

SASKATCHEWAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

May 28, 1984

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10

Item 1 (continued)

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I wonder if we might move along on some of the items which we were earlier discussing.

You indicated that the Executive Council now has personal service contracts with five people, including David Black, Jack Harrington, John Schaw . . . I do not know whether you were counting Michael Leddy. What other people do you have contracts of personal service with?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the five are Barabas, Black, Harrington, Krupski, and Todd.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — All right, one is Barabas, Black, Harrington, Todd and, and Huxkey, did you say? With respect to persons . . . I will come back to Barabas and Huxkey, if I've got the name right, in a moment. With respect to the persons who I believe who were on your staff at some time during the last year: David Black, per diem rate - \$176 a day. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, that's correct. It's unchanged.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Garven and Harrington: Garven — \$290 a day; Harrington — \$350 a day. Are those correct?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, they're exactly the same as they were last year, and they've been given in *Public Accounts*, and they're unchanged.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Holbird and Leddy — \$200 a day and \$190 a day. Are those two correct? And I'll put Roberts in at \$250 a day. Are those three correct?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Those people, or contracts, no longer exist, Mr. Chairman. There are only five people on personal contracts.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Sorry I didn't make myself clear, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier. During the year under review — or perhaps it's not under review, but during the year which we have just passed — it's my understanding that Holbird, Leddy, and Roberts were on contract, and that they were paid, respectively, \$200 a day; \$190 a day; and \$250 a day — and I'm asking whether those facts are correct.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member may be reviewing last year; we're looking at this year's estimates. And I'm saying that those people that are still employed are receiving the same as they did last year. And I made that clear several times.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier. I'm asking again, and if you refuse to answer, simply say you refuse. Is it true that during the last year you had on staff Bonnie Holbird, Michael Leddy and Barry Roberts, and they were on contracts receiving, respectively, \$200 per day; \$190 per day; and \$250 per day?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, when those individuals were employed with me, they received what it says in the book. When they're no longer employed by me, they're not receiving that — or, in fact, from Executive Council, they're receiving zero. And I've said many, many times, and I've gone through the list and the hon. member knows that.

So I have five people now on personal services contract. Last year I had more than that for various reasons that I've already mentioned. And their salaries are exactly as I said last year, and he has them all. And I said they remained unchanged.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I appreciate the Premier's reluctance to say that John Schaw makes \$350 a day, but I'm going to ask you: when John Schaw was in your employ in the last 12 months, did he get \$350 a day?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I sent the information over last year. And the information hasn't changed. If he received X amount of dollars last year, then he received X amount of dollars this year, because it's unchanged.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Very well. With respect to Dave Tkachuk, I assume then that the \$350 per day is unchanged, and that . . . Do I understand that he is now on contract, or is he employed on some other basis?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Tkachuk is an order in council appointment.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to the people who were not on your list last year, namely Barabas and Krupski, if I have their names right, would you indicate who these people are? I appreciate the spelling of their name and the rate of their remuneration per diem.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I'll repeat the names: Mik Barabas, David Black, Jack Harrington, Jane Krupski, Lynn Todd. And they receive exactly what they received last year.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. Would you advise what they received last year, because in all the material which I have, I do not see either of their names? And I started out reading all of the ones that I thought I had, starting with Barry, Black, Chamberlain, Disbery, Fitzpatrick, Forsythe, Garven, and the rest, and they did not include Barabas, and they did not include Krupski.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I've already provided the hon. member with the fact that there are five individuals. If all five of them worked all the normal days, it would come to \$178,309 — something like about \$35,000 a piece. If each of them, under the contracts that I've already given and provided last year — it said that they are unchanged — worked the normal course of the year of 260-some dollars, their salaries would be in the neighbourhood of 51,000; and 30,000; and 60,000; and 18,000; and 17,000 — Barabas, Black, Harrington, Krupski and Todd — and I've already presented that information and it is unchanged.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Premier, I hate to contradict the Premier, but I flatly contradict you that you gave me any information with respect to Barabas or Krupski. Now let's, please understand what I'm saying. I will supply you with the material you supplied me, and if you can find Barabas and Krupski's name on there, you're welcome to it.

And I will read the list: Barry, \$200 per day; David Black, \$176 per day; Grant Chamberlain, \$200 per day; Ian Disbery, \$250 per day; Lorraine Fitzpatrick, \$135 per day; Reg Forsythe, \$225 per day; Garnet Garven, \$290 per day; Linda Gendur, \$11 per hour; Hack Harrington, 350 per day; Bonny Holbird, \$200 per day; Marjorie Germyn, \$155 per day; Kathy Lambsdown, \$100 per day; Keith Lampard, \$250 per day; Michael Leddy, \$190 per day; Terry Leier, \$410 per day; R.C. Livingstone, \$330 per day; John Nichol, \$150 per day; Jim Paterson, \$3,000 per month; James

Petrychyun, \$90 per day; Lawrence Prout, \$175 per day; Barry Roberts, \$250 per day; Paul Robinson, \$290 per day; Harvey Rothecker, \$150 per day; John Schaw, \$350 per day; Andrew Schmitz, \$350 per day; Robert Svoboda, \$150 per day; Dave Tkachuk, \$350 per day; Lynn Todd, \$11 per hour; Ted Walters, \$250 per day; and Russell Young, \$100 per day — and I saw no Barabas or Krupski there.

Would you mind telling me what their per diem is?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I advised the member opposite that during the year of transition we had 31 people on a personal contract basis. It's now down to five. There are two of those of the five that were not on the original list of the 31. I apologize to the member for not having the two additional one the list of the original 31. I will provide him with the same sort of information that I did on the others, that is, what they received, and the corresponding information that the 31 had over a year ago.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, with respect to the per diem of these — you gave me all the per diems of the others — if per diems of \$350 and \$410 per day didn't embarrass you, why won't you give me the per diem for Barabas and Jane Krupski? And, if there's just two, can you give me those figures now?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I've already said that their salaries — if they worked on a normal basis of 260-some days — would be 51,000 and 18,000, and I'll calculate them out and send them over.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, that you're saying that Barabas is paid at a rate of \$51,000 per year, and Jane Krupski is paid at a rate of \$18,000 per year? Are you telling me that the person who works with Mr. Harrington, a Jane Krupski, if I've got the right person, does she work on a full time basis at the rate of \$18,000 per year?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I said earlier that if they worked the normal course of days.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why do you say, "if"?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, a personal contract you can work any number of days that you want to put in, okay? So, if they worked on a normal course of events, that would have 260-some days, they would give us something in the neighbourhood of \$18,929 for Miss Krupski, and that's what I said it was. So I'll calculate it in terms of a per diem, and I'll send it over. The same applies to Mr. Barabas.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, would you mind telling me what was paid to Jane Krupski for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1984?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, my officials inform me that Jane Krupski receives a \$110 on a daily basis, and if she works the normal course of events, would in the ballpark get \$18,929 a year, as I've been saying for some time.

Mr. Barabas is \$300, and if he worked the normal course of events, would get \$51,623, if he worked the normal 260-some days. If he works half that, he gets less. If he worked more than that, I guess he would get more.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier. I take it then that the answers are: for Jane Krupski, \$110 per day; and Mr. Barabas, \$300 per day. And that deals with those items.

With respect to law firms employed by Executive Council in the past, let us say, 18 months, would the Premier indicate what law firms were employed? And please understand what I'm

asking. I'm not now asking what was paid to them, but what law firms were employed?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, we are checking, but to the best of my knowledge at this time — and we'll check and see if there is any more — MacPherson, Leslie, and Tyerman were the only firm employed by Executive Council.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, what services were rendered by MacPherson, Leslie, and Tyerman to Executive Council. What's the nature of the services rendered?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, confidential legal advice.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Did this confidential legal advice involve them in the pursuing of any legal actions or the defending of any legal actions during the period under, for the last 18 months, on behalf of Executive Council?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I replied that it was for confidential information, and it's exactly that — it's confidential.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I ask you again: did this involve them launching any legal actions on behalf of the Crown, or defending any legal actions on behalf of the Crown? And if so, I would be interested in knowing how you can make a legal action confidential.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, they — MacPherson, Leslie and Tyerman — did not launch any legal actions on behalf of the Executive Council, nor did they defend any.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, with respect to the confidential legal advice, we are understanding that the advice that they rendered to you was confidential. Are the subjects on which they rendered the advice equally confidential?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, if they're retained to provide confidential advice, they are doing so on confidential matters, and as a result, they are confidential.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, you take the view that not only is the advice confidential, but the subjects on which you consulted legal counsel are similarly confidential. And therefore you take the view that money simply should be paid to the firm and no accounting of any kind should be given to the public on what issue you sought legal advice on. Of course we understand why the advice they gave you should be confidential — that is understood.

But with respect to the matters which you felt the need of legal advice on, you take the view that you won't divulge none of that. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the kinds of advice that, for areas that people would be getting advice for in Executive Councils here, now and in the past, across the country, are with respect to settlements with employees, or government employee separations, regulations, orders in council, having some outside advice to confirm that, on inside advice — who's in the ballpark, and general advice to the government.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well I'm surprised to know that the form of orders in council is confidential, but I'm continually surprised about what this government does not reveal, and sometimes surprised about what it does reveal. He has just told me that somebody, Jane Krupski is getting something like \$18,000 a year, and then when pressed, it gets to be \$110 a day. And I don't know how often she worked, but if she works the normal 260 days in a year or thereabouts . . . We will, a simple bit of mathematics will indicate that \$110 a day times 26 — 260 days

is not going to produce 18,000, but probably \$28,600, by my rough calculation. But somebody can have another go at that.

Similarly, the \$300 a day paid to Barabas will not produce \$51,000 a day if he's working 260 days, but something like 78,000, and I think those are pretty significant differences - \$300 a day on 260 days, and that's — and perhaps 260 days is not the right number, but it's very, very close — that's what you offered: \$300, \$78,000. Simply put, Mr. Premier, is it around \$51,000, as you first told me, or is it \$300 a day, as you next told me, which works out to \$78,000?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order! Allow the Premier to answer.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — I have here a chart. I'm sure the hon. member has been through it in his own experience. But it gives the comparison of dollars per day on contract and what that's worth in a gross figure, and then at the bottom of the page, it's headed what it's worth when you subtract all the other benefits or uncomparable figures to somebody that works for the normal government. And in the case for somebody on contract, the hon. member knows that they don't receive the cash benefits associated with Canada Pension Plan, or unemployment insurance, or superannuation, or group life insurance, or the dental plan, or the disability income plan. Non-cash benefits, they don't receive the vacation of three weeks, the sick leave, statutory holidays (which are 11), scheduled days off (which are 12), or car allowance, or professional days which amount to 2.3 per cent of what the total is, is six days.

So that's where we get the normal figure. If you want to start at \$100 a day, it's worth, gross, 26,100; on a comparable figure, given normal public employees, it's 17,208. If you go up to — I'll pick the one that we're looking at here - \$300 a day, gross, it's 78,300. If you take it into comparable figures given normal employees, it's 51,623, and that's where that came from. If you wanted \$200 a day, it's, gross, 52,000; subtract the other normal benefits, it's 34,415. So that's the difference.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I see then. We're doing some equivalents here. But in the money that was paid to Mr. Barabas would be in excess of \$75,000 a year and if he worked the 250 days or so. Obviously, if he works fewer days, he'll get less, but somebody might well have assumed from your answer that he was getting something like 51,000 and, in fact, if he works the 250 days or so, he'll get 75,000 or better.

