

May 28, 1984

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. PARKER:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to welcome you back today, and at this time it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, two groups visiting with us this afternoon in the legislature.

The first group I have met with; they are a group of 30 grade 9 and 10 students from the Briercrest High School at Briercrest, Saskatchewan. They're accompanied today by their teachers, Mrs. Spicer, and they're seated in the Speaker's gallery.

The second group is a group of grade 5 and 6 students from Rouleau School in Rouleau, Saskatchewan. They're accompanied today by Lori Draper, their teachers, as well as chaperons Bev Clarke, Janice Armstrong, and Bill Crawford.

I'll be meeting with the group from Rouleau at 2:30 in the rotunda outside the Chambers. Following that, we will be meeting for refreshments. At this time I'd like to ask both the groups to please stand and be recognized, and I'd ask all members to join with me in giving them the usual welcome to the legislature.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Government Advertising

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, and has to do with a promise made at the time of the last election which promised that if he formed the government he would cut back on government advertising and save the taxpayers of the province a great deal of money.

I wonder if the Premier would outline, in light of the very large ads that were run this weekend, I know, in the *Leader-Post*, and I believe in the *Star-Phoenix*, and possibly in all the weeklies, advertising basically 12 ways social services are getting better — and the minister's name on it, but very little about the programs — whether or not the Premier has changed his stance now, and will be using this type of ads, advertising the government going into the next election?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member, the thing that bothered the public so much prior to April of 1982 was the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations advertising Crown corporations that were, to a large extent, monopolies. So they would be pushing SGI or pushing Sask Tel in situations where they already had a monopoly.

And it became apparent that the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations, or the government of Crown corporations, were more important than real families, and people took offence to that. In fact, they even booed the ads in television theatres because they didn't like them any more. So we said that we would cancel those, Mr. Speaker, because real families were more important than government families. So we did.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplement to the Premier. I would whether or not he would see an irony in the situation where we have the Minister of Social Services cutting back on

welfare payments to handicapped people, while at the same time you are running very large, expense ads in newspapers saying what a great job your government is doing.

As well, in light of the fact that the United Church held a major conference in Prince Albert this weekend and criticized very severely your government for these very cut-backs, on the same weekend you're advertising what a great job you're doing. I wonder if it wouldn't be better if this money, the thousands of dollars that were spent advertising and trying to cover up for the minister, were given to the individuals who are seeing their benefits cut back.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member knows that in virtually every category but one, there was an increase in expenditures in Social Services. The budget is up to a very, very large extent. And the major place where there has been reform, where people across Saskatchewan, including the United Church, likes to see, is for young, single, employable, healthy individuals who may be trapped on welfare.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the ad describes the increases that have taken place for senior citizens, for handicaps, for single parents, for all kinds of people that need additional help, that got additional help. That's why in Saskatchewan we virtually lead the nation in expenditures in those categories. Compare our province to Manitoba, for example, where they will rank 6th or 7th or 8th or 9th or 10.

So in all categories except the major one for young, single, healthy employees, we have increased expenditures. And even in those areas where we've cut back for singles — 16, 17, 18, and 19-year-olds — it's still above the Canadian average so it's nothing to complain about, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Premier, I wonder if you would comment on the resolution that was passed at the United Church conference in Prince Albert, which criticized your government for not only the cutbacks to the people who might be blind, or might be using a walker, but were categorized by your minister as being employable, whether or not you would comment on this resolution that was passed at this week's conference — whether or not you are taking it seriously, or whether you are attempting to explain it by the fact that because there are now 645,000 people on welfare, which is an increase of about 17,000, which makes it look like you are paying out more in welfare. What kind of an approach are you taking to this resolution which was passed by the conference?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, so many of the ideas that we have brought forward in this Legislative Assembly come from members of the United Church. Ideas from people across Saskatchewan from, indeed . . . indeed from people all across this province from all the churches are supporting the kinds of things that the Minister of Social Services is doing. And it's for that very reason that he's carrying on.

So I would say that the minister has the endorsement and support from religious organizations from one end of the province to the other — particularly in the fact that we are increasing expenditures for those that need more, while cutting back for those young people who might get trapped in the system. And that's precisely why he's going through the whole process of welfare reform, and indeed it's . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Premier, would you tell me which of the . . . which of your new policies in the area of welfare, or other areas, were taken from the United Church? Can you explain to me whether it was the liquor advertising, the largest cabinet in the history, the trips of ministers, the welfare cuts — which of your policy changes have you taken from the United Church? You have said here that you took a lot of your recommendations and policies from the United Church. I would like you to outline which of them you have taken.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, for all I know, most of the seniors . . . or the majority of seniors in the province of Saskatchewan belong to either the United Church or the Catholic Church. And they support the programs we're doing for seniors. And all you have to do is look at all the kinds of activities that come from people in rural Saskatchewan, in towns and villages, on farms, in cities, the youth, women, all those people who have supported the kinds of policies that you see in agriculture and social services, may belong to one congregation or another.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they support . . . what they support most of all is some sincere acknowledgement that there is something more powerful in this province than just government, that indeed, families are more important; the dignity of the individual is more important, and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that the supremacy of God is more important.

No longer in the province of Saskatchewan are we going to have the family of Crown corporations dominating everything. There's new priorities. This party and this side of the government goes back to the Diefenbaker bill of rights. The members opposite, Mr. Speaker, don't like the Diefenbaker bill of rights. Let me remind them what it stands for. Let's listen to this.

The Diefenbaker bill of rights acknowledges, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan, and indeed across Canada, acknowledges the supremacy of God, the dignity of men, and the role of the family in a nation of free men and free institutions. It talks nothing at all about the Crown corporations. And it talks nothing at all about the supremacy of government. It talks about individuals and families, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Premier. He has indicated that the United Church would approve of the policies which he is following. I indicate the monthly statistical bulletin and refer him to the following: are you prepared to state that the United Church, or any other church in Saskatchewan would approve of a performance whereby, in the last year, from March of '83 to March of '84, the number of people who were fully employable but out of work increased by over 2,000, and the number of people receiving training under the program so touted by the Minister of Social Services increased not by 2,000 but by 92?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, . . . pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I will gladly assure the members opposite that the United Church of Canada is much more happy with the statistical evidence in Saskatchewan than they are in Manitoba under the NDP, because we . . . (inaudible) . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — And nobody in this Assembly, I'm sure nobody in this Assembly, and nobody in Canada, and nobody in any of the churches wants to see one person unemployed. They don't want to see that. They don't want to see people on welfare. That's why, Mr. Speaker, that we have been leading the nation in creating economic activity. We have seen a rapid growth in economic activity in Saskatchewan compared to the past. We see the labour force growing more quickly, which the churches are happier about. We've seen significant changes in the tax system — reduction in the tax, accumulated benefits in the province of Saskatchewan that aren't in anyplace else in the country, and particularly not in Manitoba.

So yes, Mr. Speaker, I would say the church endorses those kinds of things that put Saskatchewan ahead of other jurisdictions across this country.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. Will the Premier acknowledge, in this flow of rhetoric, that the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan in the last year has gone up, and the unemployment rate in Manitoba and Ontario and some of the other provinces has gone down in the

last year? Will he acknowledge that?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't know what this has to do with a particular church. We have the lowest unemployment rate, we have the lowest unemployment rate in the nation, and I'm sure the churches are happy about that. We have rapid increases in population because people come here to look for employment. In fact, children stay. That isn't true of the past. So the United Church, or the Catholic Church, or the Anglican Church, or many other churches are happy to see administrations working hard to create economic activity – activity for their people. And that's why they like the record in the province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. SVEINSON:** — I would like to bring the supplementary, Mr. Speaker, back to the original question, which was advertising. And I would like to suggest to the government that when it becomes, and as it has become, a very unpopular government in the province, you will see an elevation; you will see a rapid elevation of expenditures on advertising. The expenditure was evident recently when one of the more popular front-bench ministers, from Regina South, in fact, had a voice clip on an advertisement campaign.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. The member rose to ask a supplementary question. If you have a supplementary, I would ask you to get directly to it. Otherwise we'll move on to the next question.

**MR. SVEINSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I do have a supplementary. I would like to ask of the Premier of Saskatchewan: is he not willing to admit that the reason for the elevated expenditure on advertising in this province is not that Social Services is a popular department or that Lights On Saskatchewan is not a very popular program but, in fact, it's to elevate the position of this government in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — No.

**MR. SVEINSON:** — I appreciate his answer but I, in fact, don't believe his answer, Mr. Premier. This government criticized the members in opposition for several months prior to the last election for elevated expenditures in advertising . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. I'll take the next question.

### **Pay Cheques of Char Industries Employees**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. My question deals with a group of workers from the Estevan constituency who were former employees of Char industries and, as the minister will know, Char industries' plant in Estevan burned to the ground last month. On Friday, your colleague, the Minister of Small Business, confessed to complete ignorance of the fact that the final pay cheques to 18 former employees had bounced.

And I ask you, sir: are you taking steps to see that this group of employees gets their final pay cheques? Are you taking steps, particularly in view of the fact that your colleague, the Minister of Small Business, acknowledged that Sedco was fully protected? Are the employees going to be fully protected?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, we are fully aware of the situation in Moose Jaw – or in Estevan, pardon me – and that the labour standards officer there had the first formal complaint one morning, and by late afternoon the complete payroll audit had been done. We know there are 17 employees that have not had their pay, totalling some \$6,700, and we are acting on it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Minister. Would you kindly advise the House and the employees what you're doing by way of acting on it? What steps are you taking to see that

those employees will get their pay cheques? After all, it's the end of May, and they lost their jobs in April.

