,000 more to keep the same number of offender in that camp as it would to keep them in a correction institute. In other words, the number of employees per inmates was: for every two inmates there was one employee. In correction camps, or correction institutes, I understand it's 15 to 1, which

was a very major concern. In times of restraint that was taken into consideration. And I fully realize that.

There's other things that can be done with that camp, and we'd have no doubts about it. So, although we'd be sad to see it go, at the same time we realize that the economic restraints may prevail. I've talked to the Attorney General and he's just taken another look at it, a serious look at it. I don't know what the end result will be. But until that time I'm not . . . (inaudible) . . . comment.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### Passing of Jeff Bugera

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness today that I report to the House that Mr. Jeff Bugera, deputy minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs, died early this morning in hospital.

We express regret at the passing of this fine young man. The sympathies of this entire Assembly are extended to his wife and family.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to say on behalf of the opposition that we join you with heartfelt sorrow. I had, and many members of this opposition had, known Mr. Bugera when he was deputy attorney general, I think, for some years. He did an outstanding job in the department and was missed when he was gone. He went to your department, and I think acquitted himself very well there. His family and friends are no doubt going to miss him. I say as well, Mr. Minister, the public of Saskatchewan are going to miss him as well.

## STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

### Preamble to Bill No. 6

**Mr. Speaker:** — I'd like to give a statement today concerning bill No. 6. On Thursday, March the 17th, 1983, first reading was given to Bill No. 6. An Act to amend The Public Utilities Review Commission Act, standing in the name of the member for Regina Centre. This bill contains a lengthy preamble which, in itself, is a permissible though little-used form for public bills in this House. However, the contents of this particular preamble have caused me serious concern.

I refer all members to Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Form*, fifth Edition, paragraph 705 on page 218:

The purpose of a preamble is to state the reasons and intended effects of the proposed legislation. Though a preamble is not necessary in a public bill, it is sometimes inserted in bills of great importance in order to place on record the intentions of the framers of the bill.

Further, I would like to cite Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, 19th Edition, page 465:

Though a preamble is not often incorporated now in a public bill, it is still employed in bills of great constitution importance or bills to give effect to international conventions in order to place on record the intentions of the

framers of the bill.

I find that the preamble to Bill 6 is not restricted to the purposes or usage's outlined above. A technical problem arises in the first clause of the preamble which states that:

Whereas the Government of Saskatchewan enacted The Public Utilities Review Commission Act  
...

Strictly speaking, the Government of Saskatchewan cannot enact any statute. Only the legislature has that power.

Also, the fourth clause of the preamble states that:

Whereas the public utilities review commission has indicated that it may proceed to court to clarify the application of the act to such a case;

And this clause is hypothetical and speculates on the actions of the public utilities review commission, and is therefore inappropriate as part of a preamble for a bill.

Also, the fifth clause of the preamble states that:

Whereas although the original act contemplated that the term 'rate' would apply in such a case but the government or certain of Her Majesty's ministers have failed to understand or recognize this fact, and it is therefore necessary to clarify the legislation.

This is going far beyond the normal bounds of a preamble in that it is introducing debatable material and opinions that would be more appropriately placed before the Assembly during debate on second reading. It fits neither the practices of this House nor the guidelines for preambles as set out in parliamentary authorities. Therefore, I rule that Bill No. 6 is out of order. However, this ruling does not prevent the member for Regina Centre from resubmitting his bill in a proper form.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

#### **Resolutions**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Chairman, I have four motions to move with regard to interim supply. First motion: committee of finance Consolidated Fund.

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$243,885,210 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 month period ending March 31st, 1984.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I just want to clarify, Mr. Chairman, we have . . . This is the usual procedure whereby we have an opportunity to question the ministers on the motion. Am I right in that? I guess I am. I ask you, Mr. Minister, I understand there are some unpaid bills in the Department of Finance, bills for goods and services delivered, supplied prior to March 31st, 1982, but which cannot be paid out of the '82-83

appropriations because the funds had run out, and you now propose to pay them out of the '83-84 appropriations. Is that understanding accurate?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Okay, in response to that, we are still paying some bills out of the '82-83, but that we are looking very closely at that to ensure that they are in fact appropriated and not simply a mechanism by which people are trying to get around the appropriation concept.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I want to be sure that the minister of I understand each other. We both know that normally the books in the fiscal year are kept open for 20 to 30 days after the end of the year, and services which might have been rendered in March might still be billed in early April and, in fact, might be paid in early April, but out of the previous year's appropriation.

What I understand is that this year, because funds have run out, they are . . . For services that were supplied in March, you are billing in April, but paying out of the '83-84 appropriations, and that's a marked departure from what has been done in the past.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I suggest that it's not a marked departure and if you had listened to my answer, I indicated that we are still paying accounts out of 1982-83 fiscal year, still today, on that transition period. Okay, we're still paying that but you have to ensure that they are, in fact, appropriated in that particular year.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, is the minister telling me that my understanding is wrong, that that is not in fact going to occur, that you are not going to be paid out of the '83-84 appropriation? Are you telling me that my understanding is wrong and that will not in fact occur?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I'm advised that it's not different from before, that we review each one of them and have to be satisfied that they are legitimate expenditures from the appropriate period last year, and if they are, then we would pay them under that '82-83 year and have the books open for that period of 20-25 days.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Okay, just then so that we are clear, the minister then is stating that it is not the case that goods and services supplied prior to March 31, '82 are being paid out of the '83-84 appropriation — that you're not doing that. Is that what I understand you to say?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — what I'm saying is that we are doing it the same way as it was done before. Obviously, some will be and some won't be. You try to do it the best you can to catch them and pay them at the appropriate time. We're not doing it any way different than it was done before at that same period of time.

Resolution agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I move:

Resolved, that towards making money, the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, the sum of \$243,885,210 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I move:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$59,509,250 be granted to Her Majesty on account of 12 months ending March 31, 1984.

This relates to the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I move.

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, the sum of \$59,509,250 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

The said resolutions were reported, and by leave of the Assembly read twice and agreed to.

### **APPROPRIATION BILL**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I move that Bill No. 7:

That the bill, An Act for the Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1984, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill be now read a second and third time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second and third time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to inform the Assembly that the Chief Justice is here at this time for Royal Assent.

### **ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS**

At 2:49 p.m. His Honour the Administrator entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave Royal Assent to the following bill:

Bill No. 7 — An Act for the Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1984.

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 2:50 p.m.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES SECOND READINGS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Andrew that Bill No. 1 — **An Act to amend The Education Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. When this bill came forward a few days ago, I

indicated that I wanted to make a few more comments in respect to it. I want to say first of all that the Minister of Finance introduced them in a rather cavalier manner, indicating that these bills were only of a housekeeping nature, and I want to say that there is a fair amount of significance in the particular bills that are being introduced, and in particular to the amendment to The Education Act.

I want to point out a few of the significant features that are in fact established by the introduction of this bill. I want to say that it would appear that the full disclosure, financial disclosure, by the government is somewhat reduced by the proposals that are being introduced. It now appears that these new revolving funds will be entirely separate and apart from the Consolidated Fund. It also appears that, if at the end of the year there is a surplus or a deficit in a particular revolving fund, the government may be able to simply carry this forward from year to year. That is a departure from the previous arrangement.

Also, no longer will any of these accounts, these revolving funds, have any maximum limit set by statutes. Previously in respect to advance accounts, limits were set by legislation. Now all such limits are set merely by order in council. I think that's a departure, and I think it hands over to the executive branch more control over the financial affairs, less control for the public. Also, no longer will there be any statutory requirement that details that the financial transactions should in fact be published. Thus the Assembly and the public will probably no longer be protected by the requirement that these transactions, these expenditures and revenues, be published for scrutiny.

Similarly, there appears to be no longer any clear requirement that these funds and their transactions be audited by the Provincial Auditor. Not only have they cut the staff of the auditor in this budget, they now seem to want to reduce his scope still further.

Another point that I raise of considerable concern, it is especially interesting to note that each of these bills is to come into force on April the 1st, 1982, that is, at the beginning of the last fiscal year, retroactive. And it seems to me that for the government to impose this retroactive feature is indicating that the government has been acting all along as if these bills were in fact to force, and acting as though they had the jurisdiction, even though it was not in place, and as a consequence of the retroactivity: one, is that they have been doing it all along and need it now to give it legislative authority; or secondly, what they want to do is to mask that which they were doing during the past year. In other words, it seems to me it's basically not putting forward the same information that they would have under the previous advance accounts during the past year.

So obviously their retroactivity is of considerable concern. And the Minister of Finance, in his comments, did not touch upon the reason why he is going back to April the 1st, 1982. And in my mind, as I said, Mr. Speaker, there can only be two reasons: one is that they have been already acting as though the legislation had been passed; or secondly, they are afraid to disclose in the previous method that the transactions of the government as occasioned with the use of the advance accounts, and as a consequence want to go back with retroactivity.

Certainly it would be useful to us if the Minister of Finance would, in fact, address those basic concerns that we have with the act. As I say, under the advance account system

any surplus was transferred to the Consolidated Fund. Under the proposed legislation, the revolving fund concept appears to have changed so that the funds are entirely separate and apart from the Consolidated Fund. Unlike the existing legislation, with the exception of The Department of Continuing Education Act, there is no statutory limit on the total amount of the advances which may be made to any individual fund. In each case, this limit is to be set by order in council, as I indicated.