I turn to a different subject now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I don't think . . . I hadn't hear any call for a review of the Conservative leadership. They usually do every couple of years, but I haven't heard it yet.

Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I want to turn to a somewhat different subject for the moment, and that deals with agriculture and grain and shipping costs. And I am now quoting from the *Leader-Post* of last November, when it quoted as follows:

We'll do whatever is necessary to make sure that the future of Saskatchewan grain growers is not destroyed by higher freight rates.

And then:

Devine said the government will be monitoring very, very carefully the impact of legislation passed by the House of Commons to eliminate the Crow's Nest freight rate.

That was back in November. Would the Premier care to comment on the fruits of the monitoring of the legislation, the impact of the legislation passed with respect to the Crow rate?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, we're just digging up a little bit of information. While we are, I might respond to a question that I took notice of, and that was with respect to a house owned by Sheila Brucker, in Carlyle. Bob Brucker, her husband, an employee of Saskatchewan Power Corporation, was transferred from the Carlyle office to the Regina office in October, 1981. He moved his family into the Regina residence in January of 1982, and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation board at that time approved the purchase of his Carlyle home in January of 1982.

And I understand that this is normal procedure and that was the story that I was referring to in the *Leader-Post* that said that Bob Brucker was incorrectly identified as an in-scope union employee. The story under the headline was "SPC Cabinet bend policy by buying employee's house", and the *Leader-Post* went on to make an apology saying that the SPC board of directors approved the purchase of Brucker's bungalow in Carlyle after two appraisals. One appraisal valued the house at 71,500 and after a second appraisal, the board agreed to pay Brucker 67,500. So on July 21, 1982, the president of the corporation recommended to the minister in charge that the purchase be approved, and cabinet passed the order in council August 11, 1982.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, was the house owned by Mr. Brucker, or was it owned by the person who is now your secretary or your assistant secretary?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, Bob and Sheila Brucker are husband and wife. I haven't done a title search. I'm not . . . I can't say who owns the house, but I suspect that they owned it jointly, as do married folks.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I indicated to you — I'll see if I can turn it up again — the order in council that did not have any reference to Bob Brucker on the order in council.

It's a small point, but the order in council is dated August 11th, 1982. It's order in council no. 1301/82, and the registered owner is Sheila Brucker. I take it you tell me that she is the wife of Bob Brucker, and the power corporation bought it because she is the wife of the person who they transferred.

And I take it that's what you're telling me, and I understand it, although I point out to you that, at least if the order in council which you signed is accurate, there was no case of joint ownership, but simple ownership by Sheila Brucker.

I ask again with respect to the government's monitoring very, very carefully the impact of legislation passed by the House of Commons in Ottawa to eliminate the Crow's Nest Freight Rate. Are you monitoring, have you monitored, and what are the results of your efforts at monitoring?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I will address that in a moment.

I'd like to make it very clear that it was the board of directors in January of 1981 that made this decision with respect to the Brucker house — 1981 — so it had nothing to do with the current administration in making that decision.

January of 1981 was the information that — pardon me, January of 1982 . . . So if there was any concern about which Brucker owned the house, it must have been evident in January of 1982. And we just carried on on the advice of the board of directors at that time.

I would take this opportunity to read a couple of paragraphs of the communiqué that the western premiers just sent to the federal government on transportation, which reflects the concern that not only this province, but, I would suggest, the neighbouring provinces, have with respect to changes in freight rates.

And it goes on to say the following:

The premiers emphasized the critical importance of transportation for the development of their provinces. They agreed that there should be upgrading of facilities, and simplified regulations for all modes of transportation. And specifically with respect to rail capacity and rate structure, the premiers strongly urged that the full expansion of rail capacity, which was intended to follow the passage of the western grain transportation act, proceed according to previously announced plans.

They noted that, since the passage of the act, the railways have revised their cost estimates for projected capital commitments, and suggested that this change should be reflected in a downward revision of the rate structure. The premiers expressed concern that the rate structure for grain shipments penalized increased production of this key export. They strongly urged the federal government to remove the artificial marketing cap of 31.5 million metric tonne. (And finally) the premiers agreed that the federal government must encourage expansion of value added processing activity in the West, western Canada, as been promised earlier.

Mr. Chairman, that reflection of the four western premiers, which includes the Premier of Manitoba, and obviously the Premier of British Columbia, was based on considerable amount of research on the fact that the railroads had readjusted their estimates on what it might cost to refurbish the branch lines, and the main lines, and double track, and whatever else, from about \$15 billion down to about 11 or \$12 billion.

And the premiers were very concerned that if the railroads found an additional 3 or \$4 billion, that it should be, one, either reflected in a reversal of the rate changes, that is the rate should be reduced, or we should see an immediate identification of the kinds of change that were evident as a result of that new-found money of \$4 billion.

So we have been monitoring it. We brought that information to the table. The other premiers agreed, and they went even farther to say, yes, we will agree with Saskatchewan that they should remove the 31.5 million metric tonne, because all it is is an artificial disincentive to market more. And if we were supposed to be marketing more within the rate structure, let's make sure we're getting our money's worth, number one; and number two, let's not build in disincentives, so that farmers will have the encouragement to produce not only 31.5, but perhaps 40 million metric tonne on an annual basis.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are monitoring it. We take our concerns to the western premiers level. These are sent to the Prime Minister, and indeed to the railroads. And I recently received a copy from the Premier of Alberta, who's been asking, specifically with my endorsement, the railroads what they're doing with the money.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I'm sure that we all hope that the railways will spend the money they promised. I don't think anybody in this Chamber is so naïve as to believe that commitments by the railway companies which were not imposed upon them by law will, in fact, be honoured by the railway companies. This has not been their practice, and I have no reason to believe that they will stray from their past practices of steadfastly spending as little and gathering in as much as they can. And I think not even the Premier would be naïve enough to believe that they were going to spend this \$16 billion, and they're not in the time frame. In due course, they undoubtedly will, but not in the time frame indicated.

I don't believe either that the Premier believes that the cap is likely to come off in the immediate future. It may well be that he believes there will be a change of government in Ottawa, and if there is, that the cap will come off. We'll await that.

What I am asking the government of Saskatchewan intends to do to assist farmers who are burdened by the additional amounts which are going to be imposed upon grain shippers — amounts which were even larger than we had assumed would be the case, because of the manner in which shipments are being calculated; the manner in which the cap is being used to calculate the grain rate. What steps does the government of Saskatchewan propose to take to assist grain shippers, who are being burdened with a very sharply escalating freight rate because of the changes in the Crow rate statute?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member mentions, one of the most positive things that could happen to western Canadian farmers would be a brand-new administration in Ottawa. We have had the opportunity to have a more powerful voice in Ottawa for a very short time period before, due to events that I'm sure that the members opposite are not all that happy with. It was reverted back, and we had four or five more years of the same. But I would certainly concur with the member opposite that one of the most positive things western Canada could have is a brand-new administration in Ottawa to remove the 31.5 million metric tons.

The former Minister of Finance said, just the other night in Regina, with a brand-new administration in Ottawa, they would remove the diesel fuel tax for farmers. They said that in public. They would make sure that the expenditures on transportation would be there.

So, if you take those three things: a brand-new government in Ottawa, with a brand-new administration in Ottawa, they would remove the diesel fuel tax for farmers; remove the 31.5 million metric tons; and have money spent in provinces like Saskatchewan that generate most of the revenue for the railroads, so that, in fact, we could see some of those improvements here; so we can, in fact, see some of the marketings, and improve the net profit position of farmers in western Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I remember that last government in which Mr. Crosbie was the Minister of Finance. And I can remember sitting down around a table when he was telling us what he was going to do with fuel prices, and it was all up, all up. And it isn't that long ago, you know, when he was 18 cents a gallon, and . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Eighteen cents.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Eighteen cents a gallon, that's right. And that's what the tax is going to go up. But we can believe Mr. Crosbie if we like. He certainly had his chance and didn't take the first chance to lower the cost for farmers. He certainly didn't take his first chance.

But what I would to ask is not what Mr. Crosbie may do in the event that his party is elected and he is Minister of Finance, not what some other party might do in Ottawa, but what the PC Party is going to do in Regina. And that is the question I direct to you, Mr. Premier: what is the PC Party going to do in Regina to assist farmers who are bearing the burden of higher freight rates because of the Crow rate change?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the most important this that we can do in Saskatchewan . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. I would ask the member from Regina North West to keep quiet while the Premier is answering a question.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the most important thing that we can do in Saskatchewan to improve the transportation system in western Canada . . . The single most important thing that we can do is to make sure that we have a brand new administration in Ottawa. That's the single most important thing that we can do.



Now I would know, Mr. Speaker, that the previous administration would rather support Mr. Trudeau and the Ottawa Liberals, and they have in many, many cases, and they did here in Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked: what's the most important thing that we can do? We can make sure, we can make sure that there are 14 brand new members, 14 members here in the province of Saskatchewan representing a brand new administration in the Dominion of Canada. That would be the most important thing that we could do.

And it will come to pass, in my view, Mr. Chairman, because people have seen the results of the last 15 years, and they've seen what people here would do to deny others an opportunity to do that. So, Mr. Chairman, I will point out that what we have done provincially is make the strongest recommendations possible with the support of the three western provinces. Manitoba supported our position, Alberta supported our position, B.C. supported it in a communiqué to the federal government, telling them exactly what to do, which has been endorsed by the federal Progressive Conservative Party, which will be the case when we have a brand new administration in Ottawa.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I'll ask the question again — not what a government in Ottawa is going to do, but what the government in Regina is going to do. That was the question I asked. It was you, sir, and not Mr. Mulroney or Mr. Crosbie, who said that you would put your treasury behind the farmers if they were injured by the removal of the Crow rate — not Mr. Crosbie's treasury, not Mr. Mulroney's treasury, not Mr. Lalonde's treasury, not Mr. Trudeau's treasury, but Mr. Devine's treasury, the treasury of the province of Saskatchewan. And my question is relatively simply; my question is relatively simple. What do you propose to do as Premier of Saskatchewan, other than talk, other than talk, to assist farmers who are facing higher costs because of the removal of the Crow rate?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the record of the previous administration in agriculture was so poor I didn't know that they'd want to bring this up, but now that they have, then we'll get into it. We'll get into it, Mr. Chairman, if they are prepared to listen, I'm prepared to tell them. And if they're not prepared to listen, then I will wait. I'll wait.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asks what money we're spending out of our treasury for the province of Saskatchewan in agriculture . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . If they're prepared to listen, I'm prepared to tell them . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

A dollar is a dollar, lad. Let's talk. Mr. Chairman, let me go through the dollars that we're spending which will include all kinds of things that we're doing in agriculture that helps reduce the cost and increase the net profit.

First . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Chairman, they obviously don't want to listen. I think the public of Saskatchewan would like to know the answer to the question. Okay?

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. Allow the Premier to answer the question.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me add up the money in the Saskatchewan treasury that's going into agriculture, and see if it has any impact on the cost-price squeeze or on impact that transportation rates may have. And I'll deal specifically with transportation, all right? And you should get your pencil out and you should start adding it up.

We can start and we will begin with the removal of the tax on gasoline — a hundred million dollars. A hundred million dollars that isn't charged in the province of Saskatchewan. Half of that goes to rural Saskatchewan; half of it is urban. The population is split 50-50 — half rural, half urban. \$50 million a year annually in the pockets of rural Saskatchewan as a result of the gas tax removal - \$50 million; \$50 million.