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we're covering all the angles. We're talking to the management of the company. We have been in touch with the partner in Montreal and, as I say, we're doing everything possible right at the moment to get the money to the employees.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of the report that indicates that the employees had been offered post-dated cheques drawn on a Quebec bank payable in July, in full and complete payment of their claim for wages? And is the minister taking steps to see that they get cheques which can be cashed now, drawn on a Saskatchewan bank, and not cheques dated some weeks hence, drawn on a Quebec bank?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, we are in the process today of having the post-dated cheques drawn back because we already have the money in hand, practically, to pay the employees.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Just a final supplementary. Would the minister indicate the difference between having the money in hand and the money practically in hand?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, it's just a matter of getting a legal document through and we will have the money for the employees of Char . . . (inaudible) . . .

### **Salaries of Officials of Crown Corporations**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct a question to the Premier. And my question is really who, in fact, speaks for the government on the matter of policy which seems rather confused in recent weeks, and that is the matter of the openness of your government? On May the 5th, Mr. Premier, last year, on page 1833 of *Hansard* you said:

. . . we reveal the salaries of the head of crown corporations, which is very much public information.

Yet recently the Minister of Finance is quoted as saying:

Senior Crown corporations' officials shouldn't have to endure public criticism of having their salaries disclosed.

So I ask the Premier, in this clear case of a contradiction of policy, who speaks for the government? And what, in fact, is the government's policy regarding disclosure of the salaries of the heads of Crown corporations?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously I speak for the government, but I would certainly want to review any comments that any of my colleagues have made before I'd make . . . pass judgement on what they might have said.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well as a supplemental, Mr. Speaker: is the policy which you indicated and reported to the House in *Hansard* as I quoted? Is that policy, in effect, that you will, in fact, provide to the shareholders of these Crown corporations, the people of Saskatchewan, indeed, this essential information? Is that the policy?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe — and I'll go check the record — that I have no problem, we have no problem in releasing them if it doesn't contradict anything that's under agreement with those individuals. If they have asked to have it in confidence, or if that's in the contract, then we'll maintain the confidentiality. And to that extent that I won't change that.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well certain, Mr. Premier, that is certainly a departure from your unequivocal statement of indicating that you would provide this. And the reason that . . .

I want to ask you a supplement, Mr. Premier. Do you not think, do you not think that the people of this province have, in fact, the right to know what, in fact, the heads of Crown corporations are being paid? Indeed, when people come to be hired by Crown corporations, in fact, they know that these Crown corporations are, in fact, owned by the people of the province and, therefore, should be disclosed. Why don't you agree with disclosing that information to the people of the province?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I can recall in opposition . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know, Mr. Speaker, I was invisible, but I'm not quite as invisible now.

But I do recall, Mr. Speaker, when the members of the opposition would get after the government for all the Crown corporations who were . . . particularly in business, and those that were competing. And the members of the government at that time would come back and say, 'We can't let you know what the salaries are because they compete with the private sector. We could never do that. We could never let it out.'

Now, evidently, they've changed their mind, which either means that we should take them all and put them in the private sector — which I'm not so sure that they would endorse right now — or else they've changed their minds since they went into opposition. And that's probably the case, because they are on the other side of the House.

So Mr. Speaker, I said that I will do the same, as I said before. If it doesn't contradict anything that we have in terms of agreements with individuals, or set some sort of brand-new historical precedent, or it isn't competing in the private sector and using their argument s- where it might in potash, or it might in oil, or some others — then we'll give it consideration.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I want to indicate, Mr. Premier, that it would be a surprising situation for a private company not to disclose to its shareholders the salaries of its top executives. I find it almost unbelievable that you stand up in this House and pretend to be giving forward openness of government. You indicate the policy that you will, in fact, do it, and now you have allowed your ministers to reverse the very policy that you put in place.

Who is, in fact, calling the shot? Is it the Minister of Finance, or the Deputy Premier, or are you setting policy? And if you are, why isn't it adhered to?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I set the policy, and it's adhered to.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a supplementary question to the Premier.

When you came into office in 1982, you announced that contracts with permanent heads of Crown corporations would be structured such that it was clear that when they came to work for a Crown corporation as a general manager or head of it, that their salary would be disclosed. You announced that that would be the way contracts should be entered into. Why have you now abandoned that pretext of open government?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I just answered that question. I don't know what else I can do to elaborate on it.

### **Closing of Community Aid Resource Centre**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well since the Premier does not have — apparently doesn't have an answer to the question, I'll try another minister on another question.

New question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Social Services, if I might have his attention. Mr. Minister, in Saskatoon, the Community Aid Resource Centre, which has operated for 13 years, announced it will close its doors on June 30 because your department has refused to fund it.

Among its many services, the centre operates a teen-age suicide program. Just a day after it was announced that the Community Aid Resource Centre will close, your colleague, the Minister of Health, announced a \$35,000 study of how to prevent teen-age suicides in Saskatoon.

My question, Mr. Minister, is: when tax dollars are tight, this kind of broken communications is utterly unacceptable. If teen-age suicides are a serious problem in Saskatoon – and the Minister of Health seems to think they are – why is your department putting a group, which supplies a teen-age suicide prevention, out of business? When is your government going to get its act together?

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the member opposite that this government has its act together a lot better than the former government had its act together.

Mr. Speaker, the community aid organization in Saskatoon last year was provided with a one-time grant, a one-time grant of \$10,000, and at the time that the grant was provided to them they were given to clearly understand that this was a one-time grant of \$10,000. In fact, as we approach the '84-85 budget year, that particular organization did not request an extension or an increase of that \$10,000 one-time grant because they understood that that's, in fact, what it was – a one-time grant.

And I'm very pleased that the Minister of Health has, in fact, announced that there will be substantial funds that will be allocated to services related to suicide prevention, right across Saskatchewan, and in Saskatoon, and in particular, for teenagers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Minister. If you're suggesting that the community aid resource centre would not have accepted government funds to continue operating, I say that is simply not believable . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that was his suggestion.

Mr. Minister, I point you again these ads. I think it is clear that the cost for these ads would come close to covering the program provided in Saskatoon by that centre. I ask you, Mr. Minister, if you think these inane ads are more important than the lives of teenagers who commit suicide.

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Speaker, I just indicated that this government has, in fact, provided thousands of dollars to the mental health organization here in Saskatchewan to upgrade mental health services. When we became government, the Minister of Health was very aware that there was a serious lack of adequate programming and funding for mental health services here in the province of Saskatchewan.

And where did that serious lack of adequate programming and funding originate? Not with this government, Mr. Speaker. With the former government opposite. And when the task force on mental health report was presented to the minister, he acted – substantially increasing the funding for suicide prevention here in the province of Saskatchewan, well above anything that has ever taken place here in the province.

I think that is something that the people of Saskatchewan wanted. We have delivered, and I think everyone should be proud of it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### **Expansion to Youth Employment Programs**

**HON. MR. MAXWELL:** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House today about an expansion to our youth employment program — Saskatchewan Opportunities '84 and Saskatchewan Access Youth Employment. Both programs were originally announced in the budget presented to this House on March 21, 1984, and have been extremely well-received by employers who are interested in creating full-time jobs for students and unemployed youth.

Therefore, in order to meet the tremendous employer response to our programs, I am pleased to stand and announce today that the provincial government has approved the allocation of an additional \$3 million . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MAXWELL:** — . . . Mr. Speaker, the allocation of an additional \$3 million to be divided between Saskatchewan Opportunities '84 and Saskatchewan Access Youth Employment. This additional funding means that a total \$8.75 million will be spent in the creation of jobs for young people in Saskatchewan this year, creating a minimum of 6,000 jobs. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I want to join with the minister to welcome additional moneys being provided in the two programs as he indicated. I only regret, on behalf of the young people of this province, that what we have here is two programs which are patchwork programs. They have not, in fact, provided to the young people of this province career-oriented jobs. And this is the case in which the young people are very concerned.

I want to say also, further, that in respect to what the minister has announced here, is certainly a rather late realization that there are young people unemployed. Just a week or two ago, 18.4 per cent of the young people of this province were unemployed. So all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a patchwork approach — too little, and far too late.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we might, with leave, refer back to notices of motions and questions?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The member has asked for leave. Proceed.

### **NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I give notice that I shall, on Wednesday next, move an act respecting the government's reimbursement on unjust dismissals act.

### **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

#### **Bill No. 81 — An Act respecting the Protection and Management of Crown Lands Critical for the maintenance of Wildlife Populations**

**HON. MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Speaker, it's a great deal of pleasure for me to introduce first reading of An Act respecting the Protection and Management of Crown Lands Critical for the maintenance of Wildlife Populations.

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

#### **Bill No. 82 — An Act respecting Intensive Livestock Operations**



**HON. MR. HEPWORTH:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting Intensive Livestock Operations.

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

**Bill No. 83 – An Act to provide for the Making of Grants to Certain Senior Citizens to assist them in making Repairs to their Homes**

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move first reading of a bill to provide for the Making of Grants to Senior Citizens to assist them in making Repairs to their Homes.

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

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**SECOND READINGS**

**Bill No. 79 – An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act (No. 2)**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to give second reading to an Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act (No. 2). This bill, Mr. Speaker, gives legislative authority for supplementary allowances to superannuation to help compensate for the effects of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, in these times of restraint, this administration is showing its ability to respond to the needs of the elderly by granting an additional allowance above normal entitlements to pension plans.

I take pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving . . . or giving second reading to this bill, Bill No. 79.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will add a very few words to this. We will support this bill on the basis of it being half a loaf, and half a loaf is certainly better than nothing. The increase last year was something over \$19 per year per year. The increase this year is \$13 per year per year, and that represents a substantial decrease in the amount of supplement which superannuates will be giving . . . getting.