And thirdly, under the existing legislation the Minister of finance is directed to publish, with the *Public Accounts*, statements detailing the status and operation of the account previously. We feel that that is now being bypassed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I think that if some of these concerns . . . As the minister says, 'It's not,' then certainly we welcome his comments in respect to that. And again I repeat is that most legislation dealing with advance accounts specifically directed that the Provincial Auditor be given access to information which would allow the Minister of Finance to complete the statement to be published in the *Public Accounts*. And it's our feeling that this section has been eliminated.

So I want to say then, that those are basically our concerns, Mr. Minister of Finance and certainly in your summary we would also like your comments in respect to the retroactivity provision. I might just point out that when we come to the committee of the whole, in respect to The Education Act amendment, there again I'll give you notice now that it would appear that the powers of the minister to use the revolving fund would appear to be expanded under section 11(3)(b) of the proposed amendment. And we will be raising that with you in the clause by clause discussion of the bill.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you. I will not be very long, Mr. Speaker. We passed these issues through in the fall and I don't think these bills changed what we had in the fall. Suffice it to say that the opposition is just as unhappy with these in March as we were in November.

For a party that campaigned on the basis of responsible government and open government, you lost your virtue in a great hurry. They were introduced some time ago as housekeeping legislation. They are in fact anything but housekeeping. They make it more difficult for this opposition to do its job. They make it more difficult for the legislature to control the activities of this government. And given the speed with which this government is losing control and with which they are losing their ability to manage public affairs, that is no insignificant item. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I could well appreciate that the member from Weyburn might not understand what's going on and I forgive him. It's less easy to forgive him for the noise that's coming from this corner.

There are a number of issues, Mr. Minister, which we'd ask you to direct yourself to. Some of them were mentioned by my colleague from Quill Lakes. You apparently are able to carry deficits or surpluses forward into a subsequent year. I think you're going to find it's more . . .

And I would be interested in knowing how the Department of Finance intends to control these funds. There has always been a problem, Mr. Minister, with these funds. They have been, I think under various administrations, a subject of abuse by departments who have sometimes funded activities out of the advance account which might not have been permitted in the regular funding. That isn't a problem that arose under the former administration, nor certainly did it arise under yours. My experience goes back to the administration of Ross Thatcher, and it was a problem then. I'd be interested in knowing, Mr. Minister, how you intend to strengthen the control of the Department of

Finance over these advance accounts, so that they are not the subject of abuse. I say if you're allowing them to carry deficits or surpluses forward, your problems are going to be exacerbated.

There's no longer any maximum limit set by statute, as was mentioned by my learned friend, and that is a departure. It is not one which we welcome. It is difficult enough for this legislature to exercise control over the spending of government in this day and age, difficult enough with any opposition, more difficult when one is working with eight members, however able and qualified they are, and certainly in this case that's certainly the case. It simply weakens the control of the legislature when you no longer have the maximum set by statute. Instead of answering to the legislature when you increase the maximum amount, you will now answer, if at all, to the regulations committee, and perhaps not to the regulations committee, as I think about it, because that deals with the propriety of the regulations and not really their substance. So it will be, I think, much more difficult for this legislature to exercise control over the maximum expenditures. True, we can always raise the amount in estimates. Given the behaviour of this government to date undoubtedly the ministers will come utterly uninformed as to what the amount of the advance accounts are and, thus, we won't be able to question you on it, simply be able to get information.

There should be some kind of requirement, Mr. Minister, that this information be available in a timely fashion well in advance of the estimates. And I don't know what the system is. It is pointless for us to put questions on the blues, since not one of them seem to be answered in any kind of time. It also appears that there's no statutory requirement that the details of the financial transactions be published. It's probable that that would appear in the *Public Accounts* at some point in time — I'm not sure about that — but that comes, as you know, somewhat late. And again, Mr. Minister, it weakens the control of this Assembly over the expenditures of the government. I point out to the minister — and it's part of an ongoing argument which we're having about the Provincial Auditor — I point out there is no requirement that there be audited by the Provincial Auditor. It appears to be an intentional thrust of this government to weaken the Office of the Provincial Auditor.

You have not done so, certainly, by legislation, but you have been critical of him personally and you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I wouldn't describe the comments 'chintzy' and 'unprofessional' as very complimentary. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm sorry; I guess it was not. It was about the Ombudsman. I'm sorry; the minister is right. It was the Provincial Auditor's staff whom you cut by five. And I take that, together with the lack of any requirement that these be audited, to suggest that perhaps the Provincial Auditor isn't going to be auditing these. And that, I think, Mr. Minister, is a new principle. I think it has been true that the Provincial Auditor has not audited all of the crown corporations, but theretofore the Provincial Auditor has audited all of the transactions with respect to the line departments.

And if someone else is now going to be auditing these funds (as I guess they're going to be called) then that is a sharp departure and it is, I would suggest as well to the minister, a sharp loss of control. The Provincial Auditor's independence is guaranteed, and it is for that reason that he audits the line departments and not a firm of chartered accountants. I may be wrong and there may be in this legislation, or some other legislation, some requirement that the Provincial Auditor audit the funds. But I don't see it and I'd be very interested in hearing the minister.

I just want to . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Don't ask Paul for help.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, certainly, Mr. Speaker, it's a case of the blind leading the blind if the minister of industry and commerce is rendering advice on fiscal affairs.

The last thing I want to comment on, Mr. Minister, is the retroactivity of these . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if you want me to go on at length, I can certainly do that. Given the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do I hear a popular demand that I carry on? I you people are enjoying this, far be it from me to rob you of what few pleasures you have in government. I will go on as long as you people cheer me on in the fashion that you are.

To get back to the point, Mr. Speaker. I want to mention the retroactivity, Mr. Minister. I think it is inappropriate, with a bill of this sort, which is a new concept, and changing the fashion in which the legislature exercises control over the spending of the executive arm. This is not a tax bill. It is one thing to have a tax bill retroactive, and to have that come into force on the day on which it is announced. But this, which relates as it does Mr. Minister . . . You can shake your head until it drops off, Mr. Minister, But this bill goes directly to the heart of the ability of this Assembly to control and exercise control over the executive arm of government. And I think it is most inappropriate to make that retroactive.

Surely, Mr. Minister, we ought to have had the opportunity of talking you and the other members of the treasury bench out of this. Given the fact that it's now retroactive, that's virtually impossible to do, because in fact it's already been implemented. And what the minister is presenting us with is a fait accompli. What you have done is to take away, to whittle down a significant power of this Assembly. And you have done it without giving us any real opportunity to debate it.

So I say, Mr. Minister, we will be voting against this, notwithstanding the supplications of the member from Weyburn. I'm not going to carry on any longer. I would appreciate it if you would address yourself to these problems, Mr. Minister, when you're closing debate.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. speaker, we will get into, I'm sure, the details of this, when we get into the committee of the whole and we can go through the particular concerns raised by the members opposite. And it is a fairly technical bill. I can simply try to reiterate the fact that this particular bill is to try to correct the advance accounts. And I believe the member opposite referred to the fact that there is problems with the advance accounts, or problems with the advance accounts as we found them.

Many recommendations by the Provincial Auditor . . . In fact this bill is a result of a recommendation by the Provincial Auditor that advance accounts were no the way to go. And in fact one of the main reasons for that, Mr. Speaker, was that there was literally no control with the advance accounts. As the member opposite, I'm sure, is . . . (inaudible) . . . to admit. Under the advance account system that was in place there was literally no control, not only by the legislature, but there was literally no control by the government, as well, as to how those in fact were controlled. This would become a budgetary expenditure, and in that sense we'll have more control with it with regards to the legislature and particularly by the treasury board, able to control the inflow and the outflow of information from this.

To suggest that it's not going to be somehow any information passed on, clearly this is a function, and the member from Regina Centre, as chairman of the public accounts committee . . . Clearly in the public accounts committee we'll be dealing exactly with this type of thing, as we of course have in the past. I think if you want to bring that when we move this bill into the committee stage, we can go into the details and specific questions of that, but certainly any question certainly with regard to the auditor, as to whether or not we are somehow taking away the power of the auditor with regard to this, I think perhaps more appropriately can be placed at any time, as you know, to the auditor in public accounts. It doesn't have to necessarily refer to the particular act or the particular report of the auditor. If you have that concern I think it would be very easy for you in the next public accounts meeting to raise that concern with the auditor, and ask him directly: is this in fact taking away the power of the Provincial Auditor? I would be very surprised, I would be very surprised if he was to respond that way.

With regard to the other reference with regard to cutting the staff of the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Speaker, I think that we can go through that question. We dealt with it. Many of the problems associated with the auditor's office in the past (and this is perhaps not the proper form to get into that), but many of the problems associated with the auditor in the past was the problem of being able to recruit people, and additional dollars would have to be put in, significant dollars, into recruiting people, Mr. Speaker, and now the problem is not quite the same, given the particular nature of the economy. But I think that's not an appropriate place with these advance accounts to talk with regards to that. We can go into that in detail when the estimates come up for the Provincial Auditor, or I'm sure you can raise that point again in the public accounts committee at any time.