Mr. Chairman, they don't want to listen. Mr. Chairman, a hundred million dollars a year that comes from the treasury into the hands and the pockets of people in Saskatchewan — 50 per cent rural, 50 per cent urban. That's \$50 million a year that goes into the pockets, into the jeans, into the hands of people in rural Saskatchewan. It averages, Mr. Chairman, about \$300 per driver. And if you start looking at the individuals, Mr. Chairman, you can find out that it'll average \$300. For a family of three or four that have drivers, that's an awful lot of money.

50 million, just in agriculture itself. Second, second . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The second major expenditure is \$11 million a year to remove the education tax off the home quarter. And that will add up to in the neighbourhood of \$300 per individual. That's the second one.

The tax on power for agriculture has been removed. And that will add up anywhere to, say, \$50 a year, depending on the home owner and the farmer. And that can amount to in the neighbourhood of \$5 million. That, in ballpark, Mr. Chairman, is \$650 per individual, or something like \$66 million per year for all individuals that either use gasoline or have a home quarter or have power that they use on their farms - \$66 million that wasn't there before. Let's make that very clear. It wasn't there before.

And if you start talking about the gas rebate or the diesel fuel rebate, that was removed by the former administration. And even when they had it here, it didn't amount to the \$11 million that's even applied to the home quarter. It didn't add up to that.

So we're looking \$50 million for gasoline tax, \$11 million for the home quarter tax, and \$5 million for power. Now, Mr. Chairman, it isn't in there.

Eight per cent money to young people wanting to own their own farm in the province of Saskatchewan. That's eight per cent. That's a mark-down of interest rates that it can add up to . . . Well, depending on how much they borrow, it can add up to on, say, \$300,000 at 10 per cent — you're looking at \$3,000 savings — anywhere from 25 to \$40 million.

Rural gas can save individual members a thousand dollars a year for the participants that want to use it, and that's 350 million, over 10 years, is another \$35 million dollars, on an annual basis.

Those participating that want to, in the livestock tax credit, can add up anywhere from 1,000 to 3,000 to 10,000 or more, which can contribute to something like \$10 million that you're adding up.

So you're looking at over \$100 million that is being put into agriculture by the treasury of the province of Saskatchewan. Now, that's on an annual basis, ongoing, every single year, that wasn't there before. And you start adding that up per individual, and you can look at up from 5 to 10 to \$12,000 per individual that wasn't there before.

Now, let's get on to tax with respect to railroads. The increase in the freight rate for the province of Saskatchewan is evidently going to cost us something in the neighbourhood of \$17 million. We have increased some taxes in the province of Saskatchewan — some taxes. Mostly we've reduced them to ordinary people. But with respect to the railroads, they're going to pay increased revenues of \$19 million - \$19 million to the people of Saskatchewan.

So, if you add up the tax revenues that are coming in, and you look at the programs, Mr.

Chairman, you see \$100 million a year going into agriculture that wasn't going in there before. It adds up to hundreds and thousands of dollars per farmer or rural family, that didn't have it before. Plus the railroads, who are going to be receiving something in the neighbourhood of \$17 million extra revenue, have paid the province of Saskatchewan an extra \$19 million in taxes.

Now, all the tax revenue helps us contribute to rural Saskatchewan in a way that it was never contributed before. So you ask: what is this treasury doing in the defence of farmers? It's not limited to freight rates, Mr. Chairman. It's not limited to livestock. It's not limited to gasoline costs. It's not limited to any one sector of agriculture. All of rural Saskatchewan, plus agriculture, are receiving significant, and major, and the largest contributions from the treasury that they ever have in the history of the province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I don't suppose we could expect the Premier long to restrain himself before he got into his gas tax speech. But I . . . Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I should have said his speech, because there is no particular difference.

But I want to remind you, Mr. Premier, that the promise you made to put the treasury behind the farmer, was made in the spring of 1983. It was made, certainly, well on in '82 — and my recollection is the spring of '83 — long after this gas tax thing, so that wasn't part of what you promised because that was already a fact; long after the farm purchase program, because that wasn't what you promised, that was a fact. And what you promised was very specific: to grain shippers, to grain shippers, so that their shipping costs would not increase. And you promised it, you promised it very distinctly and very clearly. It's not immediately clear how, let us say, a livestock tax credit is going to help a grain shipper that much; not immediately clear how that gets a grain shipper in southern Saskatchewan's grain to Vancouver a whole lot cheaper — not immediately clear.

And we are talking about the ability of Saskatchewan grain growers to get their product to overseas markets. That's what you were talking about. That's what you promised. I ask you again: do you have any proposal to assist Saskatchewan grain producers in the cost of getting their product to overseas market? Do you have any proposal to counteract the additional costs that they have to pay to the railway companies? That's the simple question — not whether they're going to run their automobile at less cost; not because of gasoline tax; not because of their grandson buying a farm; or whatever. Here is a grain shipper who's shipping 20,000 bushels to Vancouver or Thunder Bay. He's going to have to pay more. I ask you: what do you propose to do to assist him in offsetting that additional cost?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, it's fairly obvious that if the railroads in Saskatchewan are picking up an increase of tax of \$17 million, or increase in rates of 17 million, and the Government of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan are receiving 19 million in taxes, and we're looking at over 100 million annually going back to the farm level, that that's something that wasn't being done before. That's number one.

Secondly, the member opposite may not understand how local agricultural demand, particularly livestock, might reduce freight rates because the markets are right here. If we can increase the market for grain in the province of Saskatchewan in the livestock business, obviously we don't have to ship as much. And if we've been shipping feeder cattle and feed grain all over the world or particularly to Quebec or Ontario or the United States or Alberta, we have to pay freight rates on all those. If we can put the two together here for the sake of 2, 3, 4, 500,000 head, that's millions and millions of dollars we don't have to spend on transportation.

And third, Mr. Chairman, let's look at our hundred million annually that's going into agriculture — a hundred million annually, compared to the proposal of the previous administration, which was to what? Buy the CPR. Take the Heritage Fund, which there wasn't any in it, or at least there

wouldn't be after they decided to close all the mines in northern Saskatchewan and buy the CPR.

Well, not many people in Saskatchewan would like to see any portion of the Heritage Fund being put into the CPR and bought. We decided not to do that. We will tax people like banks. We will tax people like railroads. And we'll use the money to reduce costs and build and provide for economic opportunities here in the province of Saskatchewan. And that's what we have decided to do.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. You have made very clear that your proposal to assist grain shippers who are shipping their grain to Thunder Bay and Vancouver is to provide them a market for their grain locally, through stimulation of the livestock industry. That was the short answer of what you said, and I . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Fair enough, fair enough. They will all understand that. They will all understand that.

They all understand how effective it was last time when there were lots of markets locally for the livestock industry. In 1969, '70 and '71 period, there was a great deal of grain sold locally to the livestock industry. It was sold at three bushels for a dollar for grain and three bushels for the buck for barley, but it was sold. And it was . . . And it think some grain shippers didn't regard it as the absolute zenith of their prosperity in 1969 and '70 and 1971, when those conditions prevailed.

We would hope that your program will provide a vigorous market for Saskatchewan grain at better than world prices, but I think we will await to see whether or not we will see a vigorous market for Saskatchewan grains at better than world prices — and better than world prices based upon the cost of shipping grain on not the new freight rates, but on the Crow rate or some modest increase of that, because you're going to protect them from the full impact of the Crow rate. That's what you told them, and that's what they believe and that's what they have every right to believe.

I want to turn to the question of the agent-general and ask you about an order in council that was passed recently, April 25th, providing for \$9,400 for a lease of property in London for the agent-general designate. Now, would you tell me who is the agent-general designate?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the agent-general designate, at that time, was Bob Larter. Temporary accommodation from the 6th of May to the July 31st, '83, was provided Mr. Larter. The requirement for temporary accommodation for Mr. Larter was occasioned by the new government's allowing Mr. Johnson to remain in London until his daughter finished school. The cost was \$9,430.50; the cost of keeping the Larters in a hotel during the same period would have been in the neighbourhood of \$15,000.

The rental accommodation of the type taken by the previous government for the Johnsons would, on the basis of figures provided by the Canadian High Commission in London, cost about \$18,861, so it was to accommodate Mr. Johnson, who wanted to stay a little longer to have his daughter to remain in school. It also allowed some period for Merv Johnson to provide Mr. Larter with some background information, so that he could understand the role and so forth. And from my information, it was the most reasonable accommodation, given the alternatives of hotels or rental accommodations that had been used by the previous administration.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I think I'm puzzled a bit by the dates. The agent-general designate was such from April 1st, 1983 to perhaps July 31, 1983 — perhaps even a little earlier than that. But he became agent-general some time in July of 1983. It may well be that this was just the paper work got slowed up, but you're passing this in April 1984 for \$9,400. If it's the same agent-general designate, I will simply stop the questioning. If it's somebody else and if we're going to get ourselves a new agent-general, and you've already named an agent-general designate to replace Mr. Larter, I'd be interested in knowing who it is.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — No, it is the former. It refers to that period, refers to Mr. Larter and the comptroller brought it in now because he wasn't . . . It was an accounting thing that had to be done at this time.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, are there any other people at the agent-general's office in London who weren't there this time last year? Are there any staff who weren't there this time last year?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — There is no change, Mr. Chairman.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, a few questions of various kinds which I would like to ask. With respect to conflict of interest guide-lines, and this was something I raised with the Minister of Finance when we considered the Finance estimates: it's been promised for close to two years, but certainly actively promised a period of, almost weekly, about a year or a year and a half ago. The question I ask is: what are the existing rules with respect to public employees participating in political activity? You will recall that your earlier remarks, attributed to you in May of 1982, said that no civil servants shall hold membership cards in any political party. You subsequently modified that, and I am asking you: what are the guide-lines with respect to participation in political activity by public servants?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the guide-lines that we have are exactly the same as the former administration. We haven't changed them at all. We haven't rewritten them; we haven't modified them. As I mentioned before, the Ontario . . . The whole issue is before the courts in Ontario, and I think several administrations are looking at that and watching with some degree of interest to see if there should be any more modifications as a result of the decision of the courts.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Then you would agree, Mr. Minister, that this statement attributed to you:

We expect the public service to be thoroughly professional and entirely loyal at all times (and I'm sure that's equally true, but I'm wanting to quote the whole sentence so as not to be accused of ripping it out of context) and to that end we want to ensure that no civil servant hold membership cards in any political party.

You say that that is, if it was a government policy — and I'm not going to argue that with you unless you wish to argue it — that is no longer government policy, and that civil servants are free to hold membership cards in political parties.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I said at that time, I believe, if you go back and look at the record, that I said that no public servant is obliged to hold any card in any political party. They're free to hold a card in any political party if they like. Obviously, where we get into some of the problems is when they are a public employee all day serving the government, and they're also a politician all night, as the case that we saw with respect to local politicians. And it becomes a matter of judgement.

And it can be difficult for them in both places. And that would be true under any administration, or any place else in the Dominion.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, just so that the record will be clear, I'm quoting from something described as notes from the Premier's remarks to deputy ministers, May 13, 1982, and I will quote the full sentence:

We expect the public service to be thoroughly professional and entirely loyal at all times, and to that end we want to ensure that no civil servants hold membership cards in any political party.

End quote.

That is hardly capable of the interpretation which the Premier just gave. He may say that the notes are inaccurate, but what he cannot say is that the notes say that nobody should be forced to belong to a political party. They say very, very categorically that no civil servant shall hold membership cards in any political party.