Last year the superannuates got something over \$19 per year per year, as I indicated. The widows – or spouses of a deceased employee is perhaps the better way to put it, got 60 per cent of that. And orphans got a portion, got something – perhaps not necessarily orphans. The children of deceased employees, dependent children of deceased employees who may or may not be orphans – but they got something.

This year the government has cut back on the amount for superannuates, cut back on the amount for widows for better stated, the spouses of former employees, and has eliminated entirely the amount for children. This is, indeed, a time for restraint, but I'm not sure whether we needed to go quite that far in restraint.

The restraint, as we know, has not affected the performance of the government in many other ways. I will not detail the many aspects of this government which have not felt the finger of restraint. I look at the 25 cabinet ministers and I could . . . and the 12 legislative secretaries and go on from there.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that while some areas of government are not subject to restraint,

payments to superannuates are subject to restraint, and we are seeing a substantial reduction in the amount paid last year to superannuates, to the surviving spouse of former superannuates, and the complete elimination of the payments to dependent children of superannuates.

As I say, it is better than nothing. We will be supporting it, but it is an effort which does not do the government proud.

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

**Bill No. 76 – An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly:

That the order for the second reading of Bill No. 76 be discharged, and the bill referred to the standing committee on non-controversial bills.

Motion agreed to.

**Bill No. 77 – An Act to amend The Mentally Disordered Persons Act**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 77 be discharged, and the bill referred to the standing committee on non-controversial bills.

Motion agreed to.

**Bill No. 78 – An Act respecting Crop Insurance**

**HON. MR. MUIRHEAD:** — By leave of the Assembly:

That second reading be discharged, and I ask that the bill, Mr. Speaker, refer to . . . No. 78, the bill be referred to the non-controversial bills committee.

Motion agreed to.

**Bill No. 80 – An Act respecting a Livestock Investment Tax Credit**

**HON. MR. HEPWORTH:** — Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to have this opportunity to move second reading of this bill respecting a Livestock Investment Tax Credit. I think this, along with its sister legislation, if you like, the Venture Capital Credit, is an historic piece of legislation, and I believe it will bring renewed life and vitality to Saskatchewan's livestock industry and result in untold numbers of livestock being fed in our province. It will be a breath of fresh air for an industry which withered away under the previous administration.

In the early and mid-'70s, when the members opposite were in power, the livestock industry flowed out of Saskatchewan. The floodgates were open, our livestock and the businesses they support gushed out, and yet the members opposite did nothing. They didn't even try to put a thumb in the hole in the dike. They stood back and watched the livestock leave and, with it, all the economic related activity. I think this is the important reason for a targeted tax credit. All the economic related activity, including jobs, leave Saskatchewan, as well.

And I think the inaction devastated our livestock herds, as evidenced by the statistics. Our beef-cow herd has dropped from 1.2 million to about 830,000. And we could use similar figures for slaughter hogs and, as well, lambs. And I think it's safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that during that

period of time – during the '70s – the NDP, when in government, did nothing to help not only the livestock producers of this province, but I suppose one could make the general comment as it relates to all the farmers of this province.

It also resulted in, as I said earlier, enormous economic activity leaving the province, and I'm talking about things like jobs in feedlots, jobs in the farm service sector, jobs in construction, jobs in meat-processing plants – all these were lost to other parts of the country. And it's this kind of economic activity in these industries that depend directly on a strong and healthy livestock sector.

I think this act that we have before us today, this bill, is clear proof of our strong believes and commitment to the livestock industry. The Livestock Investment Tax Credit will keep our livestock here in Saskatchewan where they belong, and all those jobs and economic benefits will be available to the people of Saskatchewan.

The livestock will stay here, quite simply, because of the tax incentive offered by this act. It's a major incentive, and I congratulate the Minister of Finance for his negotiations to bring this about.

As a result of this act the Saskatchewan taxpayer can potentially reduce his net Saskatchewan tax payable to zero. A person can totally eliminate his provincial income tax. And I don't know anyone who likes to pay income tax.

So this innovative approach will attract a great deal of interest and, more importantly, public support.

But even over and above that, Mr. Speaker, the tax incentive is very simple. For every eligible steer, heifer, hog, or lamb which a person owns and feeds in Saskatchewan that's slaughtered out, that person earns a tax credit, and it's deducted from the person's net Saskatchewan tax payable – one line on the income tax form. With enough credits, a taxpayer can wipe out his Saskatchewan income tax.

The rules are quite simple, as well. For a person to earn a credit, livestock must meet the following criteria. There's a minimum number of days of ownership. Slaughter steers and heifers must be owned by the person for a minimum of 75 days; hogs and lambs for a minimum of 60 days. Eligible animals must be slaughtered at a federally graded plant in or outside of Saskatchewan, or at ungraded abattoirs in the province. In the case of cattle, they must grade A or B; hogs, 80 or better; and lambs, as well, Canada A or B. All slaughter steers, heifers, hogs, and lambs, excluding breeding and unfinished animals, slaughtered and ungraded at Saskatchewan abattoirs, are eligible. The tax credit is \$25 per slaughter steer or heifer, \$3 per hog, and \$2 per lamb. The only deductible is the \$100; the first \$100 of tax credit is not deductible. Livestock marketed between last March 22nd and December 31st, '86 qualify.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting and attractive feature of this legislation is the carry-forward provision. If a person is not taxable this year, he may carry the credit forward for up to seven years. In other words, a person who is not paying income tax now can start to build up credits against future income tax. The tax credit is treated as income in the following year.

The Livestock Investment Tax Credit is a major stimulus for our livestock industry. I believe it will encourage producers who currently ship animals out of the province for feeding and finishing to keep that livestock here. It will bring new money into the livestock sector.

I think it's no secret that there are many Saskatchewan residents who have money to invest, and who now buy RRSPs or MURBs, for example, or other tax deferrals. And now they will have another investment tool at their disposal; they can invest in agriculture. Some of those investors may be people living in the towns and cities, who aren't familiar particularly with raising livestock, but who do wish to use a tax investment such as this.

The members opposite have tried to criticize this tax credit because it may help lawyers, doctors, and others who may have high incomes and high taxes. But quite frankly, those comments don't bother me. In fact, I find them encouraging.

If we can attract some of that investment income, whether it be from farmer or non-farmer investors, people from the towns, people from the cities, people from the farms themselves, to invest in agriculture, whether through a custom feeding operation or by, in fact, themselves setting up a feedlot, I find that particularly encouraging, Mr. Speaker. Because I think it's no secret in this province that many, many people, whether they live in towns or cities, have their roots in the farm, or came from the farm originally.

There's also another scenario as well, Mr. Speaker. There are some well-established farmers out there who perhaps have no long-term debt and who do have, in fact, a tax bill, and these farmers may well have sons and daughters who would like to either expand or get into the livestock feeding business. And I can see fathers investing, perhaps, in their son's operation to feed or custom feed cattle, and so we solve, if you like, the father's problem on one hand, and increase the cash flow for the young son operating the feedlot on the other hand. And I think that's very consistent with our view of the family farm in this province.

The reason, of course, from the province's standpoint, in so far as why we have chosen to stimulate the livestock industry, is obvious. There's great potential out there, potential which has been allowed, and perhaps maybe even encouraged, to lay idle until now.

We just have to look at the opportunities in the cattle sector as an example. We have the basic factory here for producing cattle. We have one-quarter of all the beef cows in Canada – 830,000 head, Mr. Speaker.

We have the ability to grow a tremendous amount of feed grains and forages in this province. We have no shortage of land on which to grow those feed grains and forages. In fact, we currently produce about 200 million bushels of feed grains a year right now.

We have abundant pasture. Our Crown lands alone have the potential to summer half a million beef cows, Mr. Speaker. And yet, despite all these natural advantages, we send our calves, or a good percentage of them, out of our province every fall for feeding and finishing – every fall, just as regular as clockwork. I don't know for how many years, Mr. Speaker, 400 to 500,000 feeders have left this province every single fall.

And along with each one of those feeders that left the province every fall, another 40 or 50 bushels of barley left with it. And to me that makes no sense. We should be putting (a) the feed into, (b) the calves, right here in Saskatchewan, right here at feedlots here in Saskatchewan. And further, we should be slaughtering them and processing and putting that meat into boxed beef, if that's the latest technology, Mr. Speaker, then shipping it to Montreal or wherever. But right here in Saskatchewan is where it should be happening.

It just seems to me to make eminent good sense to take 300 lb. Of boxed beef and pay the costs on that to ship it to market, rather than pay the costs associated with transporting a 500 or 600 lb. Calf and 2,000 to 2,500 of feed grain every time. We should be keeping that economic activity, with all the spin-off benefits, right here in Saskatchewan. I believe, and I think my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, believe as well, that this Livestock Tax Credit will accomplish just that.

The reason that this is such a positive program for the province's economic and value, and can add so much economic value to the province is because, in fact, in the livestock sector there is spin-off here perhaps second to none. The figures are staggering. What is the potential?

Well suppose we increased. We currently feed out something in the range of 300,000 calves in

the province. Suppose we increase this feeding and processing by an additional 100,000 head, which I suspect is not an unrealistic goal. If we keep those animals here, we've created something in the order of 300 new permanent jobs in the finishing and processing industries alone. And each of those jobs in turn creates two more jobs. Now we're looking at nearly 900 new jobs. They're not government jobs, they're private sector jobs, in small businesses, and in big businesses and in feed lots, and on the farms. And at what cost to the government? Virtually nothing. Those 900 people will be out there working. And, as hard working people, they'll be paying taxes, and it's those taxes that will build hospitals and schools and nursing homes. And I could go on, and I could go on.