But with that explanation, Mr. Speaker, this is a technical bill with regard to the accounting through the advance accounts. I would say that those details will be taken up and handed out, Mr. Speaker, when the matter is dealt with in committee of the whole. With regard to that, Mr. Speaker, I would . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the minister permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to get into the give and take in answers with regards to this particular bill. . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Sure, if you want to ask me about unemployment, go ahead.

**Mr. Shillington:** — No, it has to do with public accounts committee. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I hope I'll be given just some liberty to give you the background of the question. It struck me as I was listening to you, let us assume that you may be right, it struck me entirely appropriate that these bills should be referred to the public accounts committee for consideration before they're studied here in committee of the whole. And I remind the minister . . . I shouldn't say remind the minister, I should inform the minister that we're had a ruling from our Assistant Clerk, Ms. Ronyk, that we cannot review bills unless they are referred to the committee. We cannot simply go off on a new field of inquiry and ask the Provincial Auditor about the bills. So I ask the minister, before you take your chair: will you refer these bills to the public accounts committee? I think they touch directly on the work of the public accounts committee. And if you will, then frankly I will save all of my concerns on the subsequent bills, because I do admit there's a further field of inquiry that should be pursued and I think the public accounts committee is the place to do it.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, the process will

go to the committee of the whole. At that point in time, I can make available the officials; I can make, if you like, available . . . You, at any point in time, of course, being that the Provincial Auditor is an employee of the legislature, you, at any time, have a right, as a member, as does anyone else, to go and pursue any questions with regard the Provincial Auditor, his concerns with regard to this particular legislation. So, with regard to referring it to the public accounts committee, Mr. Speaker, it's the same people. If you want to ask a question with regard to it — or your colleague that's on the public accounts committee — you will have as much forum, you can ask all the questions you like in the committee of the whole. If you want the advice of the Provincial Auditor, go ask the Provincial Auditor for his advice.

If you want to put it to the public accounts committee to simply delay and stall the bill, then I would see no use to it. I would rather, Mr. Speaker, that we take this up with regard to . . . in the committee of the whole, and I'm sure that we will be able to provide all the information to the hon. member with regard to his questions. We could come down to a point where he will not agree with what we are in fact doing, but I think we will certainly provide all the information to him, Mr. Speaker.

With response to the question, I would simply move second reading of Bill No. 1.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Andrew that bill No. 2 — **An Act to amend the Department of Continuing Education Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make a comment about the public accounts committee and the proper use of the public accounts committee. And I quite frankly feel it's surprising that the Minister of Finance can turn around so fast. You must be getting dizzy with the speed of the revolutions.

The Minister of Finance knows full well there is every difference between discussing it in public accounts, and us discussing it here in this Assembly. And you know full well what the difference is. The difference is that we have the officials there as our support staff in that public accounts committee, and we can put questions directly to them. That is not the system in the House, and full well you know it. They are your support staff in this House; they are not our support staff, and for the minister to suggest that public accounts committee operates in the same fashion as committee of the whole is just ludicrous, and I'm surprised that the minister should be — particularly the minister who was chairman, and such an active chairman, should be so . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . should be, yes indeed, such a principled minister. I'm surprised that you should misunderstand that.

I frankly don't see why you won't, unless you are afraid of what might come out in public accounts, Mr. Minister. I will give you . . . The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and I will give you our assurance, if you refer to public accounts, we will be finished with it in no less than two sessions — in two sessions. That's two days, Mr. Minister. You have our assurance, and if you want the assurance from the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, just indicate that and he'll put it on the record as well. We will not hold it up in public accounts.

I frankly don't see what your concern is. This is so devoid of any legislation. I frankly don't know what we're going to be doing, so I don't see what your concern is about getting it back and getting it done, but perhaps hidden in the labyrinth of the Department of Finance there's some reason why you want these passed. We will not hold it up in public accounts, Mr. Minister. We will not hold it up in public accounts, but the public accounts committee gives us a far sounder examination of that bill than committee of the whole will, because we have the support staff to serve us. When they are in this House . . . I'm surprised to hear that the Provincial Auditor would come into the House as one of your support staff, but perhaps he would. You may be right about that.

**An Hon. Member:** — I didn't say that.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, you did. You suggested . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — I just said when he comes in for his estimate.

**Mr. Shillington:** — All right. I will admit that perhaps I may have misunderstood the Minister of Finance. I thought you were calling the Provincial Auditor. But surely the Provincial Auditor is an appropriate person to examine about this before it is done.

The minister's timetable suggests that you want these things done before we're ever going to get to the Provincial Auditor's estimates. I'm not sure what purpose it's going to be to question him at that time, because it will be a fait accompli.

Mr. Minister, unless you're stonewalling — and I wouldn't suggest that of someone with your track record — but unless you're stonewalling, I do not see why you won't refer these to the public accounts committee. These bills directly impinge upon the ability of the Assembly to make the government accountable. It is directly within the jurisdiction of the public accounts committee, unless you are not prepared to defend them, unless you are not prepared to have your members defend them in public accounts.

I tell you that I don't necessarily, I don't necessarily stand on holy ground on this one. I remain to be convinced. If you can convince me that this provides a better accounting than the old system — and I admit there were flaws in the old system but I think your system's worse — if I can be convinced that it's a better accounting system, I'll be prepared to change my view. I'm always flexible. But the public accounts committee, Mr. Minister, gives us a much better opportunity to do it than this Assembly does. And I don't know why you people don't use some of these committees and expand them.

You were great apostles of these committees when in opposition. My goodness, the things that these committees weren't going to do for the administration of public affairs in Saskatchewan. Now that you're in government you seem to be taking a different view. So I ask the minister to reconsider the position you took. And if you won't reconsider it, will you at least have the courtesy to tell us why not? Please do not insult us by suggest we're going to hold it up, because we're not going to. Do not insult our intelligence by suggesting that the committee of the whole operates in the same fashion as the public accounts committee, because you know very well it doesn't. If you will not be open and responsible enough to refer it to public accounts, at least provide us with some scintilla of a justification for your actions.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I'd just like to make one comment, Mr. Speaker, with regards to

the member's interpretation of what officials appearing at the public accounts committee as support staff . . . Officials appear at the public accounts committee are witnesses before the public accounts committee, not support staff. At least they were when I was in that particular job, and you in fact called the department and you called them as witnesses to ask question of them.

Now, the other point I would wish to make is this: that these initiatives, Mr. Speaker, were not of our doing. These initiatives were approved and started by the former government in February, 1982, and this policy affects the beginning of the 1982-83 fiscal period.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Andrew that Bill No. 3 — **An Act to amend The Public Works Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words on Bill No. 3. It's very similar to the two that we have dealt with here today, and similar to bills we have dealt with in the last session, which the minister was attempting to lead us to believe that they were of a housekeeping nature. I'm glad to see that today he is changing his tune on that and has said they're quite technical now, if I understood him in the last speech.

And I agree that they are so technical that the minister who tried to bring them to the House before Christmas, I believe, did a very poor job — not the Minister of Finance. I'm saying the minister who did at that time had a very difficult time even reading the bills, let alone explaining what they were about. And it took us a great deal of time that day in committee to get explanations. And I would assume that in trying to get answers on committee on these 1 to 5 bills, we'll have the same great problem in trying to get answers on what was assumed to be, by their prognosis, bills of housekeeping nature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these bills are anything but housekeeping nature. What they do, in fact, is allow the government to carry over debts, or surpluses, from one year to the next with no accounting taking place. And, Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing is an attempt by this government to work outside of the Consolidated Fund, to even further fudge the numbers than what we have seen in the past two budgets.

For a government that was elected on a commitment and a speech and a theme of open government and free access to information, I find it very, very difficult to understand this kind of an attempt to work outside of the legislature, which is an attempt that they are trying to carry out at the present time.

We're looking at a bill which does not come into effect once it is passed by this legislature, which was a criticism which I have heard coming from the member opposite who is attempting to bring this bill through the House today. It appears that they have worked on the principle of these bills since last year, that a whole year has gone by where they have worked on the assumption that this was the law of the land. It's amazing that they would even bother to bring these bills in and get approval for them when they have worked on this principle for the past year.

But, Mr. Speaker, I predict that what it will lead to, this kind of jiggery-pokery with the

finances of this province, both the Consolidated Fund as well as the heritage fund, that the deficit which we have seen grow from \$220 million in the first year of operation to 317 in the second will grow even more and more rapidly as we get into this kind of accounting, where deficits and surpluses are transferred around from one year to the next to the point where no one knows exactly what's going on, even the Minister of Finance. And this is an attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, in playing with numbers so that they will attempt to make themselves look better than they really are, but in the end it will catch up to them. And when the deficits come in at 220, at 317, and on and on, we will see the result of this kind of an accounting system and this type of a rearranging of the money accountability of the province of Saskatchewan.

There are a number of questions which I will be raising in committee. And, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member from Regina Centre who says that this is important enough to be referred to the public accounts committee. And I would think that we should be looking at that option, to be able to bring in people who can explain to us the full ramifications of going to this type of a deficit or this type of an accounting procedure.