I take it that that is not the policy of the government, and that civil servants are free to hold membership cards in political parties. I approve of that change of policy, if change it is. I approve of the policy which says that civil servants should be free to hold membership cards and I take it that there will be no effort by the government to require public servants to refrain from being members of political parties, if they don't happen to be the Progressive Conservative Party. I'm sure that public servants have not been required to give up their activity for the Progressive Conservative Party. If they had, they've shown it in a very remarkable ways, like standing for nomination, as a number of them have. And I think the person who is employed by your colleague, the minister of government services, I think, has recently contested a nomination, and others have as well.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I've said before and I'll say it again, that those remarks were not a summary of my remarks. Obviously, my position as a professor at the university allowed me to run politically. I've said many cases that the man that beat me in Estevan was an employee of the government, and obviously NDP, and I viewed it as a democratic right to seek political office, and I still do, and that's the rules. And anybody that implied that it's any different is obviously either not listening to me, because I said it right off the top.

And in fact, it's very clear that Mr. Chapman, for example, went back to work in Sask Power after he was the MLA, when I became the Premier. So there are people who are seeking political office, have won nominations, that are government employees, that may seek three or four different nominations for three different parties, for all I know. It's part of the democratic right. I respect that and that's the law, or that's the rule, or that is the methodology in which this administration operates.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, there was no doubt that that was the rule under the previous administration, and people took leaves of absence and ran for political parties in opposition to the government in power . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And I don't know what the member for Maple Creek is saying, but I'll be interested in replying to her remarks when she enters the debate.

There is no question of that, and there are a goodly number of instances, indeed, when the member for Athabasca was, for a number of years, an employee of the northern school board which was a wholly appointed board by the government of Saskatchewan at that time, not in any sense independent of anybody. And the member for Athabasca, the Liberal member for Athabasca, Allan Guy, was a member, was an employee for a goodly number of years and simply carried on, and we had no quarrel with that. That seemed to me to be a way of underlining the fact that people in this province had a right without reprisal to stand for election by, under the banner of different political parties, and certainly that . . .

I'm not suggesting for a moment that the university falls in the category of a government institution, which it does not, but if anyone thought it did, the current member was, while a employee of the university, standing quite properly, and I don't think that is even germane to the issue.

I want now to raise another area that I want to ask him about. And, Mr. Chairman, this really concerns water and who will handle water. I am not at all clear what the view of the government is with respect to the distribution of responsibility for water-related issues. I am aware that the

new water corporation takes over the functions of the water supply board. So in that sense, those are the commercial functions of water. It also is going to take over some of the functions of the water rights branch, I believe, of the Department of Environment latterly.

There will still be irrigation work in the Department of Agriculture, and I take it the Parks and Renewable Resources will still have its fisheries activities, and the Department of Tourism will still have resort development which in many cases involves water. I think of some of the destination resorts which the Minister of Tourism and Small Business is now promoting. And the Department of Environment still has water pollution control and drainage control.

Will there be any fewer agencies involved in the administration of water than there previously was? They'll be slightly shuffled, admittedly. Some are being moved from Agriculture and, at least, from Environment over to the new corporation. Will there be any fewer agencies involved?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I suppose the fundamental reason . . . There'll be several reasons, but one of the primary reasons for setting up the water corporation was to provide for a "one-stop shopping" facility for water, particularly as it dealt with rural Saskatchewan, both in terms of water supply, sewer, agricultural development, and so forth. We had received many complaints from people. When they came in to deal with a water problem, they'd have to go to several departments to eventually get it resolved, if it ever did get resolved.

One of the primary functions was to establish a unit that could deal with water in a comprehensive fashion, and also — not only in that single unit of management — but also be able to pull information where they needed to have it from various other departments as they saw fit. So that isn't to say that Parks and Renewable Resources still don't deal with fish and wildlife, and obviously wildlife and fish drink water; that Tourism won't use water because of resort development and so forth; or Environment won't deal with health and pollution problems with air and water. That's obviously the case.

But for an awful lot of economic development, rural and urban, and particularly in rural farm and rural non-farm, we found that it was very confounding to the public, and that's why we provided for a mechanism people can come in to and say: this is the water situation we have in our town or our village. Here's the kind of agricultural water project we're looking at. Is this the place to be? And now they can say: yes, that's the place to be. There may be some environmental or pollution or health concern that obviously belong in Health and Environment, but generally, the idea is to provide the kind of "one-stop shopping" for water in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, if you're going to get a grant for irrigation development, will you go to Agriculture or will you go to the water corporation? I say that because the money is in Agriculture and I wasn't at all sure whether, if you were getting grant for irrigation development, you went to the water corporation, as I think would be consistent with the Premier's last remarks, or whether you went to Agriculture, the people who are giving out the grants in accordance with the estimate book.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, in committee of the whole, I believe on May 24, 1984, from page about 2959 to about 2971, the minister outlined in detail the new breakdown of the responsibilities with respect to the water corporation. Now, I believe that he did say that there would be a transitional phase as you move from, say, the agricultural to the water Crown, or from various other aspects of urban and rural development to the water Crown. So that there may be a little bit of overlap as we get it into gear and get it running, as there may have been when they set up telephone companies, public telephones. There was a series of private telephone companies, then, over time we went into strictly Saskatchewan Tel.

So, there is no end of pages of documented evidence as to what will be done where, but again that's not to say that there won't be some period of transition.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier. The material is before us. I still, having heard it all, didn't understand where one went for irrigation grants. And it may well be that that will work itself out, and perhaps I'll not get asked that in my travels, and I'll allow my colleague, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, to answer them. I was just simply trying to figure out what the routing was for people who are still inquiring as to who does what in the water area.

I anticipate that there will be still a good number of questions, because anything to do with water in Saskatchewan necessarily overlaps several jurisdictions.

I just move to a very closely related issue, and that has to do with your general approach to the environment, and to environmental impact studies, and to public hearings with respect to environmental impact studies. Have there been any public hearings — other than simple informational meetings at which something is explained — have there been any public hearings on an environmental issue since you took office, sir?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — I am advised there's been one with respect to the Regina rail line and the possibility of its reallocation.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, would you outline who the commissioner was, or was it a committee or a commission like the Bayda commission, or the Mitchell one, or the one that did the power line from The Pas to Squaw Rapids, or . . . There were many of them — someone did the Nipawin dam, the Coronach plant, the Wintego, proposed Wintego project on the Churchill River that never went ahead. There've been a goodly number, and in each case I think there was an independent chairman. I'm asking who conducted the hearings in the case of the Regina rail line? It frankly slips my mind.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — It'll be the City of Regina, I believe, commissioned it, and I don't know who headed it up, but I'll get that information.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, that will be a different kind of thing. That will be an informational meeting and not one to give recommendations to the government as to whether or not a project should proceed. What I am asking and the Premier will be familiar with a number of environmental hearings — I mention the Bayda one on Cluff Lake and the Mitchell one on Key Lake, and I think it was a Professor Nikofoarak did one on a power line from The Pas to Squaw Rapids. And it slips my mind who the chairman or the board was, although I well know it, who inquired into the Nipawin project and the . . . And I ask whether there had been any hearings or studies of that nature in the last two years?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, there hasn't been one in the last two years. We anticipate one with respect to the upgrader that's announced in the province, of Regina, and certainly, if there is, will be any subsequent announcements with respect to either upgraders or power projects, there will be the corresponding environmental impact assessment.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, a long time — two years — not to have a project which merits an environmental hearing; any major industrial project ordinarily has one. And I guess that means that we haven't had a major industrial project in two years.

But there may well be . . . People might differ on that. There was an expansion to the Rabbit Lake or Collins Bay mine in northeastern Saskatchewan, on which there was some public information meetings, but a decision was made not to have public hearings.

It's perhaps not entirely fair, but can the Premier recall the reason why you decided not to have any public hearings with respect to a major expansion of an uranium mine, and on essentially a different mine on a somewhat different location — not a different mill but a different mine — and why, on that decision, you decided not to have hearings.



**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — I believe that under the Bayda report that the review covered expansions in the area and included them. The recommendations were such that you didn't need to do another Bayda inquiry or Bayda report, having looked at the initial phase of it.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I may not have made myself clear.

I was referring to the Collins Bay or Rabbit Lake mine, which is in northeastern Saskatchewan. The Bayda one covered Cluff Lake in northwestern Saskatchewan, and may well have covered the expansion. But Collins Bay is up on Rabbit Lake, and there never was an environmental impact study, or a hearing, for Rabbit Lake, because it was done in 19 . . . Well it was started in '70, I suppose, '71. And under the previous government but one, and we just had not developed our concern for the environment.

We — I say we, the people of Saskatchewan — hadn't at that time. And I don't particularly fault Mr. Thatcher's government for that. I don't know, had any other government been in power, whether they would have been any different.

But it was because there never had been one for Collins Bay that I thought there might be one. I'm aware that Cluff Lake and Key Lake have been gone over with some care. Collins Bay not so; again I invite any comment.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well Mr. Chairman, or Deputy Chairman, whatever the appropriate name is. I don't really have much more to add. It was my understanding that the Bayda report applied to uranium development in general across northern Saskatchewan. Collins Bay and Rabbit Lake may have been in the mills since the early '70s or before that, so if there were earlier indications of some inquiry or some environmental studies, then I'll take notice and find out why they may not, or were, or whatever that applied to them at some time in the past.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. Since that is a sensitive area, and since that's a mine which had never been a subject of hearing, I had hoped that there would be one in that case and regret it that your government made the decision it did. I won't press it any further.

I would ask a quite different question now. This has to do with power generation, and in the broadest sense could you give a report on any problems which the province of Saskatchewan may be experiencing with the Government of the United States or the governments of the states of the United States with respect to water which may be the subject of the International Joint Commission, the IJC, or with respect to air pollution, more particularly sulphur emissions from Poplar River which is the one which we hear about from time to time, but maybe there are boron in the water or all of the other things which from time to time arise. Could you give us an update on whether or not there are areas of tension between our province and our neighbouring states in the Government of the United States, or whether things are relatively quiet?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as I can recall, and as far as I'm advised, there are no areas of tension. We are working probably more closely with the neighbouring states with respect to water development, and the hon. member obviously knows that the states of North and South Dakota would like to see some water management on the Souris River — if we could help them in the spring, particularly, and then use the water effectively year-round.

With respect to the air pollution, I suppose that the people of the U.S. are not that much more concerned about it, or as concerned, as the people of the Estevan community might be with respect to putting scrubbers on stacks and so forth.

I can't think of any areas of, as you say, "tension" between us and our American neighbours.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I'm not particularly concerned about Estevan. That never really has been a hot spot. But Coronach has been a hot spot with the IJC (International Joint Commission). It took a long time, as things do, to get that approved. And they have consistently — not necessarily the IJC who don't strictly have jurisdiction on air, but some people — IJC used to talk about boron in the water, and other water quality issues.

But other people, I can't remember who — the three corners farmers' group, and a number of other people from Montana, used to take a fairly vigorous line with respect to air emissions, particularly their allegations that there was far too much sulphur there, and I wondered whether we were hearing that again, and whether we felt any need to respond to that.

And I'll ask another question, so that you may respond to it all at once. Some weeks ago now, perhaps a short number of months, there were discussions between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States with respect to acid rain. And the environment ministers of Canada had met, and the Canadian environmental minister had put forward the idea that all provinces ought to lower their sulphur emissions by, I believe, his target figures was 25 per cent. And at that time, your Minister of the Environment indicated that he didn't see any reason why our province should go along with that.