But that sort of economic activity will more than recover any tax revenues which the government may forego as a result of the tax credit. And I can see why the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are worried. They are worried for the very reasons that my colleague to my left here, the Minister of Energy and Mines, has put them in the position to be worried about, and that is that the same kinds of government programs that worked – the oil royalty holidays that worked so well in getting jobs and creating economic activity for the province in the oil sector are now going to work in the livestock sector. So I can see why they're a little bit worried about this particular bill.

Another statistic, Mr. Speaker, relative to the direct economic advantage that finishing out those 100,000 head in Saskatchewan, and what it means, is that the \$76 million that will be added to the value of those cattle as a finished product – that money will stay here instead of being exported to some other part of the country.

If we keep those animals here, another 22-\$23 million in a new processing facilities may well have to be built, and that means more capital investment and more jobs. And all that economic activity will occur at no cost to the government. It's not the grant mentality – it's not grants; it's not subsidies; it's not top-loading; it's not bottom-loading. It doesn't tamper with human nature, and that's what I call a bargain. That's what I call responsible government.

The cattle industry and the livestock industry in general is a mega project just waiting to happen in Saskatchewan, and I believe that the Livestock Investment Tax Credit will make sure it does.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I move second reading of Bill No. 80, an Act respecting a Livestock Investment Tax Credit.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to just say a few words on the proposed bill that the minister has given his second reading speech on, and refers to it as a great day for Saskatchewan. And I wish him a good deal of luck. He refers it to a mega project for Saskatchewan, and I remember a former premier of Manitoba referring to his mega projects, and I wish the minister more luck than Sterling Lyon when he talked before the last election about mega projects in that province.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the minister, in outlining the program today, that will, indeed, help people who pay income tax, whether they are lawyers or doctors or whatever, does not explain how, at the same time he is allowing the beef stabilization program, for example, to run out of money – a very legitimate way where farmers would be helped in the beef industry, which would go a long way to supporting the producers who are now in place, and now facing a grave problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the minister that he will well know that probably 25 per cent of the farmers, the people who have mixed farms and raise beef in this province, do not pay income tax this year in 1984 because of the severe cost-price squeeze that they find themselves in at the present time.

And he will know that this bill will not help one of those farmers who is facing a crisis in his farming operation because of the lack of cash flow, because this program simply helps those who already have money and who are paying income tax.

He also mentions that the individual who will be a very small operator – let's use for an example a son or daughter who is just getting into the beef industry and has 10 head of cattle during the first year, or the first couple of years – he has eliminated 40 per cent of their cattle going to market being eligible for this program.

And it's no big thing. It's only a hundred bucks for those individuals. But if you have 10 head of cattle for the young person who's starting out, a hundred dollars is a hundred dollars. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, why you would exclude those young people who may be just getting into the beef industry.

I say as well, Mr. Minister, that I wish you a good deal of luck because your record in keeping the beef herd up in this province has not been one that one can be proud of in your first two years of office.

The trend that exists across North America, whether it's in Alberta or Saskatchewan or Manitoba or Montana or South Dakota, where the beef herds are being deleted in large part because the price of beef is very low, and this is basically why the NDP government brought in the beef stabilization program, and one that the beef industry appreciated very much.

And I wish you luck in this program because I think that the trend that I see, where large tracts of land are being broken up and put into wheat production in southern Saskatchewan, is not going to end, or not going to go away because of the bill that you are introducing here today.

In fact, Mr. Minister, your own inaction on the problem associated with the beef industry today – that being the drought south of the Trans-Canada Highway – where you admitted on Friday that you are going to allow large numbers of brood cows to disappear onto the slaughtered market before you do anything about a feed freight assistance program, will show the hollowness of this bill that you have introduced today as a means of helping the farmers in the province.

I say, as well, if you're talking about the slaughtering and the boxing of beef in Saskatchewan, your allowing Intercontinental to close its doors last year is a strange way to go about showing your support for the beef industry in this province, and the loss of jobs that occurs.

But here again we have announcements of many projects, millions of dollars, and how it's going to create jobs. The Minister of Continuing Education announced today \$3 million for job creation. But, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that we have all these announcements, it's difficult to understand how in Saskatchewan we have 64,000 people on the welfare rolls at the present time, and when this government took over there were 47,000.

And I say, Mr. Minister, again, in closing, that I wish you luck because your record in dealing with the agricultural problems has not been great, and I wish you the best of luck with Bill 80, but I have grave doubts as to whether it will solve the problems of beef industry.

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

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **SECOND READINGS**

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

that Bill No. 64 – **An Act to provide for the establishment and Maintenance of Public Libraries** be now read a second time.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want only to make a few comments in respect to the introduce of The Public Libraries Act. I just want to say and reiterate that the library system that was established in this province, as has been admitted by the minister in her release of the proposed changes, has, in fact, completed its developmental stages. And I think it's clearly understood and appreciated that in Saskatchewan we have an outstanding library system. In so far as the development of regional libraries, it is complete, except for northern Saskatchewan.

In looking at the act, and I've had an opportunity to discuss the implications of some of the changes, and I want to indicate that the one problem that has existed throughout, and there has been various views in respect to it, and that is whether an individual municipality, town, or city has the . . . whether it was compulsory that they belong to the regional and participate – universal participation – or whether that should, in fact, be on a voluntary basis. It is my understanding that what is opted for in the act is that each individual municipality, town, or city will have the voluntary right to opt out of the regional library involvement.

That is a particular problem, I know, which not only this government faces, but which we faced, and there are varying views in respect to that. The operation, of course, of the regional library can, in fact, be put into jeopardy if a major participant within the region opts to withdraw from participation, and certainly the financial participation.

There's one other area that is of concern which I'll raise with the minister in committee of the whole, and that pertains primarily – and I won't go into the details of it here, but I just put the minister on guard – and that is in respect to section 70 there, which really particularly indicates that if a municipality is paying . . . contributes more than 25 per cent of the municipal grant made to the board, then the board shall not determine any increase in the amount grant without the agreement of the one that is paying over 25 per cent. This practice . . . There's a number of areas where an individual city or town is paying more than 25 per cent of the total municipal grant to the operation of the regional library board: Moose Jaw is one; Swift Current, I believe; and there's others.

What has happened in the past is that the various participants have worked out an agreement, and I am advised that it has been worked out between the participants without having it in the legislation. For instance, in the city of Moose Jaw, it is agreed, because Moose Jaw contributes more than 25 per cent of the grant, that within the agreement already they indicate that before any increase will be implemented that Moose Jaw must, in fact, agree.

So what those who are involved in the library are saying: we don't really need the particular statute section in section 70, subsection (3), because it was being provided by agreements.

I have only a few other concerns which I will raise in the committee of the whole. I am glad to see that we are moving ahead with the outstanding library base which we had established when we were in government. Thank you.

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

## **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

#### **EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 10**

Item 1

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the Premier introduce his officials?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to introduce Gren Smith-Windsor, cabinet secretary and acting deputy minister to the premier. Sitting to my left, Elizabeth Crosthwaite, clerk of Executive Council and assistant cabinet secretary; Brian Leibel, acting director of administration; and Lynn Schellenberg, administrative officer.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you will be aware of the position taken recently by your minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office with respect to disclosing information on lawsuits settled by the Crown. In the case of a person by the name of Murray Wallace, the Crown corporation, SGI, was sued. A settlement was made, we are assured. And, accordingly, there can be no reason based upon public interest for not disclosing the basis of the settlement.

It is rather clear, it seems, that Wallace is prepared to make the facts known. And there were but three parties to the action — Mr. Rousseau, the SGI, and Mr. Wallace. Mr. Wallace agrees; I ask you whether SGI and Mr. Rousseau have any objection to making this information public so that the public will know what settlement was made in this case to Mr. Wallace?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, in response to the Leader of the Opposition, I believe that he said that there's — in his words, or I paraphrase — no reason not to disclose the information.

I believe that that's not an accurate statement, because where would it end? We have, and will have, and governments have had for years, employed people and having agreements with people. And the spirit of those agreements are to hold them in confidence.

If you break that agreement, and if you started that, then I would suspect — and I just throw it out — that you'd say: well why not this one, and then why not this one, and why not this one? And there could be no end of literally thousands that you may get into in terms of asking for public information on agreements that were put together under the spirit of confidentiality.

So that is why it isn't released. Because in the spirit of all the other agreements that we have here, it would be unfair to those, and unfair to those in the past, and probably, and no doubt, unfair to those in the future.

If we were putting together agreements that said: no, it will be public, particularly if somebody decides to change his mind down the road, and writes back to the government and says, well now, you can release mine. Well I'm sure there may be a barrage of letters come forward saying, well now, how about this one, and how about that one. So, I mean, in the spirit of the agreements you make sure that they do remain confidential so that people can move from one position to another, or one government to another; or from the government to the private sector; or both ways, so that they can do so with some degree of mobility and confidence that it isn't public knowledge.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, we're not here talking about the terms of employment, or the terms, really, of a separation. We're talking about the terms of a settled legal action. We're talking about an action which was started against an agency of the Crown of Saskatchewan. We're talking about an instance where it's rather clear Mr. Wallace felt that the provision in the agreement was there for the protection of Mr. Rousseau and the SGI. That's obviously clear from his subsequent action.

Mr. Rousseau indicated that he was not seeking that protection. He indicated it in the House. Mr. Wallace indicates that he's not seeking the protection. Now if, in fact, Mr. Rousseau was not



seeking the protection, and Mr. Wallace is not seeking the protection, and if the norm – and I submit to you it is the norm – is to disclose to the public what settlement is made when the government settles a legal action, why, in this case, would that norm be departed from? And why would – and apparently all parties agree that the information should be public – why would the norm be departed from? Why wouldn't the facts be made known?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I can only add by saying that the legal contract is still binding. And the contracts with all other employees – past, present, or future – are entered into on the understanding that they will be binding. We don't want to set a precedent by saying well, here's one that we put together. It was a nice legal contract. This is what we agree to do, and then say, all right, we'll break that. We don't want to do that.