And I hear members around the House, from time to time during this debate, saying that these bills are inconsequential and that there really is no need to debate them. Well, I wish they would get to their feet in this debate, rather than yelling from their desks, and explain to us how changing the accountability of a government to one which is attempting to hide the numbers from the public is meaningful to the people of the province, and explain to us how this is going to make the province a better place to live in, and how going down the Trudeau trail of deficits that this kind of accounting leads to is better serving the people of Saskatchewan.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Andrew that Bill No. 4 — **An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, when the minister introduced this bill on March the 29th, he said, 'Mr. Speaker, this amendment to The Agriculture Act applies the same way as before,' and then went on and said that, 'It's a brilliant act, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act,' and sat down. That's the information he gave. Now, I read through Bill No. 4 very carefully, and I read the explanatory notes, and that isn't the same as it was before. They're making some drastic changes. Now, was he intentionally misleading the House, or was he trying to be funny? Or what the minister was trying to do, I don't know.

But when it says in here, Mr. Speaker, 'This amendment to the agricultural act applies the same way as before.' And then he goes on to say, 'I'm sure the Agriculture critic will get up and say that in some devious method by which we are going to change The Land Bank Act or sell the Crow off to somebody.' And I think that this is much more important to farmers and the people of Saskatchewan than giving it that kind of weight, for a government that has got elected saying that, 'We are representing the farmers; we have a Premier that has a quota book and we are going to speak for the farmers.'

And here they're trying to change the method of funding that is used to fund agricultural groups in the province — boards, commissions, people that deal with

drainage project or whatever — that be paid out of the revolving fund. And trying to do it in a way that . . . I don't know if we'll be able to call you accountable or not. I'm not sure that when you . . . To pay for existing provisions, in section 14, for example, to pay for necessary service in connection with such purchase, distribution and sale, the net amount of such advances shall not, at any time, exceed \$6 million. It's just a matter of a trivial \$6 million expenditure. And your minister said it's the same as before.

I don't think it's the same as before. Before the introduction of a revolving fund, if the money wasn't spent in a given year, that was the end of that funding and reapplication had to be made to treasury, and there are many changes that are different. And I think we should have a chance, in the public accounts committee, to look at how accountable is the Minister of Agriculture going to be.

When we did agricultural estimates, Mr. Speaker, you weren't in the Chamber, but if you would have been, you would have known that I got very frustrated trying to get some answers out of him. He tried to make light of some of the questions we were asking. And I think this is a serious matter and I think the minister should give me some explanation, particularly in one, in the expenditures of a group. Say a land development group is planning on a drainage project that's going to be \$3 million, not six. How is that going to be handled out of an advance account, if that project doesn't receive approval by the end of April and is just in the process, and yet it was approved for funding that year? What's going to happen to that amount of money? How is the revolving fund going to deal with that situation that wouldn't have happened like it was before? He says because it's going to be exactly the same as it was before; it's going to apply the same as before. So I would like to have at least that question answered, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like — again, this is the same particular piece of legislation as we dealt with in Bill 1 through Bill 3 — to deal with the question with regard to public accounts. I am informed that in fact the proposal of this revolving account is on the advice and the recommendation of the Provincial Auditor. That's why it was brought in. And the reason it was brought in is because it came up in a study at a study requested by the public accounts committee, and this was the recommendation from that study, that it be approved this way and proceed this way. That is where it came from. That is where it came from to go into this, and the Provincial Auditor will continue to audit the same as before.

You want to go back and do everything all over again. I can't believe this, Mr. Speaker. What we have done is had advance accounts where many of the problems that they raise were of concern. And what happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the public accounts committee, at that point in time, as it was raised year in and year out and year in and year out by the Provincial Auditor — the question of advance accounts . . . This was then put to the Provincial Auditor to come up with a recommendation. The recommendation he come up with is the legislation that we see before the House today, that we see before the House today, Mr. Speaker. We were asking on the advice of the Provincial Auditor. He will still have the authority and the power to audit these particular revolving accounts, just as he did with regards to the advance accounts, Mr. Speaker. We were acting on that advice.

We have been held up with regards to this legislation in the previous session. We're simply introducing it again. And as I said before, this particular legislation was designed by the previous government. We are now going through a harangue with

regard to what we should be doing. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Andrew that Bill No. 5 — **An Act to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Speaker, when Bill 5 was introduced the minister told us ‘Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act, for the third time.’ I was wondering when he closes debate if he could tell this Assembly: when are the other two times, or the time we raised it? He said, ‘Once for them and twice by us.’

The same arguments apply that I made earlier, that he’s not giving us any information and particularly in dealing with The Family Farm Improvement Act, because of the notice we had that the purchases by family farm improvement act and the money they need for funding their operation is going to be insignificant because all family farm is going to do from here on in is engineering services. They’re not going to sell equipment any more. So the need for an advanced revolving fund there has become redundant. And so it’s not clear to us at all why he needs this piece of legislation.

And I think that this bill should be pulled entirely. In fact the family farm improvement branch is not going to be in the buying and selling and marketing any more, unless it’s some retroactive thing, and this is where I’m concerned. Maybe they need this revolving fund for just this particular act and all the other ones were introduced so they could handle this one, because I’m not sure what they’re going to do with the supplies the family farm improvement branch has on hand now. And possibly their give-away to their dealer friends will likely be hid by introduction of this bill.

And if that isn’t the case, then the minister should come clean and tell us that he has no devious intentions in mind, and tell us that you don’t need a revolving fund for the family farm improvement branch because they’re not going to do any more business. They’re not going to do any more business. They’re not going to sell any more goods. They’re not going to buy any more goods. Why do they need a revolving fund? Their engineering fees are free. There’s never been a charge for engineering fees. So I don’t think they need a revolving fund in the family farm improvement branch at all. So tell us what you’re planning on doing with the equipment and materials that you have on hand, who you were planning on giving it to, and how are you planning on hiding it in this revolving fund?

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — With leave of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 1 be referred to the public accounts committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The motion would be out of order because the bills have already been referred to committee.

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**CONSUMER AND COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS**

**Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 4**

**Item 1**

**Mr. Chairman:** — Would the minister please introduce his officials?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To my left, Mr. Allan Higgs, executive director, commercial division, acting deputy minister; and Mr. Orville MacGillivray, the Acting Rentalsman; and Mr. Al Dwyer, head of the administration branch.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, I want to begin with the subject of the liquor board and the liquor licensing commission. You have made statements, Mr. Minister, that you are considering opening up the bill to increase the number of outlets available in Saskatchewan. My first question, Mr. Minister, is: when are we going to see the bill?

And I want to preface my remarks, Mr. Minister, with a complaint to the corporal's guard of ministers who are left, indeed, the corporal's guard of ministers who attended today. The attendance today ought to embarrass you people. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know, I know. The Minister of Highways believes that any comments about the needs of the poor are irrelevant. And I know that you believe that any question period with needs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . they elected me and they didn't elect Mr. Petrychyn. That should suggest I know something about them.

Mr. Minister, that was not quite what I intended to question. It's not quite what I intended, although I will get into it with the area of the provincial mediation board.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: when are we going to see the bill? This is the 15th day of this session, 16th day of this session, I am sorry, and all you have on the order paper is five bills, which are of fundamental importance, but which we have seen before. Mr. Minister, I have been involved in one fashion or another with the legislative program for this government since 1971. And this is absolutely without precedent, to be heading into the 16th day of the session and have no idea what you people are doing for legislation, unless we read it in the media.

Why aren't you introducing the bills? And I point to you, particularly, Mr. Minister. The bill which you are going to introduce you introduced in the last session. There can be no drafting. I assume it has been passed by your caucus and your cabinet. And I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, where is the bill?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know where the hon. member is coming from. What does this harangue have to do with the estimates of Consumer and Commercial Affairs?

**Mr. Shillington:** — I asked the minister a simple question: to whom is The Liquor Act and The Liquor Licensing Act assigned? And I know you don't know, so I'll tell you. It's assigned to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. Therefore, it is you who administer it; therefore, it is a proper subject in your estimates. Check, just check the order in council which assigned the bills; you'll find they're assigned to you. They're

therefore your responsibility and a proper subject of discussion in estimates in this House.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, The Liquor Act will indeed be in front of this House in coming weeks. There will be amendments to The Liquor Act. We will deal with them in due course.

**Mr. Shillington:** — It's an interesting response. I wonder if you've any intention at any time to deal with my question, which is: when?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — In due course, Mr. Chairman. He has referred to the intended amendment to The Liquor Act in regards to special liquor vendors. I do indeed intend to reintroduce that amendment to this House in coming weeks.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, why don't you reintroduce it now, so we can do some work on the bill? Why, Mr. Minister, are you leaving this bill to the . . . And I accuse you of leaving this legislation till the dying days of the session when you're going to dump it all on us, and then we will be caught in a sort of a Catch 22 of either prolonging the session or not doing a proper job of dealing with legislation. The traditional courtesy which other administrations . . . I appreciate that this government is awfully short on those traditional courtesies.