And I ask you, my question along that line is: while I don't suppose the amount of sulphur we're putting in the air at Poplar River is likely to be a serious problem with respect to anybody in the United States, don't you feel that it would be an appropriate gesture for the Government of Saskatchewan to indicate that we supported the efforts of the Government of Canada to do that, indicate that we would be part of an effort to lower the acid rain emissions from our main sources of acid rain, more particularly, the Poplar River power plant?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the major point to be made is that Saskatchewan really doesn't have an acid rain problem. In fact, we probably receive more acid rain than we contribute, according to officials. And it's something like 46,000 tonnes, which is virtually nothing compared to other jurisdictions. But we are prepared to work with Montana and North Dakota and Saskatchewan, as a group, and we do meet with them to make sure that we have it under control.

With respect to our own problems in the Coronach area, it's my understanding that the soil there is acidic, and actually the emissions are good for the soil, as opposed to harming them in any particular fashion.

So we are quite prepared to co-operate with other jurisdictions. We will be reducing the emissions, rather than increasing them. We will be moving towards the technology, over time, to make sure that we don't become part of the problem, but in fact, part of the solution.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, while I agree that acid rain, here in these alkali prairies, is not one of our bigger problems, none the less there may well be a need for us to take some measure, if for nothing else then for symbolic reasons, to assist the Government of Canada to see whether they can get the Government of the United States to take a little more vigorous position with respect to all the acid rain coming north into central Canada. And I think it's a point which I'm sure the Premier would agree with, but it's a matter of degree and timing.

May I ask another question, a general question on this same area? From time to time, people in Saskatchewan have expressed alarm, and I think proper alarm, about the possibility of danger from acid rain in northern Saskatchewan, or north-central Saskatchewan, coming from oil projects in Alberta. And when there looked like there were going to be a number of tar sands operations at Fort McMurray, that was a real concern, if there were going to be a number of them.

It now looks like some of them around Cold Lake are about to be revived, and I ask whether or not the Department of the Environment, and the other departments concerned, perceive of any problem which may arise with the new Imperial Oil Cold Lake projects in Alberta, whether or not that threatens northern soils and particularly northern lakes, which clearly do not have the capacity to handle acid the way we do in the South here.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Oh yes, Old Wives, I think we could pour quite a lot of acid in there without hurting it very much. But not so the northern lakes.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have been working in a monitoring capacity for the last two years on a very close basis, watching the possible impacts on north-central Saskatchewan, particularly what's known as the pre-Cambrian Shield. We've been working with the Department of the Environment in Alberta, when there's a combination of monitoring committees with the two government, to make sure that we have identified the appropriate standards, that we can control any emissions that might have any impact on the standards, and we do recognize the fragility of the area. That's why we've been monitoring very, very closely for two years. To date, we have noticed no appreciable detrimental impact, and we will continue to: number one, agree that the standards should be kept very high; and two, to do what's necessary to make sure that they're lived up to.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. I would hope that that problem would be monitored because of the serious impact that acid in the lakes there would have on commercial fishing and tourism and a number of other important economic activities in that area immediately east, and modestly north of Cole Lake where there is a good deal of — a good number of lakes which are valuable lakes from the point of view of sport fishing and commercial fishing.

I ask a question, and I'll just ask you, Mr. Premier, whether you think you can answer this one without consulting your staff. Can you name the legislative secretaries? Could you name them all, do you think, without having some prompting?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Deputy Chairman, let me refer back to the previous question just for a moment. With respect to the funding on acid rain — and the hon. member mentions that it's a fragile area, and we should be watching it — I would like to point out that the funding for acid rain studies in 1982-83 was \$20,000 under the former administration. It was 65,000 in 1983-84, and it's \$100,000 in 1984-85, which has been increased, Mr. Deputy Chairman, five times, so it does reflect that there has been a 500 per cent increase in our expenditures on studying, monitoring acid rain in the province of Saskatchewan in the last couple of years. And it's an indication of how seriously we take the environment and how much research we're doing on it . . . and, in fact, have been monitoring it with our neighbours in Alberta, and in Montana, and in North Dakota.

Is the hon. member serious? He wants me to list the members of the legislature?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — No, I'm sorry, I didn't make myself clear. What I asked was that the legislative secretaries, and I wonder whether you could name the 12 legislative secretaries without some prompting, but I see you've got some prompting. Could you tell me who are now legislative secretaries, and to which ministers or departments are they attached?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I might point out that the council thing was on another issue. It goes back to a question that I answered earlier with respect to the — our agent-general's office in Great Britain. In executive council there are two . . . The number of people on staff there hasn't changed, but there is now, as of January 4, 1984, an economic development and trade person, under the Deputy Premier's authority, using the space in the London office. It has really nothing to do with my estimates, but he or she is there. His name is Alexander Duffy, employed by Economic Development and Trade, and that person commenced January 4, 1984.

With respect to legislative secretaries, we have Larry Birkbeck, who is responsible to the Minister of Health; we have Cal Glauser, Consumer and Commercial Affairs; Walter Johnson, Agriculture; Ralph Katzman, Highways; Harold Martens, Energy and Mines; Paul Meagher, Finance; Myles Morin, Economic Development and Trade; Lloyd Sauder, Rural Development; Russ Sutor, Economic Development and Trade; Arnold Tusa, Education; Duane Weiman, Education; and Jo-Ann Zazelenchuk, Social Services.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — That's an impressive number; as you know, much the largest that we've ever had in the province.

I noted the Deputy Premier had not one, but two, and I gather they're planning his itinerary and buying his tickets because he seems to have a busy schedule. I'll leave it at that.

And I noted he dropped in this evening, in from Bahrain, or New Zealand, or wherever he has been. And I don't know what he . . . I still don't know what he is buying or selling in Saudi Arabia, but doubtless this is not perhaps the forum to ask that.

I want to ask about the agricultural situation in northeast Saskatchewan. The Premier will know that it will be about two months ago now he was approached by five reeves of rural municipalities in that area, pointing out the real difficulties that some farmers are having in that area — a good many farmers are having in that area.

I am sure that if he consulted with the Minister of Agriculture, the minister would tell him of the extensive amount of leased land in that area, a very large number of the lessees are behind in their lease fees, and I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture would equally tell you that, in the opinion of the staff of the Department of Agriculture, the fact that they're behind does not represent any lack of diligence or lack of farming ability on the part of the farmers. They have had a series of problems from flood and frost, and it looks very, very much like they are going to have a very difficult time this year. Their land is waterlogged, and I am sure that the member for Kelsey-Tisdale can underline all these facts.

They have put forward a couple of — a number of proposals, really. One, they have suggested some acreage payments that might be made by the Department of Agriculture or somebody else. They have put forward the idea that if the department of — if the Government of Saskatchewan responded, then the Government of Canada would respond and the Minister of Agriculture of Canada. I think it was the Minister of Agriculture of Canada. It could have been the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board went round that area saying so. Merely because he said so doesn't mean it's true. I acknowledge that out of hand.

But I would the Premier to comment on the aspect of it. Does he believe there's any federal money there to be had? Is he considering an acreage payment? And they also had another question with respect to crop insurance which I will ask later because I don't want to get too many questions piled up. Are you considering any acreage payment or payment like it? And do you feel that there's any federal money there, as one of the federal cabinet ministers is reported to have said there would be if the province responded.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, with respect to area of north-east Saskatchewan, the hon. member knows that there have been some very difficult weather conditions with . . . Well, not only weather but agriculture conditions with respect to weather, such as frost and snow and water and flood and midge, as well, that have affected the agricultural sector of north-east Saskatchewan. Not unlike, I suppose, that you might find that the south-west part of Saskatchewan is now experiencing some drought in the south central. They are, to a large extent, an act of God and not really tied to any particular management practices.

With respect to the kinds of things that we can do to help, we have said that . . . and we have

approached the federal government about looking at these areas as, you might say, emergency areas, or disaster areas, because of the sustained basis of the difficulties. We have been talking to the federal government. What the federal government always says in public and says in private are not necessarily always the same thing, but we are prepared to work with the federal government and, in fact, we are doing it on an ongoing basis, discussing it with the federal government, the possibility of assistance because of local disaster — assistance to these farmers in one form or another.

I have here . . . Well it's an open letter to Mr. Whelan from our Minister of Agriculture, talking about the fact that we're prepared to work with the federal government to provide some sort of assistance on a joint venture basis to areas that have been hurt financially as a result of weather or disease or insects or whatever it may be. So they are ongoing discussions with respect to the federal government, and we are quite prepared to deal and work with them if they're prepared to put their money where their mouth is.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I think we all understand that if farmers get in trouble one year, that doesn't necessarily call for special action by your government, because this is the sort of thing that crop insurance is designed to deal with, and usually does deal with it pretty effectively.

A second year begins to up the ante a good bit, and some of them will get money out of crop insurance, and some of them won't, but a third year really does cause serious problems for any farmer who is — who has a substantial crop failure three years running. And it looks to me like that will be the situation of a goodly number of farmers in that area — not all of them by any means, but a goodly number - because of a combination of frost, flood, and now a second flood.

And I urge you to take a good hard look at that to see whether or not something could not be done. A proposal they put forward . . . They also believe that something could be done to get some federal assistance, and I urge you to pursue that. They put forward a proposal on crop insurance. I do not fully understand the crop insurance program, but they indicate to me that for crop insurance you can only insure 70 per cent for the first year, and that's reasonable.

But the second year gets you down to 70 per cent of 70 per cent, which then gets you down to under 50 per cent, and the third year gets you down 70 per cent of the 50 per cent, which gets you down to 35 per cent coverage, and that simply is not going to do the job. Even if you collected fully, that simply doesn't get your money back, your direct input costs back, never mind anything to pay your taxes or live.

Their proposal was . . . And they understand why the 70 per cent drops down to 70 per cent of 70 per cent. They understand that if a person is not a good farmer — and there are some farmers out there who are not good farmers — you have to find some way of penalizing them if they're simply not good farmers, and they're not getting crops when everybody else is getting crops.

But that's not the situation in north-east Saskatchewan. This has got nothing to do with the confidence or lack of confidence with the farmers there. The good farmers and the bad farmers in that area, if there are any bad farmers, are all in trouble. And what they were saying is there, is there any way that the crop insurance program could notch at 70 per cent; could allow them to pay their premiums; and if there is a failure, to collect 70 per cent — not 70 per cent of 70 per cent, or 70 per cent of 70 per cent of 70 per cent; not 49, or 35.

This they put forward. They're saying, you know, "We're not looking for charity if we can avoid it." We understand that crop failure is something that goes with farming, but three years running is pretty rough, and it is from no fault of our own. As they would say, the good farmers and the bad farmers are equally in difficulties — again, if there are any bad farmers. And is there any way to allow them to insure for 70 per cent? They may be able to scrape up the premium and collect.

I don't know whether this has been considered. I'm sure it was put to you, because they have put it to everybody who would listen, I'm sure. And I was around, and I know that they met with you at the time of the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) convention, and I'm sure they put that proposition, among others. Has there been any opportunity to consider that? And would the government be considering something along that line — just anything to get them some cash?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the government has been considering precisely that. And we are quite prepared to deal with it. In fact, we are currently overhauling the whole crop insurance system, and have made several recommendations to the federal government, but the feds won't seem to accept our recommendations.