It would be a precedent that would make other people perhaps say, well the next time I enter an agreement, somebody might say, well you can get out of that agreement, or they might break the agreement. We want to make sure that that isn't the case.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, no one, I think, is talking about breaking agreements. We're simply talking about amending agreements – amending agreements – and we have your Mr. Wallace saying that he's happy to have it amended, and we had Mr. Rousseau saying that he would love to have . . . to make the information public.

Now, in the fact of that, in the fact of – I take it Mr. Rousseau was speaking both for himself and for SGI – when all parties, when all parties want the information public, the fact that one or other party may not have wanted that at the outset, and the fact that one or other may have changed their mind – and we can argue which one – but why wouldn't we take advantage of the fact that all parties apparently want the information public, and make the information public, which is surely what you would want to do, Mr. Premier?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I have nothing more to add except to say that I'm not so sure why it is to the opposition's great advantage, or to the public's great advantage, to have this one particular salary, or resolution of salary, public. Because . . . and I'll say, I don't know what the advantage might be. I mean you hired the individual; we know that. But to make the resolution of it public, knowing the consequences for it, that it may impinge on an awful lot of other people.

So I'm not quite sure why it would be all that important. And, because I'm not sure that it would be all that important, or that it's so important that we have to set a precedent that would change the past as well as the future, in this government and other governments across the country, and there are governments in the past – your administration – so I'm not prepared to set a precedent by making this one public just because, perhaps, one administration brought them on, and another administration let them go, that might harm people that will be employed in the future, now, or in the past, in this administration. That's why we don't want to provide any more information because it would set a precedent that would never end.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, we obviously are not having a meeting of minds here. This was not an ordinary separation. This was not an ordinary dismissal. We're not really talking about a dismissal or a separation. We're talking about an action for defamation of character, and that's a very, very different thing. I hope there won't be dozens and hundreds of those.

I'm not aware of another one except possibly one other with respect to the assumption of office by your government. I may be mistaken there, but I hope that it is not the practice of your ministers to defame senior public servants, to assert that they are lacking in either ability or integrity. And that's what you do when you fire someone for cause, and then later on say, "Oh, it was just a terrible mistake," after 18 months or saying that about a senior public servant, and then make a cash settlement. That is not going to happen very often. It shouldn't happen very often. It is a payment out, because of an action by your minister, which was highly unusual and,

in my judgement, highly improper.

I'm not talking about something like for, let us say, down at the power corporation, where Mr. Moncur, his services were dispensed with. For good or evil, for good or ill, an arrangement was made, and that was it. It was a separation. It was of the view that no one was thereby expressing any lack of confidence in Mr. Moncur's general managerial abilities. They were simply saying they wished someone else in the power corporation. Now that's one position for a government.

But for a government to wheel in and say of a senior officer, in this case a president, "We're firing you for cause," and then not being able to make it stick – that is a highly unusual circumstance – I think the only one of a really senior person in the government that I'm aware of, and a settlement had to be made. A settlement, not because you parted company with Mr. Wallace, but because you defamed him.

Now this is pretty unusual. And I think it's reasonable for the public to know what it cost them as taxpayers, because your minister set about to defame a senior public servant, and then couldn't make it stick. This is highly unusual. Not going to set any precedents, I hope, because I hope it's not going to happen again. And I think it's reasonable to ask us: how much did we pay because your minister decided he was going to defame the name of a senior business executive, and then couldn't make it stick?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is accurate when he says that they have settled out of court, and the matter is finished, and it has been settled. And I don't see the value in pursuing this, particularly when you might flirt with the possibility of asking for an awful lot more information, as a result of providing some, in this case. And I'm just not going to provide more information that may jeopardize relationships that are here now, or in the future, or in the past.

It's settled; you're right. It's settled out of court. They've resolved it to both their satisfaction. It's finished. So I don't know why you want to pursue it any further. I don't want to set a precedent by providing more information that might lead to you asking, or somebody else in the public asking for information on this person's salary that we've employed or this person's salary we've employed, and so forth. So it's been settled; you're right. And they're both agreed to say: that's it. So I don't know what's to be gained by pursuing this.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — This is to be gained, Mr. Minister. It is settled. Somebody paid Mr. Wallace what I suspect is a substantial sum of money because of the improper action of the minister. It is going to be the policyholders of SGI who are going to pay that, either through our plate insurance, or when we buy fire insurance or otherwise from SGI. Or alternatively, we're going to pay for it because we're not going to get the same return from SGI we would have received as taxpayers.

Now it is not finished from the point of view of the policyholder or taxpayer. He doesn't know what it's costing him. He just knows it's costing him money. It's not unreasonable for the public of Saskatchewan to know what that fit of temper on the part of the minister in charge of SGI cost the taxpayers.

It yielded nothing of good to the taxpayer. He certainly could have dispensed with Mr. Wallace's services in the same way as other senior officers were dispensed with by this government, without deciding that he was going to defame his name. He took a different, highly unusual course of action – the only minister that did so. It cost us money. It cost us quite a bit of money, I suspect, and no one cares to tell us how much it cost. And I think we ought to know how much this minister is costing us.

He didn't act the way his colleague, the Minister of Labour, acted with respect to, let us say, the power corporation. He didn't act the way his colleague, the Minister of Highways, acted

with respect to the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, or the others. He acted in a very special, different, and, I suggest, costly way. And the minister refuses to tell us how much, and I'm asking the Premier again: why do you refuse to tell us how much, in this highly unusual case, which is in the highest degree unlikely that it will be repeated?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, obviously there were two ways the minister could release the individual. Under either option, he's paid. He's paid some money. Now under the normal course of events he is paid some money, and we don't make that public. And the Leader of the Opposition is aware of that, and he has released people and it's kept confidential, and that's the way it is.

Under this recent arrangement, he's released, and he's paid some money. Under both cases they're reasonable, because reasonable men agreed to arrive at an arrangement. So if they are reasonable, and it is something that's consistent with history, consistent with other procedures that have taken place, then that's all I believe that the Leader of the Opposition needs to know. Because if we make more than that public, then you're into, as he full well knows, another world in providing information on agreements between people that are confidentiality.

Again I go back, there's . . . The individual receives funds under either alternative. They have in the past; they are now; and they will in the future. And those settlements are reasonable. They're based on some sort of an agreement between individuals, and that's the case here.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I can see I'm not getting my point across to the Premier.

You felt it was in your interest to replace the senior officers of Crown corporations. And in order to do that you had to pay money for severance pay, I will call it, and you did so. And you felt you were getting some public good from that. And while I might doubt that, that is a question of opinion, and we can argue, but you're in the position to make the judgement. You made the judgement that there was a public good to replace, let us say, Mr. Moncur, and you did so. And I don't particularly quarrel with that. I think it was a wrong decision, but as I say, I'm not there making them.

But when Mr. Wallace came along, you took another decision, a very different one, that you were going to not only dispense with the services of Mr. Wallace and pay money that was associated with that, but also to defame his name, to assert that he lacked either competence or integrity — when I say 'you,' I'm saying your minister — and then you paid because of that decision. And for that decision there was no possible public benefit; none whatever. You paid out money and got absolutely nothing for it, because you paid out more than you would have had to do in order to dispense with the services of Mr. Wallace, and that was all you were seeking to do, unless you were running some personal vendetta. And I am saying that, from all the information that is available, the minister was running a personal vendetta against Mr. Wallace. He was not performing any particular public service in the course of so doing. It cost all of us money, and we should know how much this type of action by the minister costs. It's got nothing to do with getting rid of the services of Mr. Wallace, because that could have been done the other normal route followed by all of his colleagues and, I say, at considerably less cost.

And if the Premier says, "You don't know that," well, he's in a sense right, but that's what we are entitled to know: how much did Mr. Rousseau's spleen and personal vendetta cost us as taxpayers? And that's a fair question, Mr. Premier.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member perhaps knows . . . I'm sure he . . . well, I won't say I'm sure, but he may have an idea, having hired the former Mr. Wallace, or the former employee, Mr. Wallace, what the settlement was. He may. He may know exactly what it is. He will also know that the settlements that are made are reasonable. He knows that from the past. He knows it from his own settlements. And what did he have — something like 60 people that

he let go in April of '82, and the settlements. And they are in the ballpark. And, Mr. Chairman, the minister, in his own mind, may have thought that he had a reasonable case against Mr. Wallace, but there was an agreement reached between the two of them not to pursue it, not to pursue that which would cost Mr. Wallace something less, and probably cost the minister something less, not to pursue it. They agreed. And they agreed to settle it as reasonable men do. And so they agreed to settle their differences, and not to run into charges of incompetence or lack of integrity or whatever else it might have been, but they agreed not to do that. They agreed on a settlement.

The minister may have had a view. Mr. Wallace may have had a view. But the difference of the views were resolved, and they said, all right, we won't pursue that. We'll apologize; the minister will apologize. We'll drop the mantle; we'll settle it. And they are virtually going back to square one. All right, we'll settle it. And they settled it in a reasonable fashion. And I can't think of anything in addition that the public will gain by saying any more when these two men have agreed to resolve it, and it reflects on the normal resolution of things that have gone on in your administration, sir, and in ours, and in others across the country. And the settlements are, as I say, reasonable.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, the Premier may know that it's reasonable. I certainly do not. I don't know what the settlement is and have no idea what the settlement is, but clearly the Premier is not going to give us any additional information on that, much as I think he ought, and so I'll go to another matter.