I see the Minister of Highways looking as if he just bit a lemon. You were never, Mr. Minister, subjected to a session such as this, where on the 16th day of the sitting you had no idea of what the legislative program was. I ask you, Mr. Minister: why don't you introduce it now?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, this isn't the proper time to be introducing legislation, and the hon. member from Regina Centre knows that. We are here to deal with the estimates of Consumer and Commercial Affairs, so let's get on with the business at hand today. You're wasting time of this Chamber and the members herein. . . .(inaudible interjections) . . .

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, the minister has some sort of a hearing problems, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if it would be appropriate to put these questions in writing; we'll see if he has a visual problem as well. My question was not 'Will you introduce them?' but 'When are you going to introduce them?'

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, referring to *Routine Proceedings and Orders of the Day* of the Legislative Assembly, it's quite plain and simple on here: you go through the routine proceedings, presentations of petitions and so on, down through oral questions, ministerial statements, and introduction of bills — that's when it comes.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I thank the minister for that recital of the rules. Mr. Minister, my question — and again we're having great difficulty and I'm not sure what it is — we're having great difficulty; you are not hearing what I'm saying. Why don't you introduce them now? The question is not 'Will you introduce them now?' The question is not 'Where do we introduce them?' The question is, 'Why don't you introduce the bill now?'

I'm making an issue of it, Mr. Minister, over this bill, because I want to make a point to the government and that is that you are being very discourteous in not introducing the legislation which was available. And you must have this available.

If the press reports can be believed you are apparently going to introduce what you introduced before. Why is it not before the Assembly? Why don't you introduce it now, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I simply repeat, Mr. Chairman, today we are here to deal with the estimates of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. The bill in regards to an amendment to The Liquor Act will be introduced in due course; I would expect after the estimates for 1983-84 are completed.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, that is exactly what I suspect you're going to do. Mr. Minister, that is exactly what I just finished accusing you of doing: dealing with the estimates and then dealing with the legislation. That is an inappropriate way to conduct this House. That is an inappropriate way to conduct this House because it does not give us time to work on the bills.

The procedure which has been used since time immemorial is that the bills are introduced as soon as the government has them ready, and gives the opposition an opportunity to look them over. It has never been the procedure of any administration to deal with all the estimates first and then all the legislation. That would be unfair to any opposition, much less an opposition composed of eight members.

Now I ask you again, Mr. Minister, why won't you introduce the bill? I have every suspicion it is because you want your estimates through the House before we see the bill so that we cannot question you in the estimates on it. I have every suspicion that what you said is quite accurate. That is exactly why we're not seeing them, because you want to deal with your estimates first.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, the estimates of this department have nothing to do with the liquor board.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I take it the minister is going to stonewall on this one. Is that the case? You absolutely refuse to answer the question as to why you're not introducing them?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — The bills will be introduced in due course, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I want to deal as well, Mr. Minister, with the appointment of the chairman. My learned colleague from Cumberland raised the issue the other day, and it is a subject of concern to me as well. The liquor board . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . My colleague was in the House, and is absent. Our attendance today, on a percentage basis, is a good deal better than yours. I could consume this entire question period by asking where all your members are, but I won't. He raised the issue of having the same person head the liquor board and the liquor licensing commission. I tend to agree with him, Mr. Minister, that this is inappropriate. The liquor board is in the business of selling liquor. And I appreciate that's an oversimplification of their role. I hope that the liquor board don't see it as their role to maximize the sales of liquor, but it is their job to sell it. It is the job of the liquor licensing commission to act as a judicial and an administrative tribunal to control the distribution and the sales of liquor. To have one person doing both is, in a sense, to have one person being judge and prosecutor. And I ask you, Mr. Minister, why you chose to have one person fill both those roles, when in fact there is a conflict of interest.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, I would ask that this member be called to order. We're here to deal with the estimates of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. Liquor board is another matter that can be dealt with in public accounts. It is not in the blue book, the matters of the liquor board.

**Mr. Chairman:** — He can ask a question, unless there's another estimate that we can look at for the liquor board.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I missed Mr. Chairman's comments. You asked us to go on to another issue while you . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — No, I said you can ask the question unless there's another section that deals specifically with the liquor board.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you. Well, I assume now you're going to answer my concerns and the concerns of the member from Cumberland about the appointment of Mr. Pederson, who I know has no political affiliation. I know he's got an arm's-length relationship with this government. Yes he does; I'm sure he does. He may be a good man, but his relationship with the government is scarcely arm's length. So I ask you, Mr. Minister, why you would appoint one person to two positions which are apparently in conflict.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, at this time of integration of the liquor board and the liquor licensing commission, which I might add is in progress because of the efficiencies and the savings we are realizing from this integration — some \$276,000 in the first year of integration, as it were, not the wasteful \$100,000 a year they were paying to have the liquor licensing commission housed in a separate headquarters on south Albert Street. They were a wasteful administration and they know it.

Now, Mr. Martin Pederson is indeed the chairman of the liquor board and also at this time the chairman of the liquor licensing side until integration is completed through a legislative process. Mr. Pederson is not being paid any salary to be the chairman of the liquor licensing commission. Indeed, at this time we have brought in a chief inspector from Saskatchewan, Mr. John Weir, to act as the chairman of the licensing committee. Those duties and those functions will be carried out efficiently by Mr. Pederson and Mr. Weir. We are also in the process of forming a board of directors for this new body, as it were, the liquor board. Mr. Pederson is the chairman. Mr. Murray Wilkie is the vice-chairman. In due course other members of that board will be added, and they will be on a part-time basis.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Minister, you made some very serious accusations. First of all you indicated that the previous administration was a wasteful administration and that you are going to be making substantial savings with the reorganizations. I think that if you're going to make the accusations then you should be able to file with us a detail of all the savings, and I would ask you to do that now. Table it.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to provide the hon. member from Quill Lakes with a document showing the efficiencies that we are going to realize. In his reference to my accusations in regards to the liquor licensing commission in that south Albert location for which they contracted to pay \$100,000 a year, why did the former chairman have a shower constructed in his office over there like you did in the offices in Saskatoon of Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation? That's the kind of waste that he former administration demonstrated to the people of

Saskatchewan. That's why they wiped you off the map on April 26.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I think, Mr. Chairman, that here we have a minister who is supposed to come into there to answer specific questions, who makes allegations which he cannot substantiate and is unwilling to substantiate, and starting to make political statements which can't substantiate. I think that it's evidence that this minister is one of the weak ministers on the other side of the House, and it's certainly a consensus among all of his backbenchers that that in fact is true.

But I want to ask the minister: you indicated that there was substantial savings into what you're doing. I suggest then that you have those information, and I ask you: can you table it at this time?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I had indicated to him just several minutes ago, Mr. Chairman, that I would.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Chairman, I was also listening, and my colleague, the member for Quill Lakes, raised this. But, you said that you were planning on integrating the liquor board and the liquor licensing. I would like a little detailed explanation of just what you expect. Is that the same function, in your mind, the licensing and the role of the liquor board? Do you see that as a single-unit function that can be integrated under one administration? Or one area, where you're talking about integration, that tells me . . . It sounds as though you're trying to combine the two into one operation. Do you see the liquor licensing and overseeing of liquor sales as the same, as a separate function from that of marketing and selling, like the liquor board does, or do you see that as an integrated unit?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — They are indeed separate functions, Mr. Chairman. That doesn't preclude the fact that they can be under the same board, as it were, one liquor board; one liquor board in handling marketing, shipments of liquor and what not, and also handling the licensing through a separate branch. However, the board of directors, once it is finalized, formally finalized, will be making those final decisions as to what specific function will be.

**Mr. Engel:** — Do you not see this as a problem? I was under the impression that liquor licensing was a policing type of board that would police liquor sales. Do you see that as a policing function?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — The primary function, Mr. Chairman, of the licensing side is to assist licensees in the operations of their premises. I don't regard it as a policing function, but we do have to have licensing inspectors out there to see that they are abiding by what the act says they have to abide by. I don't regard it as a policing function.

**Mr. Engel:** — In other words, you don't consider it policing if — the house they're open to sell liquor, or who they sell liquor to, the age of the individual . . . You don't consider that a policing function?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Licensing inspectors, Mr. Chairman, are there to see that the licensees abide by the act, and they're there to assist the licensees, to make sure that they understand what the act says. A policing function can be carried out by the police agencies of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Engel:** — You're reading a broad term into it and misrepresentation of the question I asked you. I was asking about a regulatory function of the licensing section of the present liquor licensing aspect of it, and I wasn't referring to actual breaking of the law. What I am saying is: if you have the same body corporate dealing with marketing, and the individual is there and taking the orders and the amount and the volumes they're handling, and that same body then also is in the regulatory aspect of it, do you not see you're subjecting your civil servants to a tremendous amount of pressure?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — There will be a separate and distinct licensing committee, Mr. Chairman. The marketing will be handled by entirely different people than the licensing committee.

**Mr. Engel:** — Well, if that's the case, where is this tremendous saving you're handling there, other than I see the minister looking for a role where he'd be influential? This is why I'm concerned with the integrating of this. You're trying to increase your role of influence so that the people buying are dealing with exactly the same body as when you're trying to police it. And it makes for a very convenient role for you in your political application of it.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — In regards to the hon. member's accusations regarding political influence, there will be no political influence in the licensing committee. There will be part-time people appointed to that licensing committee — people who understand the problems and the abuses of alcohol in the province of Saskatchewan, who will indeed be able to relate to the problems that alcoholics have and relate to the needs for education, as it is in regards to alcohol there. So there will be no political influence in the new liquor board in its new set-up.