We are prepared to make major changes to crop insurance but, as you know, it's a national program. And when we first took a look at the crop insurance system in Saskatchewan and across the country, and having a lot of farmers in our caucus, they said there are major imperfections, and it needs to be corrected. And that's one of the reasons that we've put a man in charge of it, to make sure that we can have the kinds of things that we want done registered with the federal government. So, yes, we're prepared to do it. I've said that we're prepared to do it. We are making changes on our own, but it's helpful if you can have the federal government involved, seeing that it administers a good part of it, or finances it while we administer a good part of it.

I could add, and it's not very long, but just in a lot of the newspapers, *Hudson Bay Post*, Nipawin, Tisdale, and so forth, the Minister of Agriculture said something along that line to the Minister of Agriculture federally. And Mr. Hepworth writes, I think it was May 16th of this, of 1984:

In my March 27, 1984, letter to you I urged you to ensure that the Government of Canada provide financial assistance to the farmers in the north-east part of Saskatchewan. Since I have not received a response from you, I have taken the liberty of writing to you again.

The \$4 million program which was announced in the March 31st, 1984, budget has provided assistance to 29 farmers, through the loan guarantee provision, in just three weeks. The response to this program has been extremely positive. The number of applications for assistance, approximately 20 each day, has far exceeded the anticipated demand.

For this reason, I again urge you to adopt a program which will provide relief to financially stressed farmers, not only in the northeast, but in all areas of the province.

Now he goes on to talk about those other things that we're prepared to do, and I mention specifically, in response to your question. We are prepared to work in the crop insurance area, to update it, to make sure that it's meaningful to people in agriculture, not that they're going to cry every time some little thing happens, but on a sustained basis where we have problems of wheat midge and glume blotch and frost and flood and snow and insects and everything else, on a rather sustained basis we're prepared to do whatever we can in co-operation with the feds to resolve the problem.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I hope that it will not be simply a case of talking with the federal government, and that they will do nothing, and you will do nothing, since I think there is a serious problem in northeastern Saskatchewan. I'm not asserting that all the farmers, or perhaps even a majority of the farmers are going to go to the wall up there, but some are, and a great number of others are going to tax their resources to the absolute limit if they don't get a crop this year, and it looks to me like (from the reports I'm hearing) their prospects of a crop, of even getting it seeded, are not good. And they, therefore, have to survive this year and

have enough money to put in a crop next year, assuming all goes well. And that represents a very, very stressful time for them.

I'm delighted to hear that you're looking at the crop insurance program. That program has grown at such a rapid rate that there are bound to be things that need to be done. I think a little calculation will show that the coverage on crop insurance this year will be 70 times what it was in 1971, which is a fairly brisk rate of growth. 70 times is a, I don't know how many hundreds of per cent, but it's some thousands of per cent. And when a program grows at that rate, because of a clear need by Saskatchewan farmers to have adequate crop insurance, and when the things like spot loss for hail and other things are tacked on to it, there are bound to be some holes. But more needs to be done because it has been a very real benefit to Saskatchewan farmers, particularly those who have to finance. The banks are virtually demanding it — an adequate crop insurance - and the credit unions, and I think rightly so.

And then you get a situation like north-east Saskatchewan where the program is, for reasons which weren't thought through at the time fully, not working for them. If the coverage gets down to 35 per cent, then it's not doing the job. And I urge you to have a look at firstly, the particular situation of those farmers in north-east Saskatchewan, and secondly, the program to see whether or not it cannot be — there cannot be a way of declaring that the drop notches will not apply in an area where there has been a failure based upon conditions which apply to virtually all the products in the area.

I urge you to take a look at that because it seems to me that that is something which is probably needed if we are going to continue to provide a first-class crop insurance, and that gets more important every day as, it's almost trite to say, the costs of input get higher in the relation to the gross. And when the costs of input are higher in relation to the gross, then you need to insure your inputs. You get to be a gambler if you're not insuring now and you're putting large amounts of input — the input costs are high and many farmers do not wish to be gamblers, and are not in the positions of being gamblers. They have to at least be able to get their input costs back. And all of this I think is pretty obvious, but I would urge that you look at that particular problem which has now occurred in south-east Saskatchewan — in south-west — in north-east Saskatchewan because of what I say is going to be three successive crop failures for almost all of them, and more than that for some of them.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition and I agree 100 per cent on this particular issue. That's precisely why that we appointed a minister of the Crown to look after crop insurance. We found it very inadequate. We found a great deal had to be done to bring it up to what he calls a first-class type of agricultural crop insurance. It isn't that; it wasn't that. We want to build it that.

One precaution that, and I'm sure he'd be familiar with it, is that when we're making these changes we have to be careful that the federal government doesn't just sit back and say, well, this province, you spend that money, and this province you spend it, when we really have to have a federal program in tune with what we're doing provincially. So it's a little bit more difficult than just saying, all right, we'll take some money, and make some acreage payments, when the federal government is financing.

And we want them to recognize that it is inadequate. And if they really want to help Canadian farmers, they should make the changes right across the board. We're giving them suggestions. We're doing whatever we can, locally, to make sure that is better, first-class, or top-notch, and so I agree it was inadequate. That's why we're putting a minister responsible in charge of it because agriculture is too important to us to let it be anything else.

**Mr. Engel:** — Thank you, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, for allowing me a few questions on this same line. I feel that there's . . . Maybe you've taught university and agriculture and all, Mr. Premier, but I don't know if you realize or not, but when I was first elected, you couldn't buy

crop insurance within a hundred miles of my farm. Wasn't available. No amount of money could buy you insurance in that area of Saskatchewan. And you could start from the good land near Estevan and go right to the Alberta border, and there was nobody, nobody had crop insurance. It wasn't there.

And when you want to talk about a first-class insurance program, compare it. What you've done in two years was what was done before your term of office. You put a minister in place; you give him a fancy job. But I can't see any results. I've seen some discussion on crop insurance where somebody's hinting at, and somebody's talking about, with pretty loud and pressured tones, about self-insurance and individual insurance . . . (inaudible) . . . programs on the farm. And I'm not sure, I'm not sure if that's what my people are looking at. And they don't want that kind of aspect. Now I think there are some adequacies or some inadequacies in crop insurance that need to be addressed.

And I think the point is made clearly that the farmers in Carrot River have a problem that is a result of not poor management — they're not getting their performance discounts. They've wiped those off, and then when they have to buy an insurance and it only gives them 35 per cent coverage . . . They tell me you've got a quota book. If you know anything about farming, that is a valid investment to invest premium dollars for 35 per cent coverage. It just isn't going to work because that's an additional expense that the person can't afford when he hasn't sold any grain.

It's reported in the *Star-Phoenix* that the president of the credit union at Carrot River says that 90 per cent of the bins were empty within weeks of the harvest last fall — 90 per cent. Just imagine the conditions that exists there, and you've been dragging your feet. And these people now have had another delay in seeding because of all the wet weather and rain they've had up there. But something should have been done prior to this, and I think your Minister of Agriculture is dragging your feet. I think you should superimpose some pressure on that department — say there's an area here that needs to be considered.

And besides that — while you're dealing with that — I've had phone calls that asks for forms and application forms that . . . Farmers in my area are saying that we'd like to apply for that freight assistance program. And they think that program is still in place where they can get 30 or \$40 a tonne assistance to bring feed in.

I met with quite a few ranchers on Sunday. There was a rodeo within a couple of miles from my place and 50 cowboys that entered, and there's quite a few people around. And they were talking, Mr. Premier, about the conditions. Some of them have already — three farmers that were there from that south country — have already hauled their cattle up North, at their own expense. They have tried to put them in community pastures. The pastures are giving them orders, saying that if there's isn't going to be rain within two weeks, there's no grass there. It's a serious situation, as serious as the rain is in the northern area. I saw that; I wish we could spread it around a little because it would make a world of difference in this province.

But you just happened to be stuck with a couple of problems, Mr. Premier. And in one hand, it's too wet; and the other, there's no moisture at all. There's no moisture at all. There's areas in my riding that haven't had a half an inch of rain since Easter. And there's no grass growing; there's no hay there. Are you going to reinstitute that freight assistance program for feed grains and hay, to haul that down into the country where they need it real bad?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to crop insurance, obviously we inherited the poor system designed by the members opposite . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if the Leader of the Opposition just said it was inadequate, and we agree . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . So, . . .

Mr. Chairman, let me give you an example. Mr. Chairman, under the existing system as we



inherited it, if people didn't pay their premiums . . . Mr. Chairman, under the system as we inherited it, if people didn't pay their premiums because they were in difficulty and had crop failures, then, by law, they wouldn't have crop insurance, and hundreds of farmers wouldn't even have crop insurance this year. We changed that law because the former administration didn't see the light in helping these people.

The minister just announced the other day that he would change it and say we would receive post-dated cheques so all those folks could have insurance this year. And it had never been done before. Under the former system they wouldn't have even had insurance.

Now you can't have it both ways. I agree that it's not perfect, and it needs to be fixed. But that means that you have to bear the responsibility for the wrongs that were in the past, and I'll bear them for those that are in the future, all right?

So we just changed this. We just changed this, and as you designed it so it would not help people, we changed it so it would help hundreds of farmers. And we will continue to change so that we could help more farmers, in co-operation with the federal government.

And as the Leader of the Opposition knows full well, you don't just always put your money up front when you're dealing with the federal government because they'll take it from every single province one at a time. And they pick you off at one at a time. We want them to fund it properly, adequately right across the country, and that's why we're dealing with it.

With respect to pasture situation, we are already identifying and looking at areas of pasture and feed, not only in Saskatchewan, but in neighbouring provinces, and continuing to talk with the federal government.

**Mr. Engel:** — One simple little question. Are you reinstating that feed freight assistance program that worked, with thousands of farmers in the south qualified? Some are getting, 3, 4, 5, and \$6,000 cheques in my area for bringing in some feed. They were able to maintain their cattle, and they were able to get through a drought when they needed it.

Mr. Premier, two years ago you had a situation in the Hudson Bay area you did nothing about. Last year the situation was aggravated by another wet year; you still did nothing about it. This is year three; you still haven't done anything. You can't blame the former administration for those problems. You had three years to fix it up — the third crop, the third crop loss. You should have adjusted it the year you got elected. You didn't do anything. They lost the next crop; you still didn't do anything. They lost the crop after that and you still didn't do anything. They lost the crop after that and you still didn't do anything, and now they are at their wits end — 90 per cent of them are in serious trouble.

You're saying, "Well you guys didn't do anything, so we can't fix it up." So you're going to monkey around. When you're fooling around with premiums, you know that the premiums that the farmers have to pay, and you're giving them notes. You're charging them 15 per cent; whose money? Who's up-fronting the money for that? Who's up-fronting for that?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the feed freight assistance, the hon. member knows that as it rains in the northern part of the agricultural belt in Saskatchewan, that the more it rains, the more feed there is. I mean that's what causes the feed to be there. South of No. 1 highway particularly, in the hon. member's and my area, is where you're going to have some difficulties with respect to feed. Now we are not going to get into programs now, today, that is going to pay for having feed trucked in from Ontario if we have it right here in Saskatchewan. Or if we have a large feed supply in the middle of our province, smack dab in the middle of it, then we're going to be dealing with that, and we'll watch how that progresses and how the rains are and how the crop is and so forth before we get into paying other provinces for feed. Because you know as well as I do, when you start putting on a feed freight assistance to other provinces, the price of feed jumps to level of the feed freight assistance.

And your former department would document that. So let's make sure that we know what we're doing before we start to get into interprovincial feed freight assistance program. We know that if the rain continues in northern Saskatchewan, or the northern half of the agricultural belt, then you're going to have lots of feed in the province. And we'll look at the distribution of both, the cattle going both ways, and the feed going both ways.