He has indicated people who work in his office: Gren Smith-Windsor and Mrs. Crothwaite and Mr. Leibel and Miss Schellenberg. I'll ask about some other people and what their duties are. Do you have someone by the name of Heather Dreher – D-r-e-h-e-r – employed in the Executive Council, and what are her duties?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, Heather Dreher is a clerk steno 4 and works with Mr. Garf Spetz, who is director of media relations.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — And Sharon Fritsch.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, Sharon Fritsch was a communications officer in Executive Council, and she is no longer there.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. Has she been replaced in her capacity as a communications officer?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, she has been replaced, and by Ivy Glover.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I was about to ask you about Ivy Glover. Were they both on staff at the same time? And I'm reading from some material I have which appears to indicate that Sharon Fritsch was appointed in June of 1982 and Ivy Glover in June of '83. Did they succeed each other, or were they on staff at the same time?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that they did not work at the same time except for maybe a brief period of overlap.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Do you have on staff someone by the name of Margot Weir?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. Margot Weir is a communications officer.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I note these people with communications officers getting around \$1,900 or \$2,000 a month – some of them a little less than that. How many of those types of communications officers do you have at approximately that level?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Two.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Do you have on staff a Joan Heisler? And what are her duties?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, Joan Heisler is a clerk steno 4 and is secretary to Mr. Quinlan.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, Mr. Premier, with respect to Mr. Quinlan, what are his duties, and what is his title, and what is his salary?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, Sam Quinlan is director of communications. His salary is \$4,584 per month, and his duties, in very brief, are to co-ordinate departmental and Crown public relations strategy with the public of Saskatchewan.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Minister, do you have someone called Mr. Shorvoyce on your staff — Mr. Ron Shorvoyce?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, Mr. Shorvoyce is employed. He is the cabinet press officer. His duties primarily are working with ministers and their news releases and ministerial statements, and his salary is \$4,273 a month.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. Mention has been made of Mr. Garfield Spetz. Would you indicate whether you have . . . what Mr. Spetz's title, duties, and salary are?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. Garf Spetz is director of media relations. His salary is 65,000 per annum. His duties are: one, media liaison, as director of media relations implies; and adviser to Executive Council and, particularly, to me.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, you have a director of communications, and a director of media relations, and a cabinet press officer, and two communications officers, and some senior secretarial staff serving them. Could you attempt to outline for me the lines of demarcation between a director of communications, a director of media relations, and a cabinet press officer?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Spetz is my individual that deals with media, and particularly the hard news media, in an advisory capacity to me as Premier. Mr. Shorvoyce does the same for cabinet ministers. In other words, where Mr. Spetz provides me the information on the kinds of things that he thinks are important in the news on a day-to-day basis in co-ordinating my statements, Mr. Shorvoyce does it for the entire cabinet on terms of the news implications that might have some impact on a minister — one, or two, or three ministers — and then in co-ordinating theirs.

Mr. Quinlan, on the other hand, co-ordinates all the educational programs and advertising programs of departments and Crown corporations, which is a completely different bailiwick.

Mr. Shorvoyce obviously reports to Mr. Spetz, and Mr. Spetz reports to me.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, to whom do the communications officers — and I refer to Hamon and Margot Weir — to whom do they report?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member meant Ivy Glover, but that's the one he was asking about earlier. And she answers my telephone. If they phone 565-5300, they will get a charming lady at the other end, and she will say, "The Premier's office."

And Ivy reports to the assistant principal secretary, Mr. Greg Fyffe.

Margot Weir is the manager of the correspondence unit: that is, people who write in to the Premier for information, and we write back, and that's her major responsibility, and I believe she reports to Greg, as well.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, we have got, as I say, these two communications officers, and this director of communications, and this cabinet press officer, and this director of media relations, who are looking after the communications in the Premier's office. To the knowledge of the Premier, do not most of the cabinet ministers have a press officer themselves? We have uncovered . . . not uncovered, but identified, identified that information as we have been going through the estimates, and is it not felt that these people are competent to advise their ministers without Mr. Shorvoyce telling them what they should be saying to their minister?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, it is true that many ministers have ministerial assistants, and it's also true that the activities of the departments and the Crown corporations need to be co-ordinated. And it's also true that it's a good idea to have the Premier advised of that co-ordination or, from time to time, have him involved in that co-ordination.

So, yes, they have their own day-to-day ministerial assistants, but that often is not sufficient to provide the overall co-ordination.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, it seems clear that there are many people with a good deal of seniority — I'll put it that way — who deal with the public relations in your office. I noted one was Mr. Shorvoyce, and you told me what his salary was.

When we were here last year, it was indicated that Mr. Shorvoyce's salary was included in the order in council of May 5, 1983, providing a 6 per cent salary increase for out-of-scope employees. And he is listed as Ron Shorvoyce, cabinet press officer, position no. 254913.

It appears, if I understand the order in council correctly, that on June 2, 1983, certain employees were exempt from this 6 per cent increase, and I am looking at order in council no. 847/ . . . No, correction, I am looking at 847/83, and it appeared that Mr. Shorvoyce was not going to get the increase. Can you tell me whether Mr. Shorvoyce was exempted from the 6 per cent increase?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shorvoyce was exempted from the 6 per cent increase. And just so that we totally understand it, the 6 per cent wasn't 6 per cent on anything; it was a captive \$3,000. But in any event, he was exempt from the whole . . .

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — With respect to that decision to exempt Mr. Shorvoyce and certain other individuals from that — I'll call it \$3,000 increase — what was the reason for deciding not to include him in the group getting the increase?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member no doubt knows that it's not necessary to include anybody in the \$3,000 increase or the 6 per cent increase, particularly those that are on order in council. When he was first employed, it was viewed that his salary was competitive. And at that time we decided to, as we did in many cases, watch the productivity and performance of various individuals. And so at that particular time they were not included or exempted.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, on June 2nd you exempted Mr. Shorvoyce from this 6 per cent increase, and on March 7th the 6 per cent increase was to be effective April 1st, 1983, and was for the others who were not exempted. On March 7, 1984, you increased Mr. Shorvoyce's salary by \$200 per month. You not only did that, but you made it retroactive to April 1, 1983. On May 5, 1983, you increased the salary. On June 2, 1983 you

cancelled the increase, and on March, 1984 you made an increase retroactive to April 1, 1983, prior to both of the orders in council.

What were you doing with Mr. Shorvoyce's salary? What caused you to make a salary increase retroactive for one year, and particularly when you had, in effect, denied him an increase in the . . . (inaudible) . . .

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hon. member will understand and fully appreciates the difference between across-the-board, or a cost-of-living increase versus a meritorious increase based on performance or productivity. As I said at the outset, when we looked at the salary in early of 12983, we were of the view that the salary was very competitive. It was appropriate. Having reviewed it, and looking at the performance of the individual and the productivity and the work and the responsibility, in our judgement he deserved a meritorious increase and, as a consequence, that's why we provided it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Did anyone else get a meritorious increase, retroactive by 11 and one-half months?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, we're doing some research here, but I'm advised that, as far as we can find out, there is no OC employee got a similar retroactive increase. I stand to be corrected, but we are doing some review.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I didn't . . . My people didn't find one either, which makes me think that you put a very high stock on Mr. Shorvoyce's skills and, particularly, Mr. Minister, since it was just a few days — perhaps a couple of weeks in all — before it was announced . . . In March Mr. Shorvoyce gets an increase and an increase retroactive for a year, and a few days later, the Minister of Finance announces that there will be no increases for senior public servants in 1984. That is a fortuitous bit of timing so far as Mr. Shorvoyce is concerned: nothing like getting an increase, particularly if it's retroactive for a year, when a few days before it's going to be announced that there aren't increases going round. Doubtless it will be said that Mr. Shorvoyce isn't getting it for 1984. As I say, if you get it in March of . . . It sort of salves the wound a bit to think that you're not to get another increase on April 1st.

Doubtless this is because of Mr. Shorvoyce's abilities, and I'm not here to deny them. I note that his duties are to work with other ministers, and perhaps it was because of the public relations coups of some of your colleagues, your ministerial colleagues — and Mr. Garner and Mr. Rousseau come to mind — that cause Mr. Shorvoyce to be so rewarded. Would you indicate what particular gifts Mr. Shorvoyce showed in advising ministers about their public statements that caused him to get this increase retroactive to one year?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's obviously a matter of managerial judgement when you asses the performance of people that are employed for you. Mr. Shorvoyce brings to his position a great deal of experience, active experience in the media where he was involved with, I believe, CBC as a reporter, and for a large number of years in the province. And that kind of insight is not easily measured quickly, but when you observe him under a large number of different circumstances with different ministers, you see that his experience is very valuable. That's the valuable part and, of course, his initiative, and the fact that he's not afraid to work and not afraid to take on responsibility. So it was recognized, and I recognized it, and to put your finger on any one particular thing, it's like a combination of various elements that make up a person's managerial and communications skills. I'm sure the hon. member understands it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Yes, Mr. Premier. I'm not here to denigrate Mr. Shorvoyce's skills. When I think of the cabinet expansion and some of the new ministers with whom Mr. Shorvoyce had to work in order to deal with their public relations, I've no doubt that he had a good deal of work to do and probably is underpaid, rather than overpaid, having regard to the very considerable — very, very considerable difficulties of the job.