**Mr. Engel:** — I am pleased to hear that, because I'm afraid we're going to need to do an awful lot of educating in this whole area of the use of alcohol, if what the minister is telling us and what indications were in the original introduction of your piece of legislation that was before this Assembly just a few months ago . . . and I, too, would join my colleagues in saying that I would like to see that bill and the new implications of it while we have a chance to question you on your estimates, and maybe a good procedure would be that we delay continuing these estimates now until we see the bill. And then we'll come back and finish your estimates as far as your consumer and corporate affairs estimates are concerned, because I feel that what you're doing . . . and my gut feeling is that you are opening this wide open. I just came back, I came back from visiting a . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You're going the same direction as many places in North America are today. The Minister of Health told us today he's going down to review the health delivery program all over United States and North America. I don't think that's a good place to look to see where you're going to get the good delivery of program. And if that's who you're copying when you're talking about liquor licensing and liquor sales, and if you want to go the same direction as our neighbours to the south of us are, where every gas service station, every grocery store, and every corner store, be it a 7-Eleven or what it is, is selling liquor. You can buy any kind of booze you want at any time of the day or night. And if you think that that is going to restrict the use of alcohol, I think you're badly mistaken. And you'll need one heck of an educational program to educate the people on the use of alcohol.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, I am simply amazed where the member is coming from. He doesn't understand what's going on in this House. Where were you in the last session when I introduced the amendment to The Liquor Act as it is in regards to

special vendors? You were here. You know what it says. Why are you bringing all of this up now? It will be the same amendment as was introduced before.

**Mr. Engel:** — If you have the piece of legislation, and if your assurances are that it'll be the same, why don't you give it to us? What is the delay in bringing it before this House now so that we can debate it?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — It will be here in due course, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Shillington:** — . . . (inaudible) . . . Mr. Minister, that I'm having some difficulty seeing the savings to which you allude. If what you're saying is you're going to maintain . . . Let's start back at a more elementary step. Do you still intend to maintain . . . do you admit . . . Let's go back one step further . . . Do you admit that the liquor licensing commission's function is primarily control? Is that common ground between us?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, they're playing this to no end. I am prepared to discuss this issue to all lengths when we introduce the legislation. We are here at this time to do the estimates of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. Let's get on with the job at hand.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I can well understand why the minister wants to avoid the subject, but that doesn't make it any less pertinent to your estimates. We are trying to uncover these savings which you promised the province of Saskatchewan. My friend from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg alleges, and I share his suspicion, that the changes are being made not because they're going to save any money, but because they're going to increase the accessibility of alcohol in this province. That's my suspicion as well, I'm not sure we'll see alcohol sold in service stations this year, but his suspicion is my suspicion, so we want to know, Mr. Minister, about these savings.

You indicated earlier that the liquor licensing commission did not have a police function. Who polices the act?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, I've indicated to the member opposite that I will be pleased to answer these questions when we get into the legislation. I'll answer them in due course when the legislation is before this House. At this time we're here to get through the estimates, and as soon as we get through the estimates we can discuss in detail any questions that you have at that time.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, you said a moment ago that the liquor licensing commission did not have a police function. So dismally informed are you that you don't know the truth. The fact is that they do have a police function. To whom do the inspectors report? The man in the moon, or the Minister of Finance, or the Attorney General?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I had a recent conversation with one of the chief inspectors, Mr. Barry Hicks, who I'm sure is known by the previous administration because he has been with the liquor licensing commission for some time. He advises me that liquor licensing inspectors do not regard themselves as policemen. I don't want to get into an argument of definition of the word. They are not policemen; they are inspectors. They are there to see that the licensees abide by the act, and that they provide assistance to licensees in regards to interpretation of the act.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, that's a brand new definition of an inspector — someone who assists the licensees in interpreting — and if the licensee wants to interpret his license to mean he can open Sunday morning at 11 o'clock, it's the role of the inspector to assist him in finding that interpretation in the legislation.

Mr. Minister, will you not admit that the function of an inspector is control, to ensure that the licensees obey the legislation? And if that isn't a police function, what in the name of heaven is it?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — He's quibbling over the word 'police' and we have two different definitions. To me a policeman is a man in a uniform, RCMP or provincial police or any other police agencies that there may be across this country. A licensing inspector is a licensing inspector and he's there to see that the licensee obeys the legislation. It's as simple as that.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Exactly. Exactly. He's there to ensure that the legislation is obeyed. His is an enforcement function. I'm glad that after 15 minutes the minister finally comes clean. Now if we could have a little success in some of these other issues, we might get on to the rest of your estimates, Mr. Minister.

The liquor licensing commission has an enforcement-control function, a judicial and an administrative function. The liquor board is in sales. We have been suggesting to you that these are two diametrically opposed functions. One wants to increase sales; one want to control excessive sales, and those functions are not coterminal. They're normally operating in diametrically different directions, and you are putting them in one body. If the minister is not going to put them in one body; if you're simply going to move the whole mess into one building, that's different. I'm fascinated to know how you're going to save any money putting them all in one building, because you're going to need the same amount of floor space. But, maybe I'm overlooking some genius that you people have fostered.

I want to know, Mr. Minister, if you will admit that one has a control-enforcement function; one has a marketing function. Is that common ground?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, I'll spell it out again. We're going to have a liquor board and a licensing committee — a liquor board and a licensing committee. Each will serve in a different way under the liquor board as a whole. And I don't see why the member from Regina Centre is confused about this. It's as plain as the nose on his face.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I'm glad the minister finds this matter so simple. Perhaps we'll proceed a little faster then. Is the minister telling me that there is no difference between the committee and the commission? Is that what you're telling me: that it's the same thing, just a difference in nomenclature?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — What I understood you to say: is the licensing committee the same as the former licensing commission? It will serve the same purpose.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, all right. That's only part of the answer though. Will it have the same powers; operate in the same way with the same legislative authority?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Yes.

**Mr. Shillington:** — All right. And it will be composed of people who are independent from the responsibility for marketing liquor?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Yes, with one exception, the chairman.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Why the exception?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I guess it is time to remind the member opposite of a committee, the former administration in 1978, which recommendation at that time was that the liquor board and the liquor licensing commission come under one jurisdiction, under integration. That was a recommendation of the former administration in 1978. I think it was Mr. Faris, was it not? A Mr. Don Faris made the recommendation. Now I don't now why exactly he made the recommendation, but I can tell you that we're making it for efficiency and productivity and a saving of over one-quarter of a million dollars in this first year. Other provinces find that their liquor boards work well in this manner, Manitoba and Alberta in particular.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I don't know. He must have done it. Mr. Faris I doubt made any recommendation in 1978 about the liquor board, Mr. Minister. Throughout the entire of 1978, Dr. Faris was the minister of education, and you people may think that education and liquor should be one responsibility. That was never our view and we never had one minister who was both, and I frankly don't know what committee you are referring to. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if there is logic and reason to have two separate committees, because they serve different functions that may conflict. Why is it not logical and reasonable to have two different chairmen?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Because I have faith that the present chairman is quite capable of handling those functions. On another matter, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to table the Faris recommendations of 1978 if the hon. member would like to have a look at them.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I think the ones you are referring to, if I'm not mistaken, are 1972 not 1978. I think it was during the first term of the former administration. Mr. Minister, if you have dissimilar functions which may conflict, how can you have one person doing both? He may find himself pulled in opposite directions. That is like re-creating the Star Chamber. The problem with the Star Chamber was that the prosecutor's role and the judge's role was one. And I say, Mr. Minister, you are similarly confusing the two roles. Surely, if one is to exercise a control-enforcement function, the board itself is to exercise a sales function, surely they should be handled by different people, and not having one person trying to separate those very conflicting responsibilities.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I have complete faith, Mr. Chairman, in the abilities of the present chairman of the liquor board. He is a responsible, human person. He is working hard at getting the liquor board and the liquor licensing commission together into one agency, if you will. I also have faith that the licensing committee, as I have outline it earlier, will indeed perform its duties in good conscience and in good responsibility.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, what are you saving besides the chairman's salary? I want to get back to the chairman in a minute, but what are you saving besides the chairman's salary? You've got two committees, which you've told me are no different. They are carbon copies of what we used to have except one person now is the head of both, I gather . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Call it a committee instead of a commission.