**Mr. Engel:** — Does the premier think the feed freight assistance program only applied to out-of-province feed?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — No.

**Mr. Engel:** — Well, Mr. Premier, help the people in the North that have hay, and help the farmers down south that are more than 50 miles away, and allow them to pay for some freight.

There's hay being hauled right today. If you'd go out on the highway once in a while, instead of flying over top that you can't see what's in the trucks, you'd see that they're hauling hay right today. They're hauling feed down right now.

People are feeding their cattle today that should be out in the pasture. There's no hay there. And why couldn't there be a feed freight assistance . . . (inaudible) . . . I have a list as long as my pocket of farmers that have been phoning that have been wanting application forms to apply for feed freight assistance.

They think the program's in place. Tell them that they can get it if they save their bills now, and they have to have feed. Will you make it retroactive like you do the pay of the people sitting around you? When they get a pay increase, you always make it retroactive. Will you do this for a farmer? This is what they want to know. Are you going to make the feed freight assistance retroactive when you finally get around to implementing it?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, it's obviously easier to move cattle to feed than it is feed to cattle, and particularly when we're looking at this summer. So we are identifying places that you can move cattle, and cattle are being moved. They're being moved in my area, they're being moved in yours, and if they're to, they may have to be moved into areas where there is feed.

And that's a lot more economical and less costly than it is taking feed and moving it from either out of the province or inside the province to the cattle. So that's why we're identifying areas, because we want to do this in a fashion that does not waste money, but cuts the costs of providing feed to this livestock. So if we can take some areas where the herd — cows and the calves — need to be moved to feed, then we'll do that and identify those, as opposed to moving them the other way.

**Mr. Engel:** — Does the minister know how much it costs to move a load of cattle?

I've had people tell me they've done that. They've hauled them and they've asked and they've been in to visit directly, and they hadn't gotten to see the Minister of Agriculture, but they saw some of the staff, and they want to know if they're going to get some assistance in hauling their cattle. Are you aware that it's going to add about \$60 a cow to haul it up to a pasture and then back again? And that's semi-load lots. They're staying right in Saskatchewan, and it's rented a pasture. We have the figures; we can document it. And you go to your Minister of Agriculture, he has them too. And they've been moved. We think it's a great idea. And they've been moved; that's been done.

But we're saying that because of the drought and because of the conditions that exist, and there's not such a thing as buying crop insurance for cattle, you know. When there's no crop there, I think that like of program should be in place. I don't think the farmers are asking for

something that is exceptional.

You have money for the oil companies. Boy, when the oil companies were in trouble, you had lots of money. You talked dirty, and I sat here and listened to you give your little gas tax speech. I didn't make as much off the gas tax as my friend that's got some semi-trailer tractor units on the highway.

I have a friend that's got a hundred units driving in Saskatchewan. He happens to make \$12,000 a truck that's on the road in Saskatchewan, thanks to your gas tax. That's \$1.2 million a year for one man — for one man, you've got! And you haven't got a little feed freight assistance for the cowboys down south that are trying to maintain a herd. And you're telling them: dump your cattle and it's tough luck, boys. There's nothing there. We can't assure you no program for cattle. We can't assure you no program for feed, so you're saying we don't haul the feed. We can give you names of cowboys that have hauled their cattle up North, if you want those. So that's been done. That's been done. I think you should act instead of talk. Our farmers are looking for some action from you.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is thank God that you're not the Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I've gone through in excess of \$100 million that goes to agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan. A 100 million annually, annually, Mr. Chairman, everyone in Saskatchewan that knows anything about energy knows that the new policies in oil are making money and jobs for the people of Saskatchewan in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Hundreds of millions of dollars.

**An Hon. Member:** — Yes, you go out and ask your people, guys.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman . . . Mr. Chairman . . . Mr. Chairman, the member from Shaunavon, the member of Shaunavon speaks well from his seat . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . But you, you come up. The member from Shaunavon speaks well from his seat. Who is the man that condemns the oil policies the most?

**Some Hon. Members:** — The member from Shaunavon.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — The member from Shaunavon. One-year holidays, three-year holidays, five-year holidays; and it won't do anything for the little guy — nothing for the little guy. Who's the individual in Shaunavon who's participating in the program? It's a member of the legislature. Who's there, Mr. Speaker? Let the whole world know who's there to participate in the program, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, is there anybody in Shaunavon that is participating in the one or three or five-year holiday in drilling? Is there anybody from Shaunavon? Could there be a member of the legislature that might happen to do that? Well, would you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, the thing that bothers the members opposite is that they will criticize a program on one hand, and turn around and use it on the other. And they will stand up in the legislature and say, "Well I don't agree with it at all. I don't agree with it," and at the same time, that they will use it.

The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg knows full well that the most popular program in the livestock business in the history of Saskatchewan has been the tax breaks that we brought forward for feeding livestock, for feeding beef, for feeding hogs, and for feeding sheep. Can you imagine, saving five, 10, 15, \$25,000 a year on your income tax, and you say that that isn't significant?

That's the whole point, Mr. Chairman. The member opposite doesn't understand agriculture, and he never will.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Chairman, the premier thinks that cattlemen are paying income tax. Did you hear that? You're a cattleman. You're trying to feed some cattle. There's no money in feeding cattle, Mr. Premier. You've got it all mixed up.

The oilmen are the only guys that are going to pay income tax. There's no money in cattle, man. All the cowboys I've talked to . . . The only reason my neighbours keep calves . . . Let me tell you a story.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order. The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg has the floor. Let him ask his question.

**Mr. Engel:** — If that person that represents Cut Knife-Lloydminster wants to speak, I wish he'd get up in this debate. Only time these members talk, that fertilizer row talk, is when they're in their seats. And not even in their own.

And, Mr. Premier, I resent being interrupted because . . . Let me tell you a story about raising cattle. I've got a neighbour that keeps 60 cows. He raises 60 calves a year. And do you know what for? He makes more money using them in cutting. He uses those calves in cutting shows. That's where he makes his money. There's no money in feeding them out. You keep some healthy calves to cut nowadays.

And now, to top that off, to top that off they haven't got any hay. They're asked to ship their cattle up north. They can't even use the calves for cutting or roping.

And, Mr. Premier, I'm not making a joke of this. I think you should consider reintroducing a feed freight assistance program that's in place, and if you want to add to it, to haul cattle out, I'll say that's tremendous. That's tremendous, and that's what you need to do.

Now if you're not going to do it, say so. But if you are, tell the farmers tonight that you'll make it retroactive, you'll make it retroactive. If it doesn't rain, you'll get it; if it rains, tough luck, they moved their cattle too early. Tell them that, and at least they'll know there's something in place.

They've got to have some hope. They're depressed. They're depressed. And it's tough. It's dry, and the dust is blowing, and it's time that this government does something, because they're blaming you for their trouble.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, obviously we can't blame the members opposite, or the members here, for the weather. But we can . . . We can monitor the situation, and we area, to make sure that we will find the fullest co-operation with the federal government, our neighbouring provinces — feed supplies inside, so that if it looks like we have a severe enough situation, in a broad enough geographical area to warrant the kinds of programs that people think are necessary, then we'll provide them.

The caucus committee on agriculture, the MLAs generally, are reviewing the situation on a daily basis, and they will be providing us with the kind of information necessary to make sure that we have a first-class program. So the member can rest assured that we are on top of it, and as we gather the information, as we watch the weather, as we monitor the rains, as we monitor the feed supplies and so forth, we will deal with it accordingly.

**Mr. Engel:** — The simple question I'm putting to you is: will you make the program retroactive to the guys that are spending their money now? There's people, I know three farmers that have hauled their cattle out. I can give you their names. One of them has been in and lived at the

Minister of Agriculture's doorstep because he wanted to know before he hauled them last week. He's been in seeing him. Are you going to make some program retroactive to include these, or are you going to say "It's tough. You guys did it already. We're making our program effective August 1 or whatever." You know — are you going to cover the guys that are taking some advanced steps so that there is some grass there?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, we haven't designed the program yet, let alone decide what date it's going to be effective. And obviously the kinds of agricultural programs we have in Saskatchewan are things that are being copied across the country. They're very good, very well received. And when we make up our mind what's going to be done in this situation, depending on the weather, depending on the extent of the damage wherever it may be, then we will certainly be providing farmers and the members of the opposition, the information. So it's a little hard to say tonight that it's going to be retroactive when we haven't designed the program. We are monitoring the situation. We're monitoring the cattle, the feed supplies, the weather, our neighbouring provinces and, indeed, working with the federal government to come up with some very needed changes in crop insurance because they hadn't been made for years.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Premier, if you've been monitoring the situation how about giving us a review or an assessment of where it's at. Is it as bad as it is in my area, or is that general, or is it larger than just Red Square, or how big is it? How big is it? Can you give us an assessment of how . . . What percentage of the grassland do you — would you argue would support some cattle?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, it's obviously never as bad as the members opposite try to make it out to be. We have areas in Saskatchewan, particularly southern Saskatchewan, that are too wet, and they can't get their crops in . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Let me finish, please. We have areas that have too much rain that are going to have great feed supplies, some that can't get their crops in, but they're going to have a great deal of feed. We have areas in the south that don't have enough rain, and the temperature's been cold enough that it isn't even growing grass even with the subsoil moisture that's there. If we get the right kind of temperature changes, that is, a little bit of heat and a little bit of rain, you can still see grass supplies developing. We have pockets from Shaunavon, through to Assiniboia, through to Estevan, that are very dry. And those people will either be moving cattle or have some feed moving in, or both, unless it rains in May, or June, or July, or a combination thereof.

So we are monitoring it consistently. Some people are feeding cattle in the south-east now. If they get some rain, they may not have to, but to date they are. So we're watching it on an ongoing basis. So the hon. member knows himself, if he's been doing any travelling other than in his airplane, that that's the case.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Premier, if you're saying you're monitoring it, and you're going to decide . . . Do you know, do you know for certain whether there are people that, on a year-to-year basis, pasture their cattle on the short grass, range hills that stretch not from Shaunavon, but from Maple Creek, right across that South country through those hills, through the Cypress Hills, through the bench, right across?

Do you know, is there grass there or isn't there? Have you monitored, or have you had people out there monitoring. You say you're monitoring that? Have you had feedback? Have you had feedback from these people? What are they telling you?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, yes we're monitoring it. In some areas there's grass and some areas there isn't.

**Mr. Engel:** — Well, I'll give you an assessment. I'll give you an assessment for what I think I'd monitor. And that's about 80 per cent of the pasture land in my riding that will not support a third of the cattle it did last year. The conditions are serious; if a guy could last year pasture a hundred cattle, they tell me they're not putting 20 cows in there this year. There's 80 that are

going to hit the market this week if they think there's not going to be a feed trade assistance program in place. They're saying it's got to be done. We got to get rain this week, or we're done, is what the farmers are telling me. Community pastures are telling people: look, we'll keep them, till the middle of June (that's only two or three more weeks), and then we're through.

And I think — if you're not monitoring that situation, you better start coming up with a program pretty soon, because the farmers want to know. If you'd make a commitment tonight saying that you'll make it retroactive, then they'll say, well, we'll make our own little arrangements. I'll find some pasture that I can take my cattle to. Somebody else says, "I've got a brother-in-law up North that'll haul my feed down cheaper than if I take my cattle there," and they'll make their arrangements. But they want to know if they can get in on the program if they do it in advance?