But I want to ask you, Mr. Premier, about the policy of your government with respect to the placing of advertising. We've been over this before. Is it still the same? Is it still Dome Advertising getting, I think it's 3 per cent as an agency of record, and the act of agency, if I may put it that way, getting 12, and Dome getting 15 per cent for direct placements of announcements, etc.?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, the mechanism is the same as it was last year, as I described it, with Dome Advertising being the agency on record and so on.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, could you give us any ballpark figures as to how much advertising was placed through Dome Advertising, let us say, in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1983?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, '82-83 placement was \$2.3 million, some change; and '83-84 was just over 3 million.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, do I understand, then, that that is the gross figure upon which the government would, in most, or all places, or, correction — the government wouldn't — the media would pay, in the normal course, 15 per cent of \$3 million? When we're talking about the \$3 million, this is the gross amount of advertising placed, or this is the fee earned by Dome Advertising?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, that's gross placement.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, Dome Advertising Limited — I have the right firm, do I? — that Mr. Spencer Bozak is president, and somebody by the name of Mr. Phil Kershaw is secretary? I'm talking about the same firm? Then is this the firm in which . . . to the knowledge of the Premier, is he aware that there were about 200 shares issued, of which 155, or thereabouts, are owned by a Mr. Larry L. Kyle of 341 Durham Drive, Regina? Does the Premier have any grounds for disputing that statement?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know the answer to that question. I believe . . . it's my understanding that it's a private firm, and I don't know who are the shareholders, but I will venture to find out.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — So the Premier is not in a position to indicate that. Again, for what agencies of the government is advertising not placed through Dome? Are there some exceptions to what I took was the general rule that advertising was placed through Dome?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, in general the agency of record handles it all. There may be an occasional exception — exception, I believe, in the case of potash in dealing with United States, because of some legal matters, that they may do it themselves, and there may be one or two other exceptions. But in general, the agency of record would handle it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, earlier this year there was an odd communication — or it struck me as odd — from Sean Quinlan to directors of communications around the government, with copies to ministers and deputy ministers and other people, talking about out-of-date print materials.

And I have the response of the Department of Agriculture, talking about out-of-date print materials. Material is out of date when the program information of the minister's name, etc., is wrong. And I noted Mr. Roger Fry, of the communications branch of the Saskatchewan Agriculture, asked that publications be destroyed if they were on list one because, presumably either the program information was out of date, or the minister's name was wrong.

And similarly he asked that at the end of 1984 another list be destroyed because the program



material was out of date, or the minister's name was wrong. I looked at the lists, and I look at some which I find it difficult to think that the program material is out of date. I see one, for example, on "Coyote Control." And I don't know what we've learned about coyote control that we didn't know a year ago. And I assume, therefore, that the offending part of that pamphlet was the minister's name.

And I think, "Wipe Out Warbles" – there I don't know whether we've learned a whole lot in the last year about wiping out warbles that we didn't know, such as to cause the immediate destruction of the pamphlet. This is the list for immediate destruction. Now you can say that we found some interesting material on wiping out warbles that required the immediate destruction of the pamphlet, or you can think that the minister's name was wrong. I prefer to think that the minister's name was wrong.

And I ask why the government has adopted a policy of destroying pamphlets on what seemingly non-political items such as "Fly and Odour Control" and "Wipe Out Warbles," simply because the minister's name was wrong. Is that the policy of your government?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, the intent of the memo was solely to deal with out-of-date information with respect to FarmStart or land bank and so forth. Clearly the intent was not to reprint something just because it had the wrong minister's name on it. I think we still distribute pamphlets with, I believe, Gordon MacMurchy's picture or name on it, or Edgar Kaeding's picture or name on it. It certainly wouldn't be to slow down the "Wipe Out Warbles" campaign or the care of the coyote's campaign or whatever it may be.

There has been an awful lot of educational programs or policy programs that have changed, and I'm sure the hon. member is aware of that with respect to our farm purchase program versus the land bank system or something else. That was the intent of it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Minister, I look at this list. Now this is the list of ones that shall be thrown away, not used after 1984, presumably because we got new program material. I see "Peonies in Saskatchewan." Well I don't know whether we got some new program material on how to grow peonies in Saskatchewan, but I doubt it. I doubt it. I suspect that the offending part of that pamphlet is because the wrong minister's picture was on it. And I suspect again that, notwithstanding the Premier's explanation, what we have here is a wholesale destruction of pamphlets because the wrong minister's picture was on it, and not because we have any new and startling information on fly and odour control, or peonies in Saskatchewan, or concrete on the farm, although I suppose there could be something new about concrete on the farm. But I doubt very much whether, as I say, there has been new and startling information come to hand on peonies in Saskatchewan.

And I would like to know on what basis Mr. Quinlan has directed – and that's really what it is – directed communications officers from many, many departments to destroy information, simply because ministers' names, etc., were not right. "Please ensure that distribution of out-of-date materials is discontinued. If you are unable to comply due to exceptional circumstances within your department, please advise." That's fairly short, sharp, and unambiguous.

And, while the Premier may assert that we are asked to throw away pamphlets on peonies because we have new material on peonies, I think it's much more likely that we're asked to throw them away because we've got a new minister. And I ask the Premier why Mr. Quinlan would distribute a memorandum in those terms.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether or not we may still have brochures "Peonies in Saskatchewan," and "Wipe out Warbles," and "The Uncare of Coyotes," or whatever it may be. Again, I would go back to . . . Obviously – and I believe that it's accurate – that there was about a five-year supply of brochures on land bank. And it was obviously wrong. And there may have been a five-year supply of some other kinds of information that were obviously

wrong and out of date.

So the memo was intended to say we shouldn't be publishing or disseminating or distributing this information on government programs that was no longer accurate. And if you had a five-year supply of it, it was just probably something that, in their excitement, perhaps the previous administration decided just to have a whole bunch of because they . . . But, in any event, if . . . We will check and find out if there still are brochures on peonies in Saskatchewan and the wipe out of warbles and so forth. It was not designed . . . The program, if I can reiterate, was not designed to slow up educational distribution or the distribution of brochures that dealt with educational programs, whether it was in flowers, or agriculture, or whatever, but primarily, wherever possible, not to publish inaccurate information because it was based on a policy that was no longer in existence.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I have no doubt that the communication officer of the individual department, in this case the Department of Agriculture, would know enough to get rid of obsolete land bank pamphlet without any instructions from Mr. Quinlan. Pretty clearly the instructions had another purpose. It wasn't . . . With all deference to Mr. Quinlan's abilities, I doubt whether he has got a true grip on all of the contents of all the pamphlets of the Department of Agriculture. And I doubt very much whether they need any help from him on knowing which is an obsolete pamphlet, as far as program material is concerned.

They need . . . What he was telling them was: get rid of pamphlets — yes, that of obsolete program material, but you will already have done that, but also the ones which, in his words, are out of date with respect to minister's names, etc.

And then we have this very long list dealing with insurance management and leasing farm machinery and part-time farming in Saskatchewan and parasites eat your profits and wipe out warbles and cattle branding in Saskatchewan, and on and on — I think things which would not have come to the attention of Mr. Quinlan in his day-to-day duties. He was not complaining about the content of the pamphlet on cattle branding in Saskatchewan.

He was complaining about the fact that it had the wrong minister's picture on it, and I say that what you have done is to throw out batch after batch of pamphlets which were perfectly up to date so far as program is concerned, for the sole purpose of putting the right minister's picture on it. And I suggest that that is a waste of public funds, that Mr. Quinlan knew what he was saying, that he knew what he was calling for, that he got the response from Agriculture that he expected and that, as a result, we have stacks of pamphlets where no change in program has taken place with respect to whatever it may be here — parasites of sheep. I doubt very much whether Mr. Quinlan was expressing reservations or objections to the content of the pamphlet on parasites and sheep. What he was doing was saying that the wrong minister's picture was on it, and I say to you that that type of thing . . . Sure, if it's a widely disseminated pamphlet there's nothing particularly wrong with it to have it up to date because you're going to run through your pamphlets fairly quickly. But peonies in Saskatchewan and parasites in sheep — I think there's no need to reprint pamphlets like that, of modest distribution, simply to have the right minister's picture on it. That's what you've done, and that wastes money.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I believe at the time that the memo was written to the various departments that there was a great deal of inaccurate information — and I use land bank as an example — a great deal of it.

At that time we wanted to make sure that inaccurate information was not disseminated to the public because there would be new programs, new policies, and so forth, and it may have been that peonies in Saskatchewan fell into the category with land bank. I can't speak for whether we've even got the program, or whether we've got the brochure, or even if it's still going out. But at the time when Mr. Quinlan sent it out, there was an awful lot of programs, as I mentioned,

about a 5-year supply of land bank brochures that obviously were out of date, and other programs in other departments. And that's what it was designed for, not to stomp out the wipe-out warble campaign.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm surprised that Mr. Quinlan would have so little confidence in the communications people of the Department of Agriculture that he couldn't rely upon them to get rid of obsolete land bank pamphlets without his guidance and direction.

If the program is obviously obsolete, the pamphlet's obsolete, you throw it away, and everybody knows that. But the reaction that was produced by the communications officers of the Department of Agriculture is very clearly not consistent with a belief that what you are trying to do was root out inaccurate program information. It's just not believable to say that the program information on all of those had suddenly become obsolete and, therefore, we had to get rid of it.

Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, last year we spent some time with respect to people who had personal service contracts, and you gave me a list, a very long list of people who had personal service contracts, a year ago, who had, or had had personal services contracts with Executive Council since May of 1982, and the names included William Barry and David Black and Grant Chamberlain and Ian Disbery and Lorraine Fitzpatrick, Reg Forsythe, Garnet Garvin, Linda Gendur, Jack Harrington, Bonny Holbird, Marjorie Germyn, Kathy Lambsdown, Keith Lampard, Michael Leddy, Terry Leier, R.C. Livingstone, John Nichol, Jim Peterson, James Petrychyn, Lawrence Prout, Barry Roberts, Paul Robinson, Harvey Rothecker, John Schaw, Andrew Schmitz, Robert Svoboda, Dave Tkachuk, Lynn Todd, Ted Walters, Russell Young.