Where are you saving the money apart from the chairman's salary? How are you arriving at this saving?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — In the main, Mr. Chairman, we're saving the salary of the liquor licensing commission chairman, which I believe was in the area of 52 or \$53,000, somewhere in there; also the salary of the vice-chairman. The vice-chairman, by the way, retired last August. Also the salary of the secretary of the liquor licensing commission, as well as the support staff — there are duplications in support staff that occurred when we had the two bodies in different locations. They can now be amalgamated for efficiencies. And also, as I alluded to earlier, the \$100,000 in rental costs for the South Albert location.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, will the minister not admit that the rental costs are irrelevant to the discussion? That could have been accomplished without combining the two functions. If you thought that you had excess floor space in a given building, surely the minister of government services could have made use of that without combining the two into one. Will you not admit that the rental space is an irrelevancy to the discussion of the principle involved, that the floor space could have been used by some other agency?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Government services, Mr. Chairman, was not responsible for the leasing of that facility in South Albert. It was apparently handled by the chairman of the liquor licensing commission at that time, and I would like to believe that had government services handled that lease agreement that it wouldn't have been as expensive as it turned out to be.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, now I'm pursuing a minor point for just a minute. I can well appreciate that the liquor board would provide its own floor space. Are you telling me that the liquor board also provided space for the liquor licensing commission? The liquor licensing commission is simply an agency. It's not a separate crown corporation. I'm surprised to hear the liquor licensing commission which is simply an agency of government, is providing its own floor space. That's not common, to put it mildly. The liquor board is a crown corporation.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — The liquor licensing commission, Mr. Chairman, has their own estimates, and therefore they handled the lease agreement on their own. The liquor board, of course, handles its also.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I take your word for it that the liquor licensing commission made their own leasing arrangement. There are not many agencies of government that do, but I take the minister's word for it.

It's an aside, actually. It's by and large an aside. The question to you is: what are you saving besides the lease space, which I allege, I know you will deny it until the end of all time, but I suggest that you have too much lease space. That scarcely requires an amalgamation of the function. What are you saving besides the chairman's salary and the lease space, if you insist on throwing that in?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — He's asked that question at least four times. I don't know if it doesn't sink in. You are making allegations that I don't know what's going on. I suggest to you, you don't know what's going on. You have asked the same question six times.

Now, Mr. Lawyer, sitting opposite there, I'll tell you what we're saving. If you want to take the rent off \$276,000, it'll be approximately \$176,000. I also told you earlier that I would provide you with a written submission of what those savings would be.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Will the minister confirm that all you are saving is the chairman's salary and the leased space? Do I take that? And if the minister simply wants to nod his head, I will take it at that. Is that all you're saving: simply the chairman's salary and the leased space? Is that all you're saving?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — No.

**Mr. Shillington:** — All right, then, where else are you saving the money?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I indicated to you earlier that I would provide this information to you. I also provided it verbally, just a few minutes ago.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, the minister's a bit piqued, I see. I'm sorry if he's a bit tender on the subject. I'm not asking you for the figures. I am asking you for the areas in which you are saving in. You're saving in the area of the chairman's salary; you're saving in the area of leased space. What other areas? I'm not asking you for the amounts; I am asking you for the areas, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I'll go over it one more time, Mr. Chairman. We're saving moneys in the area of the salary of the liquor licensing chairman — commission chairman; the vice-chairman; the secretary; the support staff, where duplications occur; in phone bills; in other services; in toilet paper, and what not — things like that.

**Mr. Shillington:** — How many staff will be eliminated in the amalgamation? Does the minister know that?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — The general manager of the liquor board, Mr. Bock, is working on that right now. I would estimate that it would not be more than two or three or four positions at the most, if that many.

**Mr. Shillington:** — All right. We have the chairman and the vice-chairman and the secretary and two or three staff, and the leased space. Have we got it all now, or are there other areas where you're saving money?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I have indicated to him I would provide him with that information and I will, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that the cost of . . . And I'll suggest to the minister that there is a problem with the consumption of alcohol in this province and in our society. The amount of alcohol that's being consumed is rising relatively rapidly, and most of the studies which have been done suggest that increased accessibility results in increased consumption. And the function of the liquor licensing commission is by and large to limit the accessibility of alcohol; that's by and large what it does. That's a bit of an oversimplification, but that accounts for 75 per cent of what that commission does: is to limit the accessibility to alcohol, to ensure that the act which controls the accessibility of alcohol is enforced. So I say, Mr. Minister, you have a significant problem in our society with alcohol. The consumption of alcohol is rising rapidly on a per capita basis. It is causing problems in every segment of our society. It is bloating the budget of the Minister of Health. It is bloating the budget of the Minister of

Social Services. It is playing havoc with the finances of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. It is causing us problems right across the board. And I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that the cost of all that makes your savings relatively insignificant.

I am not suggesting that if we have the opportunity we should ever, ever pass by the opportunity to save a couple of hundred thousand dollars, if that's what all this comes to, and I don't know. We should never pass that opportunity by, if we see it clearly. But, Mr. Minister, if what you are doing increases accessibility to alcohol and thereby increases consumption, to put it crassly and to forget the human tragedy, the cost is going to exceed a hundred fold your savings, if what you are doing is increasing accessibility. And when you weaken the control of the liquor licensing commission by blurring it with the marketing function of the liquor board, you are in fact running the risk of increasing the accessibility of alcohol. I'd ask you, Mr. Minister, for a comment and something other than the normal pious platitudes which we have been treated to this afternoon — I'd ask you, Mr. Minister, for a comment on how you're going to ensure that the access to alcohol continue to be as limited as it is when you have blurred the functions of the two?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, the liquor committee as it is made up will be very cognizant of the abuses of alcohol in this province. They are not there for the reason of increasing consumption in this province; neither indeed is the integration of the liquor board and the liquor licensing commission have anything to do with the consumption.

If he's referring to the amendment that will be introduced later in the session as it relates to the special liquor vendors, we will deal with that at the time. What we're saying through this amendment is that the communities in Saskatchewan — the smaller communities, the villages, hamlets and towns that want special vendors in their communities — they will first have to indicate it to the liquor board through a local . . . (inaudible) . . . It's the communities who are going to make that decision, not the liquor board, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Koskie:** — The minister, does he not believe that there is a correlation between the availability of liquor and the consumption of liquor? And I go on further to indicate that in respect to the special vendors, throughout the years we have always had within the statute a limitation as to the number of special vendors we have. That was in the act itself. What you are proposing is an uncontrolled right for the minister to grant as many special vendors' licenses as is deemed necessary by the minister and not be answerable to the debate in this legislature.

I ask you: do you not agree that increasing the special vendor outlet to an unlimited number, which you are proposing, is there not a correlation between the availability of liquor and the consumption of it and, as a consequence, the human costs related to the overuse of alcohol?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — The answer to the hon. member from Quill Lakes is no, of course we don't want uncontrolled accessibility to liquor in this province. What we're saying is that we want to give the communities the right to put a special vendor in their community after a local option vote. We have many, many letters on file, Mr. Chairman, that have indicated that small town X, wherever it may be, wants the service of a special vendor, because they don't want to drive 20, 25, 30, or 50 miles to buy whatever it might be — a bottle of spirits, a bottle of wine, or a case of beer. And many of these smaller communities complain. They complain, Mr. Chairman, that business is being

dragged away from their communities and taken away to a town 50 miles away where they spend their money on groceries, on dry goods, on hardware, on farm supplies, and whatever else. And this is one of the reasons why they're asking for this service in their own communities.

I am not in favour of uncontrolled dissemination of liquor, and this amendment to The Liquor Act will not do that. In fact, according to the estimates, the best estimates of the liquor board in Saskatchewan, consumption will not rise by any appreciable amount.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I have a further question, Mr. Chairman. Recently in Regina there was an instance where in fact the liquor board was granting a license in a neighbourhood in which a group of people had to unite to keep a liquor outlet right from next door to a school. You're talking about the public having the right to make decisions. Here was a decision that had been made by the liquor board and the public had to revolt against it.

What I'm saying to you: in your proposed legislation, what you're doing is taking from the legislature the power of curtailment of the availability of liquor. Certainly if there are a few communities throughout Saskatchewan which have, as you say, and I doubt very much your facts, that they're 50 miles away from a liquor outlet — I mean, that's an exaggeration that even you shouldn't be making, because you know better — but what you are in fact doing as a policy is to have uncontrolled availability of liquor, and the further opening up of the liquor to the public. And I want to say that that leads to exorbitant use of liquor and the social costs will increase.

We have rumours of it going to be put into the phantom coliseum in Saskatoon in the event that Molson Breweries signs the contract with the Hunter-Batoni group, that the condition of it is that you sell liquor at the hockey games — Molson's. You also indicate that some talk is being made that you're going to in fact extend it to Taylor Field. And I want to say that every trend made by this government is to secretly make availability more and more available, and that's why you won't put in an increase to meet those particular cases, but you want unlimited right to increase the availability.

I want your comments as to what is your direction in respect to the availability of liquor. Are you going to extend it to Taylor Field? Have you done any surveys on it? What is your thought in it? Where are you going to extend it — to the coliseum if it ever comes to be in Saskatoon? Why aren't you limiting the number of special liquor outlets, rather than an unlimited number, if in fact you're saying with sincerity that it is not your direction in fact to make liquor totally available and extended throughout this province, the like of which we have never seen?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I'll remind the member from Quill Lakes that that's why you're sitting over there. Eight measly little members. Fifty-six over here because we listen. We listen, the members from Quill Lakes; we listen. We will listen to the people of Regina and the football fans of this city. I understand they're going to have an open forum, and if that open forum clearly indicates that they want the service at Taylor Field, then we will listen to them. We will sit down and talk to them.