If they're going to wait for your program when it's too late, either the cattle are all going to hit the market, which maybe you want them to, and then just your friends will get in on the program. I don't know what you've got in mind, but that's typical Tory policy. You wait until all the others have done it, then you help your few rich friends, maybe that's what you're trying to do, I don't know.

But give them a commitment that you're going to do something, and that what they do this spring will be retroactive, and you'll solve the problem.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I said that I was monitoring it, but I will say in addition, the best thing that ever happened to the cattlemen in Saskatchewan was to get rid of the NDP. The best thing. And you go to rancher after rancher in those two southwestern ridings ever since Shaunavon . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, we'll watch, let's add it up, let's look at two-thirds of the votes in those ridings and see how many ranchers and honest-to-goodness cattlemen support the NDP. How many? Not very many and you know why. So when you look at the support for the cattle industry, when you look for support for the cattle industry, there hasn't been changes like that have taken place in this two years. They are happy about it. They are glad to see that they're there; they're better than anything else that has happened in the past, and they will look to the province of, say, neighbouring Alberta for the programs that have been there in the past. And said only, if only in Saskatchewan we could have a government that would be sympathetic to the beef business and the livestock business; and they didn't have one, but today they have and they're glad that they do.

And I would venture to say that not many sincere and solid cattlemen who have been in the business for years are going to wait to decide tonight if the government is going to have a retroactive program, whether they're going to sell their herd to Canada Packers in the morning. And you know that's a bunch of malarkey, a bunch of malarkey. And that's why they don't endorse your particular philosophy because you don't understand individual enterprising, free-enterprise cattlemen — and most of them are. They're not socialist, and they never will be.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I wonder if you could outline the steps or the . . . Not the steps, but the signs, I suppose you might say, that you will use to indicate when a program to assist the beef industry in southern Saskatchewan would be adequate, or what are you watching for? How will you be able to tell when the day comes when you'll implement a program to assist in the hauling of freight.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, clearly weather has a great deal to do with it. To date it hasn't even been warm enough to grow grass. We've had five degrees of frost and even where there is adequate moisture, I'm sure the hon. member knows, on his farm as well as mine, the germination hasn't even taken place, and the crop has been in the ground for some time. When you have that kind of frost, that kind of cold, then you're not going to have grass, let alone anything else, until the heat comes in.

All right. We expect it to get warmer, and there's probably a 50 per cent chance of rain in the

month of June or the end of May, and we're going to be monitoring that situation. We're not holus-bolus going to get into a big program of moving all the cows in southern Saskatchewan to the North, or all the feed in the North to the South, when it still is the 28th of May.

Now we are monitoring it. We will help people identify where they can move cattle, and where they can get feed. And as it progresses, as time progresses and as the weather develops, then we can make up our mind based on the decisions of elements, of time, of the date, the conditions, the cattle, etc., etc.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Premier, you will know that your theory that the reason that the grass isn't turning green in my constituency, for example, would be laughed at if you were to go to Shaunavon and say the reason that the pastures aren't adequate to put cattle in this spring is because the weather isn't warm enough. You simply don't understand what is happening, because the crops are up. The crops are 4 or 5 inches high where there was lots of moisture in the summer fallow, and the crops are very adequate.

But, Mr. Premier, if you understand, summer fallow will have moisture from last year. The grass has used all the moisture last fall, and there's been no moisture this spring to replenish it. And there is no grass. If that's what you're arguing, that there is grass, or that it's going to come up in June or July, well you simply don't understand the short grass of south-western Saskatchewan, because even if you get rain on the short grass in the hills along the Frenchman River valley in June and July, the grass doesn't turn green because it needs moisture in the spring. It didn't come; it isn't there; and the people are going to have to haul hay or move the cattle.

And whether you say it's because of cold weather, or because of drought, the simple fact is that the cattle men need some assistance in hauling feed, and I would like you to tell why you won't move at this time with a program. And if you won't move at this time, if there is no grass a week from now, will you move then? What I would like to know is how long you will wait before you'll bring in a program to assist the ranchers in hauling some hay?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, it's 28th of May, and across southern Saskatchewan in some places there is wheat that high; in some places it isn't germinating. And in some places there's grass that high; in some places there isn't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right, across southern Saskatchewan. So where there is no grass we have to look at it, the extent of the problem, and the breadth and the depth of it. And how many cattle? And how many people? And right now we are monitoring, saying, 'If cattle have to be moved, here's where they can be moved,' Right? That's what you're asking for.

Farmers are not going to wait to move cattle just to find out at midnight if there's going to be some retroactive assistance, and you know that. So I will make up our mind, with respect to a program, when we have looked at the extent of it, when we looked at the weather — when we are a little bit beyond the 28th of May. We'll let you know.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Premier, you seem to think that this is some sort of a game you're playing. And really I'm here asking for farmers like the reeve of Grassy Creek, Mr. Charlie Anderson, and the reeve of Wise Creek, Herb Wallis, and ranchers like Gus Balas, who farm, ranch along the Frenchman River valley because they have asked me to ask you when you intend to bring in a program. Barry Brown and Milton Brown at Climax, and Allan Mything would like very much to know at what date you will decide that when the pastures don't get green — and they won't unless they get rain — a week from now, a month from now. What kind of a time frame are they looking at?

Mr. Premier, I don't have cattle. I don't ranch. But I'm asking on behalf of my constituents. And you sit there and laugh and think this is some sort of a joke. And I'll tell you, as Premier, it's a sad, bloody example that you're giving here tonight, because we expect some help from your government. The ranchers in the area, and the farmers in the area who can't afford to feed their

cattle aren't interested in your tax credit. The people that I mention here, Mr. Premier, are not interested in your tax credit because they don't have any taxes to pay if they have to haul the feed or move their cattle, because they won't have any income. And what they would like to know is: on what day, or how long they will wait through this drought before you'll bring in a feed freight assistance?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member mentions names of people who are asking him for information on the program. They haven't asked me. They haven't asked the Minister of Agriculture . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, but that's the problem, that's the problem. I don't see . . . I don't see those individuals, if they are really concerned about it, why they wouldn't be in touch with the Department of Agriculture, why they wouldn't be in touch with the government of the day . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, but they . . . they are not confined to their MLA, and thank goodness they're not. If they want assistance, or if they want us to look at various areas of the province, they can certainly get in touch with Minister of Agriculture, or they can call me. And I haven't heard from those individuals.

I'll say here tonight, I haven't heard from any of those individuals that you mentioned. If the members have, or I have, I haven't received the information. I haven't acknowledged it, I haven't seen it. So if you're concerned about it, I don't know why they're not writing us.

Let me just say in summary, I will monitor the situation. I'll be glad to talk to those ranchers. I'll be glad to visit with them, the caucus members will be glad to visit with them when they want to tell us what the problem is. Then, I will be glad to talk with them.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Premier, I'd suggest that you talk to your Minister of Agriculture. I'd suggest that you talk to him because after a member talked and tried and tried — one of these ranchers that he named — tried to get to the Minister of Agriculture. He talked to the Agricultural Minister's staff. He talked to both of us, and he says: "You've got to help us, we need help. Why, we haven't got any grass. We haven't got any grass."

And now, if you're standing up and saying the ranchers aren't contacting you, then you're not talking to your own minister. Turn around next time he comes in this House and talk to him. Because they know what's going on. They've been in here. That's why they came to us as a last resort.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Chairman, I think it's fair to say that I haven't received even information from the two hon. members before tonight. I haven't, but that's my point. That's my point, Mr. Chairman. My point is this, Mr. Chairman, my point is this: if the two members were sincere, if the two members . . . If the two members were sincere . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order. Order, order. Order! The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg asked a question, and I would like him to allow the Premier to give his answer.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would ask that you look at the records at *Hansard*, when the Premier of this province would stand in this Assembly — and I won't say "lie" to the Assembly; I'll say "mislead it" and be polite — and say that we have not brought this matter to his attention when we asked him very clearly in question period about a feed freight assistance program.

I would ask that the Premier of this province would now stand and apologize to the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, because he has done this a number of times in this committee. He misleads the committee. During the estimates, he said that the fuel rebate program of the NDP government was not more than \$11 million when he knows full well it was \$16 million, and if he doesn't know that, then he's more ignorant than I'd believe.



But I would say, Mr. Chairman, that he would stand and apologize for saying and misleading this Assembly that there was no attempt to get to him about the feed freight assistance, or his government, when we spent an hour on Friday quizzing the Minister of Agriculture and during question period as much as 10 days ago.

**Mr. Chairman:** — On page 12, rule 19 . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Order!

A dispute arising between two members as to allegations of fact does not fulfil the conditions of a parliamentary privilege.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Chairman, I wonder, on your ruling . . . I wonder, on your ruling . . . If I can have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order! The Minister of Finance has been recognized.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member raised a point of order which you found not to be in order. I would ask you to review the record. Shortly, perhaps a minute, a minute and a half ago, the member from Shaunavon refers to words like “bloody well,” and that type of things, and I fully believe that that is non-parliamentary language, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order! The Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina . . . The member for Regina North West does not seem to want to . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order! Order! Order! Everyone in the Assembly has a chance to ask questions in executive estimates, and I would ask all members, the member from Regina North West especially, if he wants to say something to do it from his feet, not from his desk. He will have all kinds of opportunity to do it. It's so rowdy in here that it's very difficult for me to hear, and it's difficult for anyone to hear what's going on. And the point of privilege is out of order, and . . .

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Chairman, the point of my question and the point of privilege . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Chairman . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order, order. Members participating in Committee of Finance do not have to ask questions. I just made a ruling that members can rise without asking a question in Committee of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Chairman, the point I wish to make . . . Mr. Chairman, the point of order, and the point of privilege that I wish to make is this, is this, Mr. Chairman: I raised the question with regards to the nature of the language being used by the hon. member from Shaunavon.

And I indicate the member, Mr. Chairman, if they would give me an opportunity to advance the point is as follows: I happen to believe, and I believe the members of this Assembly should believe, Mr. Chairman, that the decorum in this House, the language in this House is important, is important that the way we carry on business in the House. And those type of language is improper and the Chair should review the record, and rule back to this committee as to the nature of that language. I think it is awful, and I think it is unparliamentary.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Chairman:** — I will check the verbatim and bring a ruling back.

**Mr. Engel:** — I would like you also to check the record and see if the Premier was misleading

the House when he said we never raised a question of feed freight assistance, and see whether he tried to deliberately mislead the House . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order. The Chair has already ruled on that point of order.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — I would like to demand that the Chair withdraw allegations that the member for North West Regina, myself, has been any more unruly this evening than any other member in this Assembly. You continue to point out me, as the single member of the Liberal party, as being more unruly than the rest of the Assembly. I demand that you retract that ruling.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Is the member challenging the Chair?

**Mr. Sveinson:** — I call for a standing vote.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order, order! The point of order is well taken. Next question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Bring in the Speaker.

**Mr. Muller:** — Mr. Speaker, during consideration of Executive Council the member from Regina North West challenged my ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Shall the rulings of the Chair be sustained?

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 32**

Devine	Sandberg	Myers
Muller	Klein	Rybchuk
Birkbeck	Dutchak	Schmidt
Andrew	Embury	Tusa
Lane	Dirks	Meagher
Rousseau	Maxwell	Glauser
Hardy	Young	Zazelenchuk
McLaren	Folk	Johnson
Baker	Parker	Weiman
Duncan	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Morin
Currie	Hopfner	

**NAYS — 1**

Sveinson

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10**

**Item 1 (continued)**

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:06 p.m.