And it was indicated that some of those people no longer had personal-service contracts. A goodly number of them had been transferred into other places in the public service. Could you tell me, sir, how many people now have personal service contracts, or in the last two or three months have had personal service contracts with Executive Council?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I believe in '82-83, and I mentioned last year in the Estimates due to transition of one government, and one administration to another, we had something like 31 personal-service contracts. To date, Mr. Chairman, we have five.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, could the minister indicate whether during the period of the last year you have had a personal-service contract with David Black or Garnet Garvin?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. David Black has been employed and still is under personal-service contract. And Garnet Garvin was, but is not any longer.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, can you tell me the daily rate of pay, if they were paid on a daily rate, payable to Mr. Black and Mr. Garvin, and when Mr. Garvin left your employ?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, in general, if we make the assumption that each of the five individuals worked for a year, and they may or may not on a personal contract, their total salary would be \$178,309 or about \$35,600 a piece.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm sorry I didn't make myself clear. I was talking about David Black and Garnet Garvin. And you told me that David Black did work for you now, and Garnet Garvin had worked for you. And I was curious to know what the daily rate of each of those people was.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I believe in *Public Accounts* of last year Mr. Garvin's salary was documented, and this year it's very similar.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I will ask about Jack Harrington and John Schaw. Does Mr. Harrington have a contract of service and does Mr. John Schaw have a contract of service? And would you indicate what their daily rate of pay is?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, for Mr. Harrington, yes, he is still employed and it would be similar, or very similar, to 1983 *Public Accounts* — '82-83. And for Mr. Schaw, he will not be employed in '84-85 in Executive Council.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, was he employed in 1983-84?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — And can you indicate what the daily rate of pay of Mr. Harrington and Mr. Schaw was during the periods when they were . . . Mr. Schaw's when he left your employ, and Mr. Harrington's current daily rate of pay?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, in last year's *Public Accounts* they're both registered here. Mr. Harrington's is here as well as Mr. John A. Schaw. And I said they'd be very similar.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I want to make very clear that the minister is not answering the question I asked. In *Public Accounts* one cannot find out what the daily rate of pay is, as the Premier well knows.

If Mr. Harrington gets \$50,000 or \$60,000 or \$70,000 or \$80,000, and perhaps I can find out from *Public Accounts*, but I will have no idea how many days he worked for that. He may have dropped in once a week for his \$80,000, or whatever the figure is.

The question I ask is a very simple one. You're hiring this man; you gave me the form of contract; the contract provides for a daily rate of pay — and I'm homing in now on Mr. Harrington — and I ask you again: do you refuse to tell me how much money per day you are paying Jack Harrington?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I passed this entire information on to the members opposite last year — all of it. And it's on the record. It's very similar to what it was last year. And if you take what's in *Public Accounts* and you divide it by 365 days or 261 days, you can come up with whatever you like. So at the normal 260 days that you usually use on a personal service contract, it's about \$300 a day.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, last year you sent me two forms of contract, and you indicated that these forms were used, and they have a blank in them, and I will refer you to the form of contract which you provided me: the minister agrees to pay the contractor — that's the employee — fees, a per diem of blank dollars for each day or partial day.

Now we know, therefore, that Mr. Harrington has to drop in for half an hour to make it a partial day to collect his \$350. He may or may not drop in for any more time. Under your contract, if he drops in for half an hour he's entitled to the per diem figure which you tell me, and I believe, based upon last year, is about \$350.

I think that it's, having regard to the fact that Mr. Harrington was the campaign manager of the Conservative Party in 1982, did an exception job for the party, for which it seems to me the party should be able to reward him, and it should not be up to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to reward him. And if he took on full employment and was there regularly, then nothing wrong. Nothing wrong also to say what he was getting.

Bill Knight worked for us from time to time. Nobody ever tried to say that Bill Knight wasn't

working, or that he did not. We stated clearly, precisely, what we were paying him.

Now what I'm asking the Premier is: would you state clearly and precisely what are you paying Jack Harrington?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, last year I provided the information that is in *Public Accounts* on a detailed basis. I said it's very similar this year. I will undertake to give you the same information as I gave you last year. I'll sent it across, the same information.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Premier, are you indicating that you don't know the per diem figure in Mr. Harrington's contract, or none of your advisers know? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well no, I'm asking. It's not for my information. I'm not asking these questions for my information. I'm asking these questions for the information of the public. And that is what the examination of estimates is all about, but I won't point that out because members opposite know.

And I'm just asking: will the minister not state what the per diem figure is in Mr. Harrington's contract? Is it such a large figure that you are embarrassed to mention it in this House?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I stated it last year. It is not statistically significant than it was last year. And I will provide the information to the hon. member, both in terms of total and the daily amount. And the information that he got in total last year, he will have this year.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Minister, as I recall it last year, you said that his pay last year was \$350 a day. That is my recollection. What I'm asking is: what is his pay this year? After all, there's nothing very obscure about it. You have a written contract. It's got about four blanks in it. One of them is a per diem. What fills the per diem blank in section 2(a)(i) of Mr. Harrington's contract? Just what's the figure? It's a fairly simple question: how much is it?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, it hasn't changed a nickel.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I then assume that you are paying Mr. Harrington, in my recollection, \$350 a day for each day or partial day. This is as I'm reading from your contract which you provided me. And is there any reason to question that that figure is right, or approximately right, and that for each partial day, each day or partial day which Mr. Harrington works, he is entitled to get . . . Reports to the office (I wrote, dwell on what he does) . . . Reports to the office — he is entitled to collect, pursuant to this contract, \$350.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, the contract this year is the same as it was last year. I provided the hon. member and the entire public of the world the information. And it's exactly the same. The contract hasn't changed at all.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think if the Premier wants to play cat-and-mouse, why we'll leave it, and I'll state it to be \$350 a day. And I know he'll correct me if I'm wrong. So \$350 a day is . . .

With respect to Michael Leddy — and I don't remember his. Can you tell me whether at, let's say April 1st of this year, Mr. Michael Leddy was a contract employee with the Executive Council, and what was his daily rate?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — It was unchanged, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — He was an employee on April 1st and his rate was unchanged. We, presumably . . . I have no recollection of that, but shall we set it at \$290 a day?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — It was 190. It was read into the House . . . (inaudible) . . .

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Perhaps it was 190. Let's call it \$200 a day. I can't remember the figure. Did Mr. Leddy's contract terminate at his request or at yours, Mr. Premier?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, we mutually agreed.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, was there what you would term a dismissal for cause or was there some other basis for the separation?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, the hon. members knows with orders in council there is no need to give any reason at all for ending the contract. So, I mean, it was mutually agreed and that's all we need to add.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — There are some very, very strange aspects of mutual agreement to that particular party. But I don't think one need to pursue it in detail, but did you act . . . With respect to Mr. Leddy and his separation, did you act the same as you do with other separations or were there some special precautions taken to see that the separation remained mutual.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I said there was an order in council. It was even less onerous than that. It was a personal services contract, which you really need no reason at all to end, and it was agreed that it should be ended, and that's it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, I'll not pursue that. Do you have an employee by the name of Sheila Brucker in your employ, or did you have one such an employee recently?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I'm very proud to say yes, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Minister, Mr. Premier, the information which appears from the order in council records indicates that she came to your employ in 1983 – early in 1983. Did you have occasion . . . Did you or the power corporation have occasion to buy her house in Carlyle before you came in . . . became your employee?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't recall all the details. I do recall, however, that the *Leader-Post* printed an apology to the Bruckers about an article that I believe Daphne Bramham had written about their home or about their move or something. I don't recall all the information but we will get it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'll let the *Leader-Post* look after itself. I am asking you whether or not you purchased – you meaning the Saskatchewan Power Corporation – purchased a house belonging to Sheila Brucker, a house being lot 16, block 33, in the town of Carlyle – I'll give you the plan number, if you wish – for \$67,500? And I ask whether or not there is anything unusual about purchasing the house of an employee or a person who subsequently shows up as your secretary or assistant secretary?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier to the hon. member, I will get the information with respect to if Sask Power bought it and for what reasons and so forth. But I can state, categorically, it was not for or had anything to do with the fact that Sheila Brucker works in my office.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Thank you, Mr. . . . The Premier will be interested in knowing the registered owner of this house is said to be a Sheila Brucker, and it's the sole registered owner not join names or anything of that nature, according to the order in council. She is, I would have reason to believe, but cannot of course state categorically, being the same Sheila Brucker who is now assistance secretary to the Premier. I think she is from Carlyle. I would be interested in the explanation which you offer to the committee.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, whether you have somebody on staff by the name of Edward W. Evancio, or did you have someone on staff by that name?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I don't believe that Mr. Evancio was ever on the payroll of the Executive Council. He may have worked for a little while during the transition time. Now I believe he's assistant or associate deputy minister of Advanced Education and Manpower.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Thank you, Mr. . . . Do you have an employee by the name of Emery, Mr. George J. Emery, and if so, what is his title, what are his duties, and what is his salary?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, Mr. Emery, Mr. Chairman, is employed by Executive Council. His title is senior strategic planner. His duties really can be called planning. Salary is \$5,006 a month.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, do you have an employee by the name of Jon Jonsson, and what is his title, what are his duties, and what is his salary?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, Mr. Jonsson works for Executive Council. He's director of the planning bureau. His responsibilities are directing the economic analysis and the social planning, and so forth, that goes on, and his salary is \$5,200 a month.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — \$5,200 a month? Is Mr. Emery part of Mr. Jonsson's staff?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, what is the nature of the strategic planning done by Mr. Emery? Does he feel he's in the social sciences or in the resource area or perhaps in another area of social sciences?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, he is involved primarily in the social planning area, which would be education, health, social services. I believe he's secretary of the cabinet committee on social planning, so his involvement would be from the social side of it, as opposed to the commodity or resource sides that would be more into resources.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.