The same goes for Saskatoon. We have made no dealings with any NHL team, no dealings whatsoever. In regards to your reference of North Regina, Argyle Park, the people out there clearly indicated what they wanted out there. The city of Regina rezones that so it was available to a liquor licence out there. It wasn't the government of

Saskatchewan. It was the city of Regina, and if you paid attention to what's going on in the province you'd know that. You know nothing about what's going on. That's why you're sitting over there.

And it was one of your people, it was one of your people who led the charge to Regina city council: let us have a licensed outlet at Argyle Park. Then he conveniently turned around, turned the other cheek, and said, 'It wasn't me.' You'd better start listening to what's going on, Mr. Member from Quill Lakes. You don't know nothing . . . anything. Pardon my grammar.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — I would like to ask the minister that in proposing this expansion of the liquor availability in this province, has he received briefs from the Anglican Church and from the United Church and from the Roman Catholic church? And are you aware of a brief that was submitted by the joint church groups to the federal government in respect to the relaxation, opposing the relaxation of the availability of liquor, and also of gambling? And I'll come to gambling in a moment, which you're opening up in this province. Are you aware of those briefs and have you in fact met with those church groups, which, when I was minister, I met with and listened to? I ask you, if you're communicating with the public, tell me what groups you have met with in respect to formulating your policy for the expansion of liquor.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, the liquor review committee, made up of several members of this House, has listened to many groups. They have talked to associations across the province, associations across the province. I have talked to people of the churches of this province; I know where they stand. I know where many various groups stand on this particular issue. What I am saying again and again and again here is that we are prepared to listen to all views, Mr. Chairman. We are prepared to weigh the factors coming from both sides, and we will do that. The liquor review committee has done a good job. I will be reviewing a final report in due course from them, and at that time we will be making some decisions in regards to The Liquor Act.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I just want to follow up on this, Mr. Chairman. I have heard from the members opposite that their motto, their direction, is 'God first, the family second, and the Tory party third.' I wonder whether you're getting your priorities mixed. It seems to me that with liquor and gambling, what you're looking at is the Tory party first, and you're catering to those who want to get the sales of liquor at any cost to society. I ask you again: can you indicate to this group here today — have you met with the various church groups in respect to implementing your policy of expanding liquor availability in this society?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to table a document with the member opposite indicating the groups that the committee has met with, and I'm sure that the member from Quill Lakes will realize that the membership of those associations and committees are church-going people — many of them. I would say that a lot of them go to church.

**Mr. Koskie** — Well, I want to follow up, Mr. Chairman, and I want to ask the minister a simple question. Can he indicate and table and provide us with the information, the

particular church groups that he has met with since he assumed the role as minister in charge of the extension of liquor availability in this province? A simple question: have you met with the United Church? Have you met with the Catholic Church? Have you met with the Anglican Church, and the Lutherans, and the Baptists? Those are all the groups that we met with during the time that I was minister. Have you met with them before embarking on this new policy of expansion of the availability of liquor in our society?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I have indicated to the member that I will supply him with a list of the groups I have met with.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I want to return to the issue of the liquor sales at Taylor field. I'd be interested in hearing the member from Rosemont. I well appreciate that the keen race for the cabinet position and your prominence in that race makes it impossible for you to get into it. I would like to hear you on this subject, and I'm surprised that your conscience doesn't force you into the debate, but I'll leave that. I'll leave that. Did I understand the minister to say a moment ago that if a referendum were held in this city, or there were some indication the majority of people in Regina wanted liquor sales at Taylor Field, that in fact you would consider yourself bound by that? Is that what you're saying?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I didn't indicate any such thing in regards to a referendum. I made reference to the city of Regina holding an open forum, and letting the community, the city of Regina, decide what they want, not us as a government tell them what they can have. In regards to the service of light beer at Taylor Field, personally I don't care. I got to one football game or I've attended one football game in the last five years, and I don't drink beer. So I'm saying to that member that the people of Regina should be able to decide, and the football fans that attend at that stadium should be able to decide what services they want there.

**Mr. Shillington:** — But surely Mr. Minister, it is a decision for society as a whole and not just for the fans at Taylor Field.

I want to say that I'm no teetotaler, but you simply can't read the annual report of the liquor board — and I know members opposite have some kind of a disinclination from reading, and I know annual reports are anathema to you people, and you absolutely refuse to read them, but I recommend that you try the last annual report of the liquor board and look at those per capita consumption figures. You cannot look at them and read them without a sense of concern about where our society is going. It is getting to be a serious problem and a very costly one, and the tentacles of the liquor problem are in all segments of our society.

I can virtually go across the front row of the treasury benches and I can tell each minister sitting there, including the minister for rural affairs, how this problem is exacerbating your financial problems. And that's being crass about it; that's forgetting the human tragedy involved. And I suggest to the minister that this is not simply a decision for the fans of Taylor Field. I suggest this is a decision for all society.

I would also suggest to the minister that you have a responsibility to provide some leadership. For the minister to get up and say, 'I don't care; they can do whatever they want.' Surely leadership is more than that, Mr. Minister. Edmund Burke, I think it was Edmund Burke, who said that, 'You owe the voters not your obedience, but your judgement.' I ask you, Mr. Minister, for your judgement on the issue, and don't just tell us that you're going to do whatever the voters want. Give us your judgement.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I would answer that inquiry with another one. It was the former administration that licensed the Green and White Room in Taylor Field as it is now. It wasn't this administration that put a licensed outlet into Taylor Field. It was you that put it in there, not this administration. Why did you do that?

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, is the minister going to entirely avoid the subject and refuse to tell us where you stand? Is the minister going to entirely avoid the subject, or will you give us your judgement, to use the phrase of Edmund Burke? Will you give us your judgement on the issue?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I have never varied one bit, Mr. Chairman, in how I feel about the availability of liquor. I say it's up to the people of Saskatchewan to decide that, up to the people of Regina, and up to the fans in Taylor Field, if that's what we're talking about.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Before the clock runs out at 5, I want to deal with Mr. Martin Pederson himself. I wonder if you would tell this Assembly what his qualifications . . . I would like his salary, but I'm prepared to take that in writing. But I would appreciate it, Mr. Minister, if you would give us his qualifications for the positions of liquor board and liquor licensing commission.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — We can supply that information to the member, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Shillington:** — No, I'm asking you for his qualifications. Surely the minister doesn't have to go back and read that. Surely you remember why you appointed him. I don't expect you to remember his salary in detail, but I'm not sure it's entirely fair, unless it's exorbitant, to make a public issue out of it. His qualifications, Mr. Minister, are . . . Given the fact that he's a former leader of your party, his qualifications are, I think, an appropriate item for discussion, but I'd ask you for his qualifications for the job, as distinct from his salary.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — I'll supply that information, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Have you no idea why you appointed him, or can you think of no reason other than the political pressures to appoint him? Can you not give us any? If you can't, I'll take the suggestion of the member from Saskatoon University. If you can't give us all his qualifications, no doubt the list would be so lengthy, can you give us some of his qualifications for the job?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't have a complete outline of Mr. Pederson's . . . or his resume here with me at the time, but I can tell them that he has management capabilities. He is a very personable person. During the short time that he has been the chairman of the liquor board the staff there has indicated to me that Mr. Pederson is doing an excellent job. They enjoy working with him. He is a person that has great capabilities in directing staff, in controlling operations of the liquor board, in supervising the operations of the liquor board.

He formerly owned and managed a company known as Manpower Services in Saskatoon, which was a company which placed people looking for work, so, therefore, he has experience in human resources. He's also a former farmer. He farmed for many years in the Strongfield area of Saskatchewan.

He's also a man that paid his dues to our nation. He was a fighter pilot in the Second World War and has flown many missions over enemy soil during the Second World War. Mr. Martin Pederson has my complete confidence. He has the confidence of the Premier of Saskatchewan that he can do the job, and he has the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan that he can do the job. That's why he's there. And if you want to know his salary, it's 60,000 per annum.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Chairman, I followed this debate with a great deal of interest — how the minister is attempting to defend the opening up of liquor outlets, opening up liquor outlets in the province of Saskatchewan. And I suppose that he is to be commended for the fact that he is honest enough to admit that he wants more liquor outlets and wants more liquor at public functions. But what I have a great deal of difficulty understanding is how the Minister of Highways, in his sanctimonious fashion, goes around the province and pretends that the Conservative Party and this Conservative government is against liquor being involved in people's lives.

What I would like to explain to you is how you square your talk about increasing liquor at various functions to the Minister of Highways' accusation that people would be drinking less. How do you square that conflict with the people of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — The member is putting words into his head that I never said. I never said I wanted increased consumption. I never said I wanted increased consumption in the province. I said that this government is prepared to increase the numbers of special vendors in the province — in the hamlets, in the villages, in the towns that indicate they want that. It is a matter of service, not increased consumption.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Is the minister saying, Mr. Chairman, that there's no correlation between the number of liquor outlets and the access to liquor and consumption of alcohol? Is that what he's trying to make people in Saskatchewan believe?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, I again repeat what the advice has been to me from the liquor board and through the liquor board: that they feel that the consumption in Saskatchewan will not increase appreciably by lifting the limit on special liquor vendors in the province of Saskatchewan. We've had in the area of 950,000 to 980,000 people for the last 30 years, and essentially the amount consumed has remained fairly stable.